

NTT Committee Minutes 2/21/18

Kris Ratcliffe joined us to talk about the lecturer contracts concerns. She said there is resistance to visit this issue, but that she would be willing to support us if we really want to pursue it.

Deb Clarke previously emphasized the 15% rule for multi-year contracts for NTT faculty. We discussed the issue that NAU apparently has a waiver for the 15% policy, but why isn't clear.

We decided that we want to know what the criteria for getting a multi-year contract would be, since there is such a resistance to giving them. Kris said that having a solid job offer elsewhere and having teaching duties that are considered "absolutely essential" to your department would meet the requirements.

The multi-year contracts are no longer a regular pathway following promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer, and those who want them will have to make a case for it. This is not true, however, for clinical faculty or other similar ranks beyond the lecturer rank. The ACD and Provost guidelines still state that these contracts are available, but this information suggests that it really isn't and will only be given in extraordinary circumstances. We observed that Barrett lecturers still have rolling and multiyear contracts. We aren't sure what the standards are on the other campuses. Kris did say that Nancy Gonzales stated that those who already have multi-year contracts would not see them taken away during the renewal process.

Kris said that visiting the issue of 5/5 loads for instructors might be more feasible as a battle, given that she has a little more control over those elements. Covering classes is a priority for the college, and both Pres. Crow and Mark Searle said there's no ASU policy for 5/5 but that it would be a college edict.

Kris and Shirley asked about lecturer conversions for instructors when a lecturer retires, but that might be ruled by coverage of sections. Kris asked about a 5/4 load for instructors when talking to Elizabeth Langland, inquiring if a rotating 5/4 or 4/4 might be a possibility, to have a course release plan for instructors. Shirley and Demetria are compiling information to see what might be possible in terms of course numbers and instructors. Kris made it clear that Langland isn't interested in how things have been done but is more forward-thinking in her approach.

Kris said that she has a set sum to cover instructors, and it's a matter of making the money work with the number of courses to cover. Currently, there are no overloads in Writing Programs courses and this saves the department quite a bit.

Kris asked if a survey of the instructors now that we are three years into the 5/5 load would be appropriate to gauge how instructors are responding. The committee and instructors in attendance agreed that we should hold off on a survey until Kris and Shirley has the information they need about courses. Kris said that Mark Searle state that the instructor rank was not originally intended to be a long-term job and that many of those positions should have converted to lecturer hires.

The college will not give the department further funding for hires, so we have to make due with what we have. Kris said that online courses during the regular academic year and summer courses are what make money for the department. We have a need for staff positions that have been vacated. The academic year online courses make more money because salaried employees are teaching them, so it's not extra funding for salary as is the case in summer.

We discussed the issue of FYC online, particularly the troubles of determining how to do it successfully. Duane Roen's studio model was of concern given the large cap on the class, and the pilot on the Tempe Campus, though modified from the studio model, wasn't successful and was abandoned. The History Dept. has one class that is scaled for large enrollment, and it is a required course that all engineers must take, so it makes funds for other things in the department. We need to come up with something that would do the same for English, but composition isn't likely to be that course.

Soren gave an update on the instructor neighborhood situation. Kris and Doris have been supportive of instructor needs and requests. They asked for 18 additional desks, but are getting 10, which should allow instructors who are regularly on campus to have their own desk. Currently, things are in flux in the neighborhoods, since lockers are being removed to make room for the desks to be added. Assignments for shared desks will be determined by teaching schedules so that there is less chance for overlap.

There has been a mixed response to the request of third-floor faculty to have access to the third-floor enclave on the main hallway for private meetings, given the lack of ceilings on many of the offices. Some instructors are fine with it, while others have resisted sharing it. All faculty do have the option to reserve and use drop-in enclaves on the first floor as well.