MINUTES OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FGC) MEETING  
Wednesday, September 14, 2011, 3:30 p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30.
Present: Colin Wells (chair), Tony Becker, Mary Carlsen, Jenny Dunning, Jeanine Grenberg, Dana Gross, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Anthony Lott, Timothy Mahr, Leon Navarez, Alan Norton, Nancy Paddleford, Marci Sortor.

It was agreed that the minutes of the last meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year needed to be located so that we could approve them. Colin is checking on this. After assigning minute-takers for future meetings, the committee considered the following issues:

1) Faculty Manual Revision I
Currently, we are unable to print new versions of the Faculty Manual which are up to date, as we have no means—short of having the manual reviewed by the college attorney—for making the “inconsequential changes” to it made necessary by last year’s revision of the manual (we need to adjust the numbering of sections in the manual later than the newly added section on post-tenure review). Colin moved that we amend the Faculty Manual so as to allow greater ease in future “inconsequential changes” to the manual, including numbering of sections and reference in the manual made to such numbered sections. We would not wait for approval from the college attorney (although Marci’s discussions with him have suggested that he approves this move), since the need to promulgate the manual is imperative. But, after the changes have been made, it would be turned over to the college attorney for further consideration and approval of the changes. The motion was approved by voice vote.

2) Committee elections
A Math/Natural Sciences representative is needed for Faculty Life. It was agreed that Sharon and Dana would speak with Matt Richey to narrow down a list of names, and would then report back to the FGC what they find.

We also need another at-large representative for FGC. Tim Mahr will contact Nancy Thompson and Guido Alvarez; Jenny Dunning will contact Neil McNaughton and Torin Alexander. Both will report their results back to the committee.

3) Long Term Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty Concerns
Colin reviewed discussions about this issue that occurred last year both in Faculty Life and in FGC. The various concerns raised by NTT were noted. Colin noted that he has not yet received documents from the NTT committee; he will, therefore, contact them to get those documents, and to inquire of Erik Fure-Slocum whether they intend to forward a specific proposal for action to FGC. When we know more precisely what is being proposed, we will move ahead with consideration of the proposal. In the meantime, Marci will talk with deans of other colleges about how this issue is handled in other institutions. She also explained what the policies at her previous college had been. Long-term NTTs have renewable six year contracts, but people under these contracts are all part-time, experience regular reviews and do advising and committee work. She needed to investigate further whether there were any sabbatical provisions for NTTs.
4) Faculty Manual Revision II
Marci reported that she spoke with Jim McKeel, and that he has offered to act as the person to go through the Faculty Manual to introduce needed revisions. Marci suggested to Jim that he have at least one other perspective on the revisions, and proposed a member of the dean’s office for that role. Mary suggested that a couple members of FGC could act as a sort of sub-committee for Jim as he does the revisions. It is understood that Jim would ultimately propose the revisions to FGC, who would send it on to the Faculty, and ultimately to the Board.

5) Other business
It was suggested that it would be a good idea to start collecting names now for Spring elections. There was then some discussion of exactly the purview of FGC, and of how to organize its work. Colin suggested that the committee limit itself to proposals brought to it by faculty, but Nancy suggested that there could be times when the committee would want to initiate things on its own. There was some discussion of a proposal brought to the committee last year by a former associate dean, concerned with the structure of the associate dean role. There was some discussion of whether what was being asked in the proposal was within the purview of FGC. Nancy argued that it was, while Tony suggested it was more the territory of the Dean’s (Marci Sortor’s) office. Marci said she would forward to Colin a report summarizing the results of a survey of associate deans that was completed after the request to FGC had been made. No final decisions about how to handle this issue were made.

It was then agreed to split the committee into three sub-committees, as follows:
Nominating/Elections: Tony Becker, Tony Lott, Dana Gross
Non-Tenure-Track Concerns: Jeanine Grenberg, Timothy Mahr, Leon Navarez
Faculty Manual Revisions: Jenny Dunning, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Nancy Paddleford

The meeting adjourned at 4:37p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanine Grenberg
MINUTES OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FGC) MEETING
Wednesday, September 28, 2011, 3:30p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30.

Present: Colin Wells (chair), Matt Alveshere (student), Tony Becker, Mary Carlsen, Jenny Dunning, Jeanine Grenberg, Dana Gross, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Anthony Lott, Timothy Mahr, Leon Narvaez, Alan Norton, Marci Sortor.

1. Approval of the minutes:
Minutes of the 4/27 meeting were approved.
Minutes of the 9/14 meeting were approved as amended.

2. Announcement of election results for FNS representative to Faculty Life Committee and announcement of slate for At-Large replacement for Faculty Governance:
Bruce Hanson was elected as FNS representative to FLC. Torin Alexander and Nancy Thompson are the slate for the at-large vacancy on FGC.

3. Request by Environmental Concerns Committee for a FGC representative:
Narvaez volunteered to be the representative.

4. Discussion and approval of revision language to Faculty Manual on so-called inconsequential changes:
The handout “Proposed revision to the Faculty Manual (9/16/2011)” was discussed. The proposed revision was passed. Wells will draft the rationale.

5. Update on larger revision process to Faculty Manual:
Wells announced that Jim McKeel has agreed to work on the “broad” revision of the Manual.

6. Update and discussion on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty issues:
Wells provided background on NTT issues. The committee had recently received “Recommendations Concerning Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty” dated 9/27/11 -- as well as an earlier document dated 11/29/10 -- from a group of NTT faculty. Discussion followed. The committee agreed to study both documents and discuss the NTT group’s points in detail at the Oct. 12 meeting. The committee also agreed to discuss structural dimensions and costs of NTT proposals at the Oct 26 meeting. The NTT subcommittee (Grenberg, Mahr, and Narvaez) will provide a draft survey for department/program chairs on NTT issues for the Oct. 26 meeting.

7. Other business:
Matt Alveshere introduced himself to the committee.

Motion to adjourn by Grenberg, second by Narvaez. Passed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Becker
Secretary pro tempore
MINUTES OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FGC) MEETING
Wednesday, October 12, 2011, 3:30p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30.


1. Approval of the minutes:
Minutes of the 9/28 meeting were approved.

2. Approval of legal contract regarding changes to the faculty manual
Legal contract was approved.

3. Non-TT issues
The committee addressed the concerns of the non-TT faculty as presented in their 9/27/11 draft. It was decided that the committee would review each of the issues raised beginning with the pattern and length of the term contract followed by the title of appointment to be offered.

With regard to the first issue (pattern and length of term contracts), the committee wishes to ascertain whether or not the concerns of the NTT faculty result from mis-information or whether there are structural issues that need to be addressed. Jeanine pointed out that certain issues can be clarified by providing department and program chairs with educational opportunities when hiring. Mary suggested that this is a ‘practice’ issue not a policy issue requiring additional education as part of the letter of appointment. Colin pointed out that this issue may involve either the Dean’s office or Faculty Life. Alan noted that some of these issues go beyond information and benefits- involving liability, office space, campus presence, length of contracts, etc.

The committee requests that the Dean’s office clarify the practice of multi-year contracts and outline how the information concerning term contracts is to be disseminated to chairs and NTT employees.

Marci Sortor will report on her findings and what she learns about the structure of the letters and return with a tentative proposal about these issues.

With regard to the second issue (title of NTT appointment), the committee began by inquiring where the language of ‘visiting assistant professor’ originated. Tony B. provided some institutional memory regarding the term ‘… in-residence’ and noted that the former RPC struggled with a term that could be used for all types of NTT hires.

Marci Sortor will review current and previous NTT contracts to see if the language of ‘visiting’ is located in the letters of appointment. She has also agreed to ask Kathee Hanscom to review the web for use of the term ‘lecturer’ and ‘senior lecturer’.

Marci would like the committee to think about the following questions:
a. What is the significance of tying tenure to the rank of associate professor? Does this influence how NTT faculty members would understand their roles (and be viewed by others) on this campus?

b. What would the culture be if we simply used the term ‘assistant professor’ in NTT letters of appointment or do we need terms like ‘lecturer’ or ‘senior lecturer’?

The committee decided to continue the review of the NTT draft document at a future meeting.

Motion to adjourn by Grenberg, second by Dunning. Passed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Lott
Secretary pro tempore
MINUTES OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FGC) MEETING  
Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 3:30 p.m.

Present: Colin Wells (chair), Tony Becker, Mary Carlsen, Jenny Dunning, Dana Gross, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Anthony Lott, Timothy Mahr, Leon Narváez, Alan Norton, Nancy Paddleford, Marci Sortor, Matt Alveshere

The meeting was called to order at 3:30.

1. The minutes for the 10/12 meeting were approved with minor amendments.

2. Colin Wells passed out the spring FGC meeting schedule.

3. Jim McKeel will propose a schedule shortly for the faculty manual revision.

4. Discussion of NTT issues continued.

   NTT benefit discussion:

   Re NTT requests for 12-month benefit coverage for NTTs .5 FTE and greater, Alan Norton clarified that there was a time when .5 FTE would be scheduled over 12 months for a 1-year appointment; now those faculty are scheduled over 9 months.

   Alan Norton went over handout (attachment 1) detailing benefit eligibility for various FTEs, costs, and numbers of faculty in each category.

   Various situations in which an NTT’s benefit eligibility would be discontinued if not teaching during a semester were discussed (i.e. interim and spring).

   Alan Norton said that most NTTs teaching over a 2-3 year period are at more than .5 FTE and thus have 12-month benefit eligibity.

   Alan Norton clarified that .5 FTE faculty are not eligible for 12-month benefit coverage unless contract is renewed. This was not true in the past. NTTs do go through the year under the current situation without knowing if they’ll have benefits. Marci Sortor pointed out that sometimes contracts are not renewed until after May (due to illness, shifts in student interests, etc.).

   General considerations of NTT issues:

   Marci Sartor said that the college needs to consider what obligations an NTT faculty member might have to the college if benefits were extended
over 12 months or over a semester where the faculty member was not an employee; such employees also involve liability for the college.

In response to a question about whether long-term NTT faculty might be treated differently than shorter term, Alan Norton said that to do so it would be necessary to define the employees differently in terms of responsibilities.

Marci Sortor said that during the 2008-9 academic year, many colleges, including St. Olaf, pulled back from multi-year contracts because of the unstable economic outlook. Times are still uncertain, though not as drastic. It is possible that the college could revisit this decision, but multi-year contracts would still be predicated on departments knowing their needs and the availability of faculty to meet those sometimes diverse needs. She guesses there would be a discrete number who would be affected by such a change. The Dean’s Council is starting to explore this issue.

Mary Carlsen pointed out that 133 (total NTTs) out of a total faculty of about 320 is almost 1/3.

Marci Sortor said that the college can talk about the practices of informing NTTs of benefit eligibility. There are many different types of contract letters.

The committee agreed that the college should improve communication with employees.

Marci Sortor has asked ACM deans about practices of shifting NTTs to longer term contracts. She has received responses from half of those surveyed.

Marci Sortor said it might be possible to discuss practices involving long-term NTTs with the leadership group, although there is already a lot on the agenda.

Various suggestions re definition of long-term NTTs were suggested—6+ years (might be conflated with tenure), 7+ years, 5+ years.

Some of the issues on the 2011 document involve NTTs with shorter commitments to the college as well as long-term NTTs.

The Faculty Manual states that term appointments beyond 6 years should be exceptional.

Titles of NTTs at peer institutions:
Marci Sortor reported on her research on titles used for long-term NTTs at peer institutions (see attachment 2).

As far as the possibility of changing titles, Marci Sartor said that we need to think carefully about what we would be communicating to other potential employers and to students.

“Visiting” appears in the letter of appointment, but not in the Faculty Manual, Tony Lott noted.

Fall 2011 NTT document vs. Fall 2010 NTT document:

Comparing last year’s NTT document and this year’s document, the issue of NTTs teaching outside service courses does not come up in the later document, but might be addressed in questionnaire to chairs.

Colin Wells agreed to send out to the committee a list of NTT requests, drawing on minutes and notes, before our next meeting.

The committee will focus on the 2011 document; other concerns can be addressed at a later date.

NTT Questionnaire for chairs:

Ideas for questions on a questionnaire about NTTs for chairs was discussed. Jeanine Grenberg (absent) provided a list of questions (attachment 3).

The committee felt that we should not ask questions that we already know the answers to, such as the decreased use of multi-year contracts. We also already know that chairs need to be better informed about advising NTT’s about benefit options, etc. Marci Sortor said that this will be covered in the January leadership meeting.

The questionnaire discussed last year was aimed at collecting qualitative information on service to students, departments and college provided by long-term NTTs, including teaching, advising, IS and IR, distinction advising, summer research, supervising internships, summer teaching.

5. Next meeting we will 1) finalize the NTT questionnaire for chairs (we hope to have a draft ahead of time) and 2) put together a list of NTT issues and “where we are with them.”

6. There was no other business discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FCG) MEETING
WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 16, 2011, 3:30 PM

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT: Dana Gross, Marc Sortor, Nancy Paddleford, Leon Narvaez, Nancy Thompson, Jeanine Grenberg, Matt Alveshere, Tony Lott, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Timothy Mahr, Tony Becker, Mary Carlsen

MISSING: Jenny Dunning, Alan Norton, Tony Becker,

1. Reviewed and approved minutes of November 9, 2011

2. Discussed faculty meeting report option...should we [Colin] offer a report in December? Consensus was “yes”. Include:

- Give a heads up to chairs for survey coming
- Give a brief statement about what we are discussing and that both committee and Dean’s office are taking the NTT document and proposals seriously. (Colin has written to Eric Fure-Slocum a somewhat detailed email which Eric has now shared with the NTT; wouldn’t necessarily detail that to whole faculty at the faculty meeting)
- Report on Jim McKeel/Marci Sortor work that is progressing on the Faculty Manual

3. Discussed revised chair questionnaire

- #11: Marci suggested revision: ended with agreement on: “what are the challenges, if any, that your department faces in long term planning as it relates to hiring NTTs?”
- [On preparatory comments, add that we are referring to long term NTTs (Marci); and use” faculty” not “employees” (Tony B)]
- #4: what do we need to know about upper level courses? Should we think about whether we want to know level 1, level 2 (majors and non-majors), Level 3 seminars? Yes
- Do we need to ask chair to identify department? Yes but response can be optional
- Mary moved (Nancy P second) that we approve the questionnaire with today’s revisions, subject to approval on email by the committee.
- The goal is to send to chairs close to December 1 and have results by Christmas break (thanks to NTT subcommittee and to Dana for agreeing to do the survey technologically)

Colin summarized our “big picture”:

- Waiting for more information
- List possible actions to bring to Provost’s Office “advice and consent clause” (Colin)
- Consider possible actions to bring to the faculty

**Multi-year contracts**

1a. Faculty Manual already allows for multi-year contracts. Should we talk about an option that NTTS shall normally be appointed to three year contracts? Might this be connected to 1c.? Recent practice of discouraging these has changed; the Provost’s office/associate Deans will remind department chairs about this staffing option. Marci says we always need to have flexibility about environmental/departmental concerns—there is no imperative or guarantee for multi-year.

1b. Two-year contracts for two-year programs. E.g. Great Con/Am Con

This is an issue for these Program Directors to know about. The appointment letter at the first year needs to specify the two-year commitment to this program and staffing level (e.g. .5 FTE first year and .33 second year)

1c. “rolling contracts” issue

The advantage over a three year is the third year benefits issue; could be resolved by conversation between individual and HR. Unclear who is using/knows about these…chair survey information will help us (i.e. MSCS doesn’t know about them). Future discussion between Provost’s Office and chairs about types of contracts will include this.

**Titles**

2. What should we do with “visiting”? This is not being used verbally, but is in contracts/letters of appointment. It is not included in the faculty manual now. We will need to take up the discussion of titles for both long term and short term NTTs. We use “adjunct” verbally, too. *We recommend that the Provost use language in letters of appointment that matches that in the Faculty Manual; Marci agreed.* Colin thinks that “visiting” is being used for practical purpose that we might not use in the future; we will discuss this in the future with the vast array of title schemes Marci has provided for us. What might be the implications for titles if we add a couple categories of people (e.g. long term NTTs)? Senior lecturer might be the title for a longer-term person; we needs to discuss what are needs are and how we can be consistent.

We will get input from NTT group and from students about impact of usage of each. A future agenda item will be discussion of the list of titles (and we will agree to prepare ourselves for that discussion).

**Extending contracts through summer**
3a. The break point for employee considered eligible for benefits is .5. A person who teaches fall/interim only at .5 cannot get benefits/pay for semester 2. Alan spoke with college attorney about liability, obligations, etc. Marci reported in his absence that Alan’s email to her stated there are pros and cons regarding the college’s liability in cases where benefits and salaries are paid over a 12-month cycle in the case of term faculty members. If the college were to extend its responsibilities to and for employees in this way, should there be expectations for additional service? We will need to discuss this at a future meeting. For instance, if faculty are permitted/expected to be on campus, how to evaluate work over the summer? And what about the extreme case of someone only teaching fall/interim and being paid a full nine months after that

Again, does our sub-category of long term NTTs create particular questions and issues in this, or is this a waste of our time to think about and discuss this?

The Treasurer’s Office needs to consider the benefits/pay allocation individually. When contract ends in May, a person can opt for summer, or a lump sum.

3b. Clarify benefits and payment options for term employees in their letter

Marci will do this and will share the language with us when she has developed it.

Next meeting: December 7, 3:30 PM

Agenda is beginning list of titles used at St. Olaf and ones we might use.

We will only meet on December 14 if there is business we must discuss/decide.
Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Governance Committee  
Wednesday, December 7, 2011  
Dittman 204

Present: Colin Wells (Chair), Matt Alveshere, Tony Becker, Mary Carlsen, Jenny Dunning, Jeanine Grenberg, Dana Gross, Tony Lott, Tim Mahr, Leon Narvaez, Nancy Thompson

Absent: Sharon Lane-Getaz, Alan Norton, Nancy Paddleford, Marci Sortor

The meeting was called to order at 3:35.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the November 16th meeting were approved, with only a few minor corrections (i.e., punctuation and the addition of the names of committee members who were present but not listed as such).

2. Continued discussion of Faculty Manual revision

Jim McKeel had sent all committee chairs a request to examine the language currently describing their committee in the Faculty Manual (FM), discuss it in light of the following questions, and report back to him before end of the term:

• Does the description of your committee accurately reflect the work you do and the responsibilities you have?
• When new members and chairs are elected to your committee, do these descriptions clearly lay out the expectations and operations of the committee?
• If not, what changes might be made?

The FGC discussed information on pages 10-11. The key points and questions were:

2.b.ii. (p. 10):

a) Does the FGC, in fact, “advise on faculty meetings?” If so, it would be helpful to add information about how the FGC does that. If not, the reference to that activity should be deleted.
b) In clarifying how the FGC advises on college governance and college planning, it would be helpful to add something to the effect that the FGC “acts as a conduit between the faculty, administration, and the Board of Regents.”

2.b.iii. (p. 10):

a) With respect to the FGC and the Regents-Faculty Conference Committee (p. 16), the FGC noted that members of the Regents-Faculty Conference Committee should be appointed at our next meeting in February.
b) This section of the manual should cite V.B. (p. 16).

2.c.iii. and 2.c.v. (p. 11):

a) It should be noted that these members are ex-officio.
2.c.vii.
a) The FM should note that the student member is selected in accordance with the procedures determined by the student government association. Ideally, information about the election of student members of committees would be stated once, at the front of the FM, perhaps as an addition to IV.A.6 on page 7.

3. Continued discussion of Non-Tenure-Track faculty issues
   Titles for NTT:
   a) We noted that Marci had said at the November 16th FGC meeting that she intends to avoid using titles that are not in the FM (i.e., “visiting”).
   b) We discussed the different meaning of rank and title for NTTs and for tenure-track faculty. Tony B. stated that rank should be related only to evaluation and the T&P processes. Currently, the FM lists the ranks of Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor.
   c) Tony L. observed that the NTT group’s document had requested the removal of “visiting” and this has been accomplished. In addition, the NTT document suggested that St. Olaf might adopt the titles that Pomona College uses for all faculty members, including NTTs: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The FGC does not know if NTTs at St. Olaf would endorse other titles, such as instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer, and distinguished lecturer.
   d) Our new unified T&P procedure, linking Associate Professor status with the awarding of tenure, renders the title of Associate Professor problematic for NTTs. Grandparenting of NTT titles would be one way to proceed for current NTTs who hold the title of Associate Professor.
   e) We previously discussed the need to know about the range of titles currently being used by NTTs; it is expected that Marci will report about those titles at the next FGC meeting in February.
   f) We noted that “normally” is used in the FM (p. 37, X.B.) to describe the use of rank, without any indication of the exceptions, such as hiring a new tenure-track person at the rank of Associate Professor. In addition, one possible implication of p. 38, XI.B is that an NTT Associate Professor would be able to participate in a T&P meeting for a tenure-track Assistant Professor.
   g) With respect to the possible titles for term and terminal faculty members – instructor, lecturer, and senior lecturer or distinguished lecturer – there would need to be a clear, uniformly applied process specified for evaluation and promotion through the possible NTT titles.
   h) The FM (p. 23, VI.A.9a-d) currently has a section called Appointments. An adjacent section could be added to address Titles for NTTs.
   i) The FGC is making progress toward defining the category of long-term NTT. Next steps include discussion of possible titles, with input from NTT at a meeting with the FGC.

Survey about NTTs:
   a) Jenny moved, Mary/Tony B. seconded, and all present voted to follow Karen Cherewatuk’s request at the December 1st Faculty Meeting that the FGC include program directors in the NTT survey. Department chairs will be reminded to
complete the survey, if they have not already done so, and program directors as well as department chairs will be asked to respond by the end of Interim. (Colin planned to send Dana email information so that she could send the Google survey link to program directors. The next day, however, Colin found the link that had been sent earlier and informed Dana that he would send it himself.)

Meeting with the NTTs:

a) Mary moved that Colin communicate to Eric Fure-Slocum that the NTT group will be invited to a meeting in March; Colin seconded this motion and all present approved it. As a result, Colin will schedule an FGC meeting with the long-term NTTs in March (7th or 28th) to discuss the progress on this issue and obtain their input, particularly about the definition of NTTs and the development of new titles for faculty members holding these positions.

b) Tim recommended that the FGC NTT subgroup develop a summary document, incorporating materials prepared by Marci earlier this fall for the FGC. The summary will be shared with the FGC by February 22nd and with the NTTs prior to our meeting with them in March.

Agenda Topics for the February FGC meetings:

a) Provost’s report about the current number of NTTs and the titles they use

b) FGC review of responses to the NTT survey of department chairs and program directors

c) Appointment of members of the Regents-Faculty Conference Committee

4. Other business – there was no other business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Gross
Secretary Pro Tem
MINUTES OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FGC) MEETING

Wednesday, February 8, 2012

Present: Colin Wells (chair), Matt Alveshere (student), Tony Becker, Mary Carlsen, Jenny Dunning, Jeanine Grenberg, Dana Gross, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Anthony Lott, Timothy Mahr, León Narváez, Alan Norton, Nancy Paddleford, Marci Sortor, Nancy Thompson

The meeting was called to order by Colin Wells at 3:33.

1. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2011, were approved.

2. Committee Nominations

A faculty member from Natural Sciences and Math needs to be found for the Faculty Life Committee to finish the academic year and serve the coming academic year. The subcommittee of Tony Becker, Tony Lott and Dana Gross will look into possibilities.

As for the general nominations slate to go to the faculty we need to have the ballot ready by the April and May deadlines. What are the vacancies for the various committees? Which are at large? We need to put the form creator together for the two votes. In the recruitment of candidates we should have a statement about the work of each committee. Colleagues should know what the committees do and who constitute the
membership.

The election during the first week of April is by divisions through electronic ballot and the May election includes presenting at the faculty meeting a slate of candidates for at large positions and is followed by an electronic ballot. Those who are not elected in the division vote may be interested in an at large position.

3. Regents Faculty Conference Committee

Nancy Paddleford and Mary Carlsen are part of the Regents Faculty Conference Committee as faculty observer and faculty observer elect. A small group of us meets with a group of Regents up to three times a year. Nancy Thompson, Colin Wells, Tony Becker, Jeanine Grenberg, and León Narváez are the other members of FGC named to this committee.

4. NTT Survey

The survey results are not complete in terms of responses from all the departments. There has been a lot of response but art, management studies, political science and religion have not responded. These departments will be approached again in the hope of getting a response.

Dana Gross explained how to access the results of the survey (go to the Google document, then to forms, and finally summary of responses).

We need to understand where we are before meeting with NTTs. The subcommittee of León Narváez, Jeanine
Grenberg and Tim Mahr will prepare a report of issues and questions for FGC following the initial discussion today. Jeanine G. will prepare a document of issues with options, a document that Tim M. and León N. will review before distribution to FGC.

Discussion of the survey results:

For the purposes of the survey, we focused on NTTs who have an FTE greater than .50. The question was raised as to whether or not this is the target NTT group for whom policies are to be developed. We will leave open for now who is included in the NTT group. The understanding of the committee was that this and related issues would be considered at a subsequent meeting or meetings.

An impressive percentage of departments have one or more NTTs doing different things for the College (doing departmental work, supervising internships, student advising, etc.).

It was noted that a significant number of departments have someone teaching a course that no one else can teach. Also, some respondents do not know the difference between nine-month contracts and twelve-month contracts. At this point we stopped the review of specific items.

5. Additional Future Action

Colin Wells will provide us with a summary of the results
by item. Sharon Lane-Getaz will do a statistical summary. Also, Marci Sortor will report at a future meeting on the number of NTTs employed at Saint Olaf.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44.

Respectfully submitted,

León Narváez
FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FCG) MEETING
WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 22, 2012, 3:30 PM

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT: Colin Wells (Chair), Marci Sortor, Leon Narvaez, Nancy Thompson, Jeanine Grenberg, Tony Lott, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Timothy Mahr, Mary Carlsen, Alan Norton, Dana Gross

MISSING: Tony Becker, Nancy Paddleford, Jenny Dunning, Matt Alveshere (student)

Chair Colin Wells called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

1. Reviewed and approved minutes of February 8, 2012

The minutes of the meeting of February 8, 2012 were approved.

2. Discussion of committee nominations, short and long term:

• A vacancy exists on the Faculty Life Committee. Someone is needed from NSM to fill it for the remainder of the year and next year. An election is not under way yet, awaiting word from Matt Richey regarding the slate of candidates.

• Dana Gross has produced an executive summary listing of the expected vacancies on the various campus committees for the coming year. The list will be circulated to the FGC committee and discussed at the next meeting.

3. Discussion of NTT issues

• Review of results of the NTT survey sent to chairs and program directors, summarized in reports by Colin Wells and Sharon Lane-Getaz. Colin Wells will continue to contact those departments and programs not responding to the survey. When it is complete the survey would be attached to the minutes of a future FGC meeting in order to be made public.

The Wells review breaks down into four categories of concern.

Category 1: Contributions of the NTTs (questions 1-4)

NTTs are doing a broad range of work for the college. These duties include supervising summer research (40%), independent study (65%), student teaching, clinicals and/or practica (30%), internships (60%), distinction projects (60%), and/or off-campus study (35%), as well as doing departmental (85%) and college (60%) committee work, advising (75%) and other kinds of service (40%). A significant majority of departments and programs have NTTs who contribute in a number of ways. Committee work, independent studies, etc. are
above 50%. It was noted that most NTTs are only doing a portion of the full listing of responsibilities found in the report.

NTTs teach all levels of courses, and 50% of the departments have NTTs that teach courses no one else is qualified to teach.

The survey looked for broad range of use of NTTs as opposed to head counting. A concern still exists about identifying the correct population of NTTs. How we count NTTs requires a more refined definition of what is considered an NTT.

Dean Sortor reported an accounting of NTTs teaching at the college for five or more years and at a teaching load of 0.5 fte or greater. For this accounting she set aside a number of coaches who also teach, as well as those who teach individual music lessons. The remaining group contains 33 individuals. There are 4 who will be leaving after this year, leaving a body of 29 NTTs. Quite a few have been here more than 5 years, doing important work for the college. 14 departments generated the 29 NTTs. It was later acknowledged that a few of the music NTTs who teach lessons also teach a course. A question was raised as to whether the service needed to be 5 continuous years. Dean Sortor will check on this and report back to the committee. She expressed the intent that the parameters should be both sufficiently flexible to accurately encompass individuals who should be considered in this group and sufficiently specific to provide clarity.

Colin Wells will determine the percentage of the response rate to the survey, and also contact those who haven’t responded, with the hopes of receiving their information before our next meeting. The final report will be attached to the minutes of the next meeting.

Category 2: Issues about contracts (questions 5-9)

There appears to be a definite need to educate chairs about the differences in the types of NTT contracts. 40% of respondents were not aware of the differences in compensation and benefits between 9-month and 12-month LTNTT contracts, and 35% were not aware of the differences in compensation and benefits between one-year and multi-year LTNTT contracts. 17% reported that their staffing needs are stable enough to allow for multi-year contracts. 45% were using rolling contracts, while 30% were not familiar with rolling contracts. 75% of chairs believe there could be advantages to rolling contacts.

Category 3: Challenges within long-term staffing planning for NTTs (question 11)

The most common challenge noted were the last minute changes that make long term staffing planning difficult. The notion of rolling contracts is understood differently across campus. This issue needs to be addressed in the education of department chairs and program heads.
Category 4: The March 1st deadline for notifying NTTs of reappointment (questions 12-15)

The March 1 deadline is troublesome for many, unknown to a few. Is it too soon? It is problematic for chairs/directors due to the difficulty in predicting the following year’s needs. There is a need to make sure chairs/directors know of the deadline, make it easier for them to meet it, and make sure they understand its importance. The deadline comes just after the class and lab report is due, so they should be able to predict with some degree of accuracy. Knowing the numbers of NTTs needed has a budgetary impact at this time of year. After discussion, the committee felt that changing this deadline to a later date would not clear up this concern.

Category 5: Other concerns (questions 16-18)

There is a need identified for chairs/directors to become better informed about NTT issues and important deadlines in order to properly advise their NTTs.

Eight other NTT issues were raised by the 20 chairs/directors. No particular issue was cited by more than 4 of the responders. The top NNT additional concerns cited involved the desire to establish opportunities for professional development, IPAT accounts, and sabbatical options, as well as improving low compensation.

• Review the summary document of the NTT subcommittee (written by Jeanine Grenberg) outlining our discussions and actions so far.

There was general consensus that this document needs to be adjusted to reflect changes Dean Sortor has already put in place before formally forwarding it to the Dean's Office.

Dean Sortor observed that as we think about who does this work (NTT appointments) for the college, we have a wide range of people and of needs. We will consistently have points where we’ll need leeway to deal with the whole series of needs. What are the assumptions being made? Is there a concern that we will only address a subset of the NTTs?

The remainder of the meeting focused on a discussion of new titles for NTTs.

It is perceived that, whether long or short term NTT, the issue of title is of concern to everybody. Jeanine Grenberg noted that being able to define the different levels of NTT status might affect different titles being employed currently. Nancy Thompson wondered if certain professional standards for specific titles should be established. Alan Norton observed that if certain conditions are set to qualify an NTT for a particular title, they might need to be sustained once achieved in order for the title to be retained. If the title is connected to something that goes up and down, it may affect the NTT title. Dean Sortor noted that one outcome of this process will most likely include a more
clear definition of the college’s expectations for the work done by NTTs. Colin made the observation that perhaps less should be asked of the NTTs if in fact the college cannot do more for them.

In contemplating many categories (the types of contracts, 2-year and 3-year contract options, redefined titles and our understanding of what is meant by long-term NTT status), Dean Sortor suggested that it might be best to structure conversations with faculty that the FGC Committee has different levels of involvement with the issues. The Dean is starting to work on a description for long term NNT position and will comeback to the FGC Committee with a set of decisions about NNT issues for us to consider. Jeanine Grenberg suggested that how we define the category of NTT is perhaps a separate issue from what the titles of the various categories might be.

Colin Wells proposed presenting NTTs some title options for feedback (and putting the long term issue on the shelf for now).

Dean Sortor stated that a discussion is needed to clarify associate and assistant professor levels of NTT, to capture history of past decisions.

Tony Lott wondered whether the committee should hold off the discussion of title until we hear from Dean Sortor regarding definition of categories.

Colin Wells wondered if a the college needs to establish a means for LTNTTs to be promoted and then get this information into the handbook.

The Dean’s decision to drop the descriptor “visiting” within appointment letters for next year’s NTTs would be in accordance with current faculty manual language. She asked whether FGC would recommend that all future appointments (now consistent with wording in faculty manual - dropping the use of the term “visiting”), be supported with language to explain the current situation, or would it be better to wait until FGC resolves the various NTT issues. Colin Wells proposed meeting with NTTs to share the current decision to drop the term “visiting,” in order to explain to them that this is in accordance with the faculty manual, and to let them know it’s an ongoing, serious and active discussion topic of the FGC and that it will not be able to be resolved quickly. It was determined that the Dean will meet with Colin to discuss this issue further and come back with a more precise plan of action.

Dana Gross asked if the college could offer some level of IPAT support at this time to 29 NTTs. At present they can receive travel funds (from their associate deans) but this type of funding cannot cover professional memberships. Dean Sortor will study this and bring back a recommendation.

Colin Wells proposed a meeting with an NTT subgroup at the March 28, 2012 FGC meeting and the committee members gave assent. FGC actions to date on this matter would be communicated and a discussion would then be encouraged.
4. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm

Timothy Mahr, secretary pro tempore
PRESENT: Colin Wells (Chair), Marci Sortor, Leon Narvaez, Nancy Thompson, Jeanine Grenberg, Tony Lott, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Timothy Mahr, Mary Carlsen, Alan Norton, Dana Gross, Tony Becker, Nancy Paddleford, Jolene Barjasteh, Matt Alveshere (student)

Chair Colin Wells called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

1. Approval of minutes. Minutes approved.

2. Welcome our new member, Jolene Barjasteh.
Jolene will serve out the rest of the year. She is serving at-large.

3. Update on Nominating process from Nominations Subcommittee.
Dana Gross: Rich Allen is now the Natural Science member on FLC. The website has been updated.
Dana has circulated two documents:
   1. A list of current committee members
   2. An official list of committee responsibilities and expected vacancies.
Jeanine has passed on list of possible candidates in the Humanities. Marci has sent email reminders to Associate Deans. Mary suggests that committee members contact their individual Associate Deans to help round up candidates.
The committee discussed when we need to have the candidate slates ready for the Division and Faculty-wide elections. Colin asked that we strive to have Division electronic ballots up by April 6th, before Easter break.

4. Nancy Paddleford is taking an FMLA leave beginning March 17th. She’s not sure if she’ll be back in time for the Board meeting on May 3rd. The committee decided to wait and hear from Nancy before we decide whether to hold an election to replace her as the Faculty Observer.

5. Phyllis Larson came to talk to the committee about proposed changes to Faculty Manual concerning the sabbatical process.
Phyllis explained that the FLC needs more time to read and suggest changes to sabbatical proposals. The committee agreed that the new plan made sense. We then gave suggestions to Phyllis for the rewording of the proposed changes to the Faculty Manual concerning the schedule for the proposal and approval of sabbatical plans. Phyllis will rewrite the revisions and share them with the committee for an e-vote before greensheeting for April meeting. The committee will greensheet the new Faculty Manual language for the April faculty meeting so that the board can approve the language at their May meeting and the changes can be in effect by June 1st.
5. Continued NTT Discussion.

A. Continued discussion of NTT Titles.
Colin met with Marci to talk about the word Visiting in NTT titles. As for now, Marci will keep the word Visiting in NTT titles; when we decide what to do about titles in a larger sense, we will adjust titles according to our larger decisions. Jeanine brought up that there could be legal issues if the term “visiting” is used in the titles of NTTs when that language is not in the Faculty Manual. Colin pointed out that that just makes our work all the more urgent.

B. The NTT Survey
Since our last meeting, about five interdisciplinary programs responded to the survey. Only one program had an NTT. Colin divided departments and programs in the data so we could compare the info from departments and programs. The committee decided that Colin should finalize the summary report of the survey given to chairs. The results are appended to these minutes.

C. Future meeting with NTT representatives and the committee: Issues to discuss.
The committee discussed what we should report to and discuss with NTT faculty in our meeting tentatively scheduled for April 11. Marci put on paper the big questions that she’s working on with the NTT issues. She wants to ask the committee these and get recommendations. We decided to discuss these issues as a larger committee rather than have the NTT subcommittee discuss and report back. Dean Sortor has a set of questions and issues that she prepared for our meeting. Jeanine promised Colin she would send him language explaining the proposal to allow 9-month NTTs to be paid over 12 months. Colin is responsible for pulling the whole list of NTT discussion issues together.

Here are some of the central NTT issues the committee identified and discussed:
- Multi-year contracts. With good planning and better communication we should be able to offer more multi-year contracts.
- Chair education. We discussed recommending to Marci that department chairs are more educated on NTT issues. Marci talked about some chair education that is currently underway; she handed out a sheet that’s gone out to chairs that explains the different pay cycles. This sheet will become part of the faculty manual. Her office is working on better communication with chairs on NTT issues.
- Share the data from the NTT chair survey, which is appended to these minutes.
- Title change. NTTs prefer not to have the word “visiting” in their titles. But Marci pointed out that sometimes, especially if a faculty is only visiting for two years, the term visiting would be very useful. The committee wants to get feedback from NTTs on when they think the term visiting is appropriate and/or applicable.
This discussion led to the issue of categorizing the NTTs. Should we create separate categories for NTTs who have been at ST. Olaf for a certain number of years? And/or for NTTs who carry a specific set of responsibilities (advising, for example) in addition to their teaching? We want feedback from some of the NTTs to take into consideration on this issue.

We also discussed the AAUP six-year rule. Colin shared the new MLA thinking that the old AAUP rule isn’t in-step with the new realities of the academic world.

Marci expressed the importance of establishing policies to create stability, regularity and expectation of pay for NTTs.

In the end, we decided that we will continue this discussion of NTT issues at our March 28th meeting so that we can be ready to talk with NTT representatives at our April 11th meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm
Nancy Thompson, secretary pro tempore
Appendix: Faculty Governance Committee
NTT Survey Summary Report: March 2012

1. How many depts./prgrms have Longterm NTT?

41 departments and programs responded. All but two departments offering majors responded, and perhaps more, as two chairs/directors responded anonymously (28); in addition, 13 interdisciplinary programs responded). Of these 41, 21 reported having at least 1 LTNTT (51%): departments, 15 of 28 (54%); programs 6 of 13 (46%).

2. In what ways do they contribute?

Of the 21 depts/prgrms with LTNTT:

9 have NTTs who supervise summer research (42%)
14 have NTTs who supervise independent stud. (67%)
6 have NTTs who supervise student teaching, clinical, practicum (28%)
12 have NTTs who supervise internships (57%)
12 have NTTs who supervise distinction projects (57%)
7 have NTTs who supervise off-campus study (33%)
17 have NTTs who do departmental committee work (81%)
10 have NTTs who do college committee work (48%)
15 have NTTs who do advising (71%)
8 have NTTs who do other kinds of service (38%)

3. Of the 21 depts/prgrms with NTT, 10 (48%) have NTTs who teach courses no one else is qualified to teach.

4. Of the 21:

16 (76%) have NTTs who teach introductory courses
10 (48%) have NTTs who teach 200-level courses primarily for non-majors
12 (57%) have NTTs who teach 200-level courses primarily for majors
13 (62%) have NTTs who teach upper-level courses

5. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 9 (43%) are not aware of the differences (in compensation and benefits) between 9-month and 12-month contracts.

6. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 8 (38%) are not aware of the differences (in compensation and benefits) between one-year and multi-year contracts.
7. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 17 (81%) report that their staffing needs are stable enough to allow for multi-year contracts.

8. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 9 (42%) use rolling contracts.

9. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 7 (33%) are NOT familiar with rolling contracts.

10. Of the 20 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 15 (71%) believe there could be advantages to rolling contracts.

11. What are the challenges your dept/prgrm faces in long-term staffing planning as it relates to hiring of NTTs?

- Perception about the difficulty or inability to obtain rolling contracts for NTT (3 responses)
- Need for last-minute shifts away from the 1-2 year projections of department staffing needs (1 resp)
- Finding instructors who can teach particular skill courses to the department’s satisfaction (1 resp)
- Inability to offer faculty grants or sabbaticals to help NTTs with their research (Da2 resp)
- Challenge of having FTE in particular years to allow long-term valued NTT to have steady work (5 resp)
- Difficulty staffing IGS programs without NTT (because of unwillingness of tenured and tenure-track faculty to contribute), combined with message from Assoc Deans to use NTT more sparingly (3 resp)
- Trying to broaden the pool of teachers in an IGS program while also helping valued NTT have steady work (1 resp)

12. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 3 (14%) are not familiar with the March 1 deadline.

13. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 10 (47%) have missed the March 1 deadline.

14. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 13 (62%) report that there are pressures or constraints that make it difficult to meet the deadline.
15. Pressures from Q14 enumerated:

- Not having full sense of department’s needs until after 3/1 (5 responses)
- Inability to find instructor with right skill set to teach specific course by 3/1 (1 resp)
- Not having full sense of department FTE until after 3/1 (1 resp)
- Difficulty finalizing department’s needs for following year in the middle of Spring semester (1 resp)
- Not receiving approval from administration to hire specific NTT until after 3/1 (1 resp)
- Staffing an IGS program without knowing status of a prospective teacher’s departmental commitments by 3/1 (1 resp)
- Not being approved to hire someone currently on a one-year contract (1 resp)

16. Of the 21 chairs/directors who have LTNTT in their dept/prgrm, 9 (43%) do not feel sufficiently well-informed to advise departmental colleagues on NTT issues.

17. Of the 9 chairs/directors who do not feel sufficiently well-informed, 1 (11%) reports not knowing where to send department colleagues when they have questions.

18. Among the NTT issues that chairs/directors report being raised in their departments:

- Opportunities for professional development, IPAT, sabbatical (4 responses)
- Low compensation (3 resp)
- Lack of timely notification for rehire (1 resp)
- Lack of opportunity for promotion, greater job security (2 resp)
- IGS director feeling uncomfortable asking NTT to contribute to program outside of teaching (1 resp)
- Difficulties for NTTs in their attempts to get outside grants due to biases among those in profession (1 resp)
- Balancing the needs of departments and IGS programs in sharing NTTs (2 resp)
- Communicating frequently with NTTs due to their infrequent (1 day a week) teaching schedules (1 resp)
Felt pressure not to hire NTTs when possible, coupled with sense of lack of college-wide commitment to interdisciplinary study (1 resp)
FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (FCG) MEETING
WEDNESDAY MARCH 28, 2012, 3:30 PM

MEETING MINUTES

3:36 Meeting called to order

Present: Colin Wells (Chair), Tim Mahr, Tony Lott, Tony Becker, Dana Gross, Jeanine Grenberg, Marci Sortor, Alan Norton, Leon Navarez, Nancy Thompson, Mary Carlsen, Matt Alveshere (student), Jolene Barjasteh Sharon Lane-Getaz (recorder)

Missing: Nancy Paddleford

A. Reviewed the previous meeting minutes (2/22/12) and approved as amended.
B. Nominations process: Dana Gross, Nominations Committee
   The one short-term vacancy on the Curriculum Committee is not confirmed but Dan Hofrenning said Devyani Chandran may be able to serve. As for the Faculty-wide election to be initiated by April 5, the decision was made to put together a slate for the May Faculty Meeting, preferably during the week following Easter. Marci will touch base with the Associate Deans (ADs) first, then committee members will contact ADs. The Social Sciences may have the firmest slate. The list from Humanities has not been fully confirmed with potential nominees. The committee especially needs to follow up with FNSM, IGS, and Fine Arts, who may not be as far along. (It was noted that Dan Dressen is making some progress for Fine Arts.)
C. Colin reviewed his notes on what he intends to share in the Tenure Track (NTT) group meeting (scheduled in 2 weeks), based on the NTT Recommendations document dated 9/27/11:
   1. Describe what we’ve done thus far (e.g., the Chairs Survey results, summary material to be sent to Eric Fure-Slocum ahead of time to share with others, as he sees fit.)
   2. What we’ve discussed about each of the NTT recommendations, potential approaches, and obstacles, including but not limited to (see Colin’s sheet for more detail):
      Recommendation-1: Greater use of multiyear contracts. Multi-year contracts are consistent with the faculty manual; affirm better anticipation of staffing needs; better chair education of contract options;
      Recommendation-2: Titles. We understand that the problem of the term “visiting” as it applies to long term NTT faculty. Would “visiting” be appropriate for short term or temporary NTT faculty? Who gets consulted when you start to consider tenure? Would the term “Senior Lecturer” be acceptable?
      Recommendation-3: Contract Renewal. One concern with contract renewal is the timing. Better / earlier staff planning might alleviate concerns. Another concern may be addressed if NTTs, anticipated to be rehired, have the option to choose a 12 month contract rather than a 9 month contract (i.e., being paid over the summer) with no break in benefits. (Alan is researching whether there may be any issues with offering this option to NTTs.) FGC members also noted that we need to consider NTT who may be .5 FTE but only teach one semester out of two. The implication was that we need to look over a broader planning horizon.
D. Marci Sortor sent around her notes concerning long term NTT Issues. Some of these items were briefly discussed. The FGC members will read the document more carefully in order to give Marci more substantive feedback at the next meeting for her consideration. Items we began to discuss include (but are not limited to):

1. Do we need something done for long-term NTT? Clearly other schools are doing it. It adds flexibility of having both tenure-track and LT NTT. It is important that the college not “exploit” LT NTT. Some take on extra responsibilities in order to be “in favor” should courses become available. We hold the best interest of students and the college as goals as we attend to the fair treatment of this category of employees.

2. What would the LT NTT responsibilities be?
   - We expect to define a base set of expectations for this category of faculty member, and then pro-rate the responsibilities according to FTE. We agreed that these faculty members should exhibit excellence in teaching. We wrestled with whether there should there be some expectation for scholarship. We asked, how would this category of faculty member be clearly differentiated from tenure track faculty?
   - The consensus was that this LT NTT category be added to the Faculty Manual and spelled out explicitly. There is nothing explicitly there now (see pp. 22-32 re: Appointments). The consensus was that modification of the Special Appointment section would not be sufficient. We asked, is this new category closer to the TT position or closer to what we currently have?

3. Are LT NTT not paid properly? Different categories of term appointments are compensated at different rates depending upon their history with the college. Compensation is one way to differentiate the LT NTT integral to the operation of particular college programs.

4. What does it mean to be long term? .5 FTE or above over a longer period (e.g., 6 years) to account for the rise and fall in class cycles. Old AAUP guidelines did not allow keeping people for 6 years or more. The spirit of the AAUP guidelines was to ensure term hires were not exploited, as is our intent.
   - The consensus defined the LT NTT category we envision as NTT with over 36 courses taught, regardless of the amount of time it takes for the employee to reach that threshold.
   - This new long term category is intended to trade more permanence in exchange for more service-related responsibilities.

E. Discussion concluded remembering that sometimes a small number of positions need to be opened up as a tenure line subject to a national search. Colin will share with the NTTs that the FGC is in serious discussions about creating a new category of appointment with its own responsibilities to potentially be spelled out in the Faculty Manual. Colin will make it clear that Alan and Marci are sifting through these recommendations with the FGC, providing consultation and guidance as we proceed.

5:00pm Meeting Adjourned.
Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 11, 2012

Present: Colin, Tony, Tony, Sharon, Jeanine, Matt, Tim, Nancy, Marci, Dana, Alan, Jolene, Leon, Mary

Guests from the ad hoc group on NTTs: Eric Fure-Slcoum, Sherry Saterstrom, Diane Angel, Anthony Rudd, Elizabeth Galbraith

1. Minutes from March 28 approved without any changes

2. Nominating committee report

Good news: many places on the ballot filled

Still to be filled: FGC tenured member to replace Dana for NSM; HUM ballot needs tenured member for FLC (Colin working on it); when this is done, the other humanities slots are filled. Fine Arts is ready to go; SS is ready to go; IGS is ready to go; Humanities should be ready Friday

May election at-large: will need observer-elect to Board of Regents

3. NTT working group conversation

Colin’s comments: Using recommendations concerning NTT document as our working piece; Colin suggested we go through the document and discuss what we’ve talked about and decided; this document also has started a broader conversation in this committee.

Reminders: Chair’s survey done and we learned a lot about major roles NTTs play on campus. Findings confirmed where we are. We looked at titles at peer institutions. We looked at specific recommendations and tried to address them directly and also as needed for further work.

Many recommendations we found not controversial, but good ideas. We have recommended some to the Dean and she has supported them. We started with those and then moved to the ones that require further information.

Recommendation 1: pattern and length of contracts; greater use of multi-year contracts.

This practice is consistent with faculty manual and we should try to bring practice closer to faculty manual policy; we affirm this, e.g. in the Conversations. Demonstrated need is there and we have recommended this be done and the Dean agrees. We want to get closer to spirit of the request...that is, college should plan better for future so we know earlier, so we can do more multi-year—on this we agreed. Example: changing timing for sabbatical requests to earlier, so planning can be earlier and NTTs can know earlier about possible hire. Also, we plan to educate new chairs about how to anticipate future needs and what/how to do contracts with specific people.
So, we affirm #1 with recommendations to the Dean. We are committed to make it HAPPEN, too, with the NTT’s assistance/information (specific situations) that can help us better understand.

Eric: Can we encode in the Faculty Manual the commitment to longer term contracts? More explicit guidelines? Page 23 Marci: VI A 6. We are letting chairs know this, but the question about affirmative action about longer contracts is an interesting issue

Jeanine: can you give us ideas about language that would be more affirmative?

Eric: Situations of those who HAD multi-year, then were given lesser contracts. So if we’re here a long time and are needed on a regular basis, could we be scaffolding up to more and not so prone to less (e.g. 1 yr, 1 yr, 3 yr, 1 yr)...looking for some level of stability. Series of conditions under which one would choose to use multi-year contracts.

Page 3 of recommendations under E. probationary period, then move to multi-year contract...

2. Since Eric raised the question of whether we can affirm more long-term NTTs by including them in the faculty manual, Jeanine suggested we move to discussion on the particular position of Long Term NTT at the college. This is conversation about whether there is a special category. The committee thinks this makes sense to consider these people different from one-time people. It’s complex and raises questions.

Sherry: I have been here 25 years, always fluctuating. Some clarity around this will be satisfying to me. Being able to look out 3-5 years instead of year to year. Diane: other places have a variety of models. Colin: this is all about evolution of colleges—AAUP guidelines, etc. We are evolving, so just going along isn’t good enough...we need to make decisions about the new environment...the 6 year moment is what we’ve talked about. Diane: we hesitated to choose a particular cut-off of years...considering more a gradual building up to a decision (Colby in particular has a model). Marci: then for the institution to consider building a review process, say every 3 years. The idea of building a relationship sounded better.

Elizabeth: what is the number of years for a special appt? Marci; 1-even 6 years...the latter coming to T & P...needs clarity at the time of coming in. Faculty Manual (36 equivalent courses). Anthony: those who teach a course or two at a time would take a long time to get there, so flexibility is important. Shouldn’t necessarily just turn into something like tenure. Eric: “graduated process” the move into different category seems to fit with what we’ve talked about. We don’t have a fixed position.

Diane: Clear expectations for NTTs—advising, summer research would be helpful

Colin: is there any language anywhere that states expectations of NTTs? Eric: I think not. Expectations differ dramatically between departments. Jeanine: it’s been a lot of ad hoc; then some become expectations. Are NTTs encouraged/discouraged for Conversations? Eric: hope for clarity that comes from policy and changes the culture; it can be developmental, of course. Mary: Marci (and Alan) have worked hard to clarify letters of appointment

Colin: Let’s go back to the original document.

Recommendation #2 Titles
Colin: *Focus on word “visiting”. We know it doesn’t appear in the Faculty Manual And many of you are not “visiting” (the college)! We discussed possible solutions. You suggested we get rid of that and use rank. We are sidetracked by snag of “visiting associate” that would then become “associate professor”. We now have united tenure/associate professor decision. Our snag is the associate professor issue. What do you prefer and why? What can we take from you about this snag issue?*

Eric: *What’s the snag with associate?*

Tony B: *A dept chair putting someone up for promotion has to consult with everyone at equal or higher rank; does not refer to type of contract. This would put NTTs in the position of supporting someone for promotion/tenure...that is potentially problematic. Also, linkage of promotion and tenure implies “associate professor” is a tenured appointment. Anthony: first issue can be dealt with easily. Second issue: many of us like the idea of keeping “professor” in the title, as it’s better understood in the wider academic community...those who are interested in continuing scholarly work and who write letters of recommendation for students think “professor” is more seriously take. Perhaps to find another adjective. “adjunct” is better than “visiting” to most of us. Mary: what do most think about “lecturer”? (NOTE: most present seemed to agree that “lecturer” is less good, but the NTTs may survey the others)*

Sharon: *what do you really need/want?*

Eric: *maybe an option for “visiting” for someone under a certain number of years. About 4 years ago suddenly our letters said “visiting”. When I asked if I could change it back, the answer was “no”; Diane was told that it had to do with reporting of salaries*

Jeanine: *instructor for those without PhD, visiting assistant for a couple years, then maybe adjunct assistant, then adjunct associate...maybe?*

**Recommendation #3**: Colin: *point at which faculty are considered full year employees. 12 month vs. 9 month. We agree to maximize the full year. Issue with .5 or greater is the issue with people teaching in only fall semester but an employee for a year. We agree that those who are teaching fall and spring are coming back following year, we have them on a full year contract. We are working to try to cover people over summer when they are coming back; we will be proactive about those who are coming back.*

Colin: *We want to have longer contract when need is there. But when a person is on that last year and next year is uncertain, what if we allowed the option for a lump sum of summer money if you are not rehired? (not any benefits) how does that sound?*

Anthony: *I can imagine that if “continuous” is the default people would find this change reasonable. Eric: A contract offer after May is unusual. HR tells people about the COBRA emergency option when their health benefit ends in May...rare.*

Colin: *What else do you want to know?*

Eric: *What did you learn from the survey?*

Jeanine: *Confusion of chairs on NTTs and contracts. Leon: the variety and ways and percentages of your contributions to the college. Colin: you’re dong what others are doing, and at this point the relationship between NTTs and the college is not what it should be; I think this graduated relationship idea is helpful...responsibilites and rights spelled out will be*
important…“when you become X, this is what we expect for duties”…question remains about scholarship, but the service expectations should be clearer. Tony B: appointment letter could include expectations.

Anthony: What about more of a sense of different options/possibilities? Which elements might be involved—committee, advising, scholarship as options in conversation with department chair.

Mary: can we talk about the scholarship question?

Eric: Danger of moving to a direction of we are just teaching faculty; I would argue that scholarship should be in the mix...as expectation and college support for NTTs. Don’t want to move to teaching faculty or research faculty. Diane, Anthony, Eric...haven’t discussed a lot about scholarship, but generally think it should be in the mix, esp. for those in very short contract positions.

Jeanine: I worry about a two-tier system...aren’t we all teacher/scholars?

Colin: if we imagine a long term NTT position, would you want scholarship to be a part of the expectations? Anthony: yes, particularly if there is a choice/elective model...flexibility is important.

Eric: IPATs and NTTS. If one were to engage in regular scholarship, predictability of support would be important to the NTT

Colin and the committee thanked the group for coming and the meeting adjourned about 5:50 PM

Respectfully submitted,

*Mary S. Carlsen*
Minutes of Faculty Governance Committee (FGC)
Meeting of Wednesday, April 25, 2012

Present: Colin Wells (chair), Matt Alveshere, Jolene Barjasteh, Anthony Becker, Mary Carlsen, Jeanine Grenberg, Dana Gross, Sharon Lane-Getaz, Anthony Lott, Leon Narvaez, Alan Norton, Dean Marci Sortor, Nancy Thompson

Called to order at 3:30 PM.
1. Minutes of the April 11, 2012 meeting were approved. Thanks to Mary Carlsen!

2. Nominating Committee Report: Faculty Elections.
   Dana Gross and Tony Becker reported that online elections in faculties had just ended and that the general faculty ballot for the May meeting is nearly complete. It was noted that the Tenure/Promotion Committee member who will represent Fine Arts must be elected by the full faculty in May. Colin Wells added an appeal from the current chair of Tenure/Promotion to nominate full professors for open positions on the committee if possible. The "at-large observer-elect" to the Board of Regents must also be filled, and Mary Carlsen offered to provide more information on the position to interested persons.

   Related to the Board of Regents, Dean Marci Sortor raised some questions about the Regents-Faculty Conference Committee, a committee intended to provide a way by which, on a regular basis, representatives of the Board of Regents and the faculty may discuss together matters of mutual concern regarding the college. Should this committee meet 3 times per year with the Regents? Once a year? What happens to the issues raised in their discussions? What should this group accomplish? How does this committee fit with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents? Dean Sortor will place this issue on the May agenda ("Other Business") of the Academic Affairs Committee.

3. Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty continuing discussion.
   Colin Wells will report on the work of the FGC regarding Non-Tenure-Track faculty at the May 10, 2012 Faculty Meeting. Discussion focused on Colin’s written summary of new questions to consider after the FGC meeting with NTT group representatives on April 11 and possible next steps – long and short term – for action on NTT issues.

   The five larger questions that emerged from the discussion with NTT may be condensed as follows: 1) possible actions by FGC regarding the encoding (in the Faculty Manual) of college policy on normal length and sequence of NTT contracts; 2) further discussions by FGC related to a new “long-term NTT” position; 3) possible actions regarding clarification of service-related expectations of NTT faculty; 4) consideration of change of titles for NTT faculty (i.e., drop “Visiting” from Instructor/Assistant Professor ranks and use “Adjunct” for Associate Professor rank); 5) further discussion of the role of research and professional activity in the NTT faculty profile.

   Possible next steps for FGC: Short term action on NTT issues
   There was lively discussion on possible short term action regarding the NTT group’s Recommendation #1: Pattern and Length of Term Contracts (e.g., encouraging use of multi-year contracts; better education of chairs about anticipation of needs and types of contracts for NTTs) and NTT group’s Recommendation #3: Contract Renewal (e.g. affirming policy of paying all faculty with FTE of <.75 over 12 months, all faculty of < or =.5 who teach in both the fall and spring terms over 12 months, etc.). Jeanine Grenberg raised two areas of concern: the education of chairs regarding the types of NTT contracts and the anticipation of staffing needs prior to March 1 (see Faculty Manual: Reappointments and Renewals 4.VIII.B). Regarding the first concern, Dean Marci Sortor informed the FGC that descriptions of non-tenure-track positions had already been sent to chairs and that an electronic handbook for chairs will include this information every year. As for the second concern, Marci emphasized the need for flexibility,
especially for contracts of less than 3 years, rather than using the more formalized language of
deadlines since some reappointments may be made well after March 1 (i.e., in the summer).

In his report to the faculty, Colin will stress the work that the FGC and the Dean have done to
clarify existing contracts for non-tenure track faculty, what is possible or acceptable regarding
multi-year contracts, the efforts to communicate more effectively to chairs the types of NTT
appointments, and the role of chairs in the anticipation of staffing needs and in keeping NTTs
informed.

Possible next steps for FGC: Medium term action on NTT issues
What can the FGC begin to do now that could be accomplished in early ’12-13 academic year?
Colin raised the issue of the NTT group’s recommendation on titles of appointment and what this
might mean regarding revisions to the Faculty Manual. Dean Marci Sortor stated that she intends
to follow the recommendations from FGC on this matter for future letters of appointment for NTTs.
Jolene Barjasteh asked if FGC knows how NTTs other than those in the NTT group react to the
use of terms such as “Visiting” (short period of service?) and “Adjunct” (longer period of service?)
since this information may be relevant to discussions of change of title. Colin suggested that
FGC report its intent to resolve the title issue before next March when letters of appointment are
sent. FGC will encourage faculty who have opinions on this matter to communicate them to us.

Possible next steps for FGC: Longer term action on NTT issues
Discussion of the possibility of encoding in the Faculty Manual a normal pattern for renewing
contracts of Non-Tenure-Track faculty, along with normal expectations for service, will continue
into next academic year for the FGC. However, FGC members raised a number of issues at this
point. Jeanine suggested that we distinguish long-term NTTs from other NTTs, which prompted
Mary to move that we encode in the Faculty Manual a normal pattern for renewing contracts for
NTTs as a series of steps. Her motion was seconded by Nancy Thompson. When Tony Becker
reminded all that the FCG and Board of Regents must engage in a cooperative venture regarding
revisions to the Faculty Manual, Mary withdrew her original motion and requested that the Dean
start the conversation about NTTs with members of the Board of Regents. Colin proposed the
FGC come up with a more detailed idea regarding the renewal of NTT contracts before passing
this information along to the Dean, to the President, and then to the Board of Regents. Dana
Gross recommended a modest proposal to mention the need for clarity regarding NTTs with the
Regents Conference Committee, and/or Mary Carlsen can raise the issue with the Academic
Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents.

Discussion shifted to the term “expectations” of Non-Tenure-Track faculty and how number of
years of service to the College figures into those expectations. Colin suggested that, by offering
3-year contracts as a rule for “Long-Term” NTTs, the College would be honoring an unwritten
understanding that already seems to exist. (Note: Expectations of service for NTTs are an issue
for the Faculty Life Committee that oversees the Faculty Handbook.) Colin ended by saying that
part of our job has to be clarifying for NTT faculty from the beginning of employment 1) the type of
Non-Tenure-Track position being offered; 2) the service requirements for each type; and 3) the
research expectations for each type of NTT.

At our next meeting, FGC may consider a motion to move forward on making revisions to the
Faculty Manual regarding NTTs.
Adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Jolene Barjasteh, Secretary pro tempore
Faculty Governance Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of May 9, 2012

Present: Wells (chair), Mahr, Grenberg, Thompson, Narvaez, Jacobson Barjasteh, Sortor, Norton, Gross, Alveshere, Carlsen, Lane-Getaz, Paddleford, and Becker.

The minutes of the April 11, 2012, meeting were approved on a voice vote.

The FGC recommendations for Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) faculty as distributed by Wells were moved by Wells and seconded by Mahr. Minor editorial changes were made. Approved on a voice vote. See Addendum One to these minutes.

Discussion of plans for next year as distributed by Wells were presented. See Addendum Two. Item (d) was added regarding title and rank. Item (e) was added regarding six FTE years of service as a definition of long term. Item (f) was added on expectations for NTT. Item (g) was added by reference with changes as noted.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Becker
Secretary, pro tempore

Addendum One - FGC Recommendations to the Dean for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The Faculty Governance Committee offers the following recommendations to the Dean and Treasurer in response to "Recommendations Concerning Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty," which was submitted to FGC by the NTT Working Group in September of 2011.

1. The NTT Working Group recommended greater use of Multi-year contracts and rolling contracts where there are demonstrated anticipated needs (both within departments and programs such as the Conversations):

As a first-step response to this request, the Faculty Governance Committee recommends that department chairs and program directors be aware that the Faculty Manual currently permits the use of multi-year contracts for term employees. Such contracts are permitted and appropriate, for instance, in the case of term employee teaching in a two-year program such as the Great Conversation or American Conversations, or where a department chair recognizes a clear multi-year need. The committee also recommends that the college as a whole continue to explore ways to more accurately anticipate departmental and program needs; more particularly, the committee recommends that a process be put into place for informing and educating chairs and program directors on the nature and types of term contracts so as to better understand the current contracts of term employees and to advise administrators on anticipated lengths of future term contracts.

The Dean’s Council has discussed this matter and affirms that in cases where staffing needs are best met by a multi-year contract, the Associate Deans will work with department
chairs and program directors to develop a plan incorporating such a contract.

The NTT working group also recommended a greater use of rolling contracts, and that the Faculty Governance Committee encode into the Faculty Manual a normal sequence of contracts. The committee resolves to consider these and other types of contracts beginning in the fall semester of 2012-2013.

2. The NTT Working Group recommended that the designation of “Visiting” (as in “Visiting Assistant Professor”) no longer be used in the case of long-term NTT faculty titles, noting that (a) no such designation appears in the Faculty Manual, and (b) the designation is inaccurate to describe long-term members of the faculty. The Working Group acknowledged that the term “Visiting” might nonetheless be useful for faculty teaching at the college for short periods of time.

The Faculty Governance Committee recommends that this designation be discontinued in the letters of appointment for the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee agrees that alternatives to this designation be debated and voted on as part of the longer-term consideration of the issue, beginning in the fall of 2012 and concluding by the early spring of 2013.

3. The NTT Working Group recommended that the college reconsider the minimum level of FTE (from .75 to .5) for a faculty member to be considered a full-year employee.

The Faculty Governance Committee affirms the following elements of current college policy (3/1/12) regarding FTE for a faculty member to be considered a full-year employee:

   Faculty with .75 FTE or greater are paid over a 12-month period.

   Faculty with .5 FTE or greater, who are in a multi-year contract that calls for them to teach in both the fall and spring semesters, are normally be paid over a 12-month period except during the final year of the contract (see below for committee recommendations for 12-month pay option in the final year of a contract).

   Faculty with less than .75 FTE and a contract of one year or less that calls for them to teach in both the fall and spring semesters are normally paid over a 9-month period (see below for committee recommendations for 12-month pay option in the final year of a contract).

   Faculty paid over a 9-month period (i.e. who are already slated to teach in the spring semester) and who sign an appointment contract to teach the following fall semester will be allowed to spread the balance of the salary not yet paid over the summer months in order to allow for the continuation of benefits.

The committee also recommends to the Dean and the Treasurer that employees on a 9-month contract (either in a one-year or the final year of a multi-year contract), who anticipate a renewal of their contract for the following academic year, be given the option to request to be paid on a 12-month schedule. In the case that they are not contracted to teach for the following fall semester, they will receive the remainder of their salary at the
end of May in a lump sum. The Dean and Treasurer affirm this revision.

Addendum Two - Starting Points for Next Year

The committee will consider for next year:

(a) whether to pursue the "long-term NTT" model in the more comprehensive sense we've talked about over the last few months, and what that would entail in terms of (1) expectations of NTT by the college regarding service and/or research, as well as (2) expectations of the college by NTT regarding contract length or "job security issues" more broadly

(b) whether to propose revisions to the Faculty Manual that "encodes" a "normal" sequence of contracts, as in the Bates model proposed, and whether this would be seen as complementary to #1 or as an alternative to #1

(c) whether, and how, to revise the Faculty Manual regarding changes to titles of term employees.

(d) the topic of rank vs. title in the Faculty Manual regarding tenure and promotion policies.

(e) six years FTE equivalent as a starting point for where long-term begins for NTT.

(f) whether there is to be such a category as long term NTT, what procedures and expectations are there to be for renewal.

(g) the issues raised in "Long term NTT Issues and Questions" dated March 7, 2012, from Sortor, parts C and E deleted.