Nontenure Line Faculty Committee
Minutes
Friday, October 19, 2018
1:00 – 3:00 p.m., JCK 880

Members Present: Janet Bezner, Howard Williams, Jarred Knittel, Amy Meeks, Dan Smith, Shawn Camp, Sandra Duke, Dale Blasingame, Susan Holtz, Maureen Smith, Sherwood Bishop, Erin Kehr, Kay Newling, Kevin Jutton, Suzy Okere, Renee Wendel, Glynda Betro, Gloria Velasquez, and Jo Beth Oestreich.

Guest: Debbie Thorne, Associate Provost

Welcome, Introductions & Announcements
• Introductions of new members
• Review of past meeting notes (9/14/2018)

Chair: Janet Bezner
Vice-Chair: Kevin Jetton
Secretary: Jo Beth Oestreich

Old Business
1. NLF Annual Fall Reception Debrief (Kevin)
   a. See details attached. Hi-lights: 166 NLF’ers and 23 guests, 20 VIP’s and 4 vendor/sponsors. Bad weather resulted in some no-shows. Net profit from this event: $3,693.75. Lessons Learned: Worked with Valerie to collect sponsorship money and created PO for this event. We should send out an e-mail reminder for the event. Door prizes were a hit with attendees. Perhaps we could consider hosting this event at Round Rock, hosting in different semester, and consider changing the date to a Monday or Wednesday for next year. Chair Bezner suggested our committee could host an event in the Faculty Dining Room—an informal gathering for faculty to engage in conversations, etc. We could use the information about merit pay by college and department and have attendees analyze which plan they preferred. Thank you Kevin Jetton for chairing and making this event a huge success!
   b. Janet to write thank you notes to all sponsors, internal and external. Kevin will send Janet the list to complete these notes.

2. Draft NLF survey to collect information regarding retirement benefits and other items of interest to NLF. (Amy, Dan, Shannon). Update: Shannon and Amy attended the Retirement 101 workshop and asked the speaker to present to our committee. We will invite this individual to our December or January meeting. Kevin suggested this could be a faculty meeting in the Faculty Dining Hall. [This question was sent to the Provost to review and provide input to our meeting today: If you are 50% or more, your time counts as a full year toward retirement. Is it possible for NLF to have phased retirement similar to tenure track faculty?] Bezner shared, perhaps the question should be: Can a Chair hire someone who was full-time at ½ time (related to NLF).

3. NLF Faculty Development Proposal (Renee, Glynda, Sharon, Susan). Update: The members met and developed a framework of ideas for the committee. The committee is coming up with ideas, types, on-line, synchronous and asynchronous, face-to-face, etc. workshop. They have a lengthy list and will present to the NLF committee at the November meeting. Perhaps the evening faculty meetings could be the opportunity to integrate an evening faculty exchange meetings in Jones Faculty Dining. Prioritize the most important items to consider for professional development.

Old Business (cont.)

4. Agenda for discussion with Associate Provost Dr. Debbie Thorne:

   Associate Provost Dr. Debbie Thorne’s Response:
   a. Inconsistencies among the way NLF are managed and led among the colleges. Response: From a general perspective, all colleges and departments operate differently (not in policy), but in process and culture unique to them. The Dean’s, Chairs and school directors as managing partners, manage individuals who are their equals or peers. One example: In Biology, we have a good team, in other discussions with other departments, NLF are not treated as permanent components of the educational process. Some individuals are considered disposable [dissipable]. One example of inclusion is in Health Professions, NLF are on personnel committees, not voting, but participate. This will be a university wide discussion now (related to faculty of practice, clinical or research faculty and the policies that guide annual evaluation)—mentioned to the Dean’s last month. This issue will be addressed. It was coming out of SACS. Our SACS visit was delayed a year, thus administration did not respond immediately on this action, but it is being addressed. There is a difference with per-course and FTE and how faculty development leave impacts course coverage (the university has to back fill when a faculty member takes leave). There will be some temporary people in and out of positions. The budget reflects how people are hired.
The university experienced its largest growth this past decade. The faculty salary budget is over drawn, the university budget must move permanent money to the faculty budget line. The university has allocated $3.1 million dollars to make emergency and temporary hires permanent. All of our jobs are subject to review at the end of the year—i.e. one year contracts. This past year, we over spent by $1.3 million—we have moved this money back, and the university will review lecturers pay, etc. where the university can push out funding to these contracts. The next step for the administration is to look at our growth and determine where permanent funding is necessary for the ongoing instruction for the various departments. The President released a new budget this week, via the Office Budget website https://www.fss.txstate.edu/budget/. Gaye Korenek, Dir, Faculty & Academic Resources handles years of service. There are some policy issues related to conversion and how years of service are recognized (it should be cumulative as per the policy language, not contiguous).

b. NLF recognition: For faculty promoted from Assistant to Associate, this is their first achievement, is there a possibility they would be recognized at Convocation. Response: This is not being done at this time, but Dr. Thorne will bring this question back up to the President for consideration.

c. NLF salaries: Cupa (https://www.cupahr.org/) data (FTE), focuses only on salaries: Overall, Texas State uses 43 different categories, 15 units are at or above the cupa medium (more than 1/3 of the median salaries); another 12 units are 25%, 63% of our categories are above, at or met medium. This information ranks and discipline (years of service, the market for the discipline, competition, etc.). This data for setting salaries for all faculty, for the NTL (63%) are at or above the cupa medium. We would like the difference with tenure track faculty. This is used for faculty hired to teach at 50%. There are problems in places, and the university attempts to rectify when funds are available applying equity adjustments (used a long time ago). There are some disconnects related to salaries for people hired years ago and new hires.

d. First-time home buying grant: The university asked the city council to expand this to NLF and was turned down. Additionally, this same program will be addressed with the Round Rock area for faculty.

e. Fulbright: There are some inconsistencies from the October 11 University Star article, the policy related to Fellowships, not fulbrights specifically. The policy is revised, asked for feedback, and work on the policy again. It does not limit NLF participation in Fellowships, it does set policy for all faculty. The faculty policy was not aligned with similar processes in existence. Administration is reviewing the process, etc. for Fellowship participation by faculty. This creates a problem with ‘back-filling’ of positions while faculty participates with this program and other opportunities. This is still being addressed.

f. Faculty of Practice Appointments. Historically, Faculty of Practice are hired based on what the person had done in the past. Annual evaluation and promotion should be based on what the person will contribute to the university going forward. This was not addressed in the policy. Faculty of Practice and Clinical Faculty needed a mechanism to carry a higher salary, and carry different expectations for this position. These faculty are expected to make scholarly and professional engagement contributions. Workload assignments must match the productivity and outcomes related to the position. The administration will move the Faculty of Practice to a change in position/title. The Clinical Faculty policy will also be revisited. The colleges and departments will establish the criteria for these positions. Dan Smith provided an example from University of Houston and University of Nevada of career path options for NL faculty, i.e. Professor of Practice. At this time the current climate (low funding) may not be the best time to request consideration of this type of career path option.

g. Changes in the focus on scholarship for NLF

New Business

Faculty Senate Updates: Chair Janet Bezner

CAD meeting: Enrollment at Texas State-record number of freshmen students at 6,780 and recored number of degrees awarded. We have one of the best graduation rates in the state. Some new degrees and PhD and Masters degrees to attract new students costs money. Investing in the new programs is costly and one reason why minimal raises to be designated to faculty. There may be a 1% increase in faculty salary (budgeted) in January 2019. We have hired a new PR firm to work on marketing on our university and more. The last time this was done was before President Trauth was here.

Funding: Legislature (our budget is $650,000,000)—majority goes to faculty/staff salaries; some funding is set aside for raises; etc.; There are two sources of funding for the university: tuition, and our enrollment is flat; and the state, which has been decreasing. We used to be able to raise tuition up to 4.9%, now 2.5%. About $12,000,000 is funding that the administration has flexibility with, i.e., utilities, salary adjustments, etc., but these funds also are assigned to benefits. Retiree benefits costs are high, (6%). Additionally, 3.1 million was designated to salaries to make temporary positions permanent; and some of the 12 million was used to start 13 new degree programs. We have the opportunity
to revisit these proposals and ask what other options are available to consider, i.e. not supporting some of the new initiatives and redirecting funds to support current NL faculty. Additional funds go to pay custodial costs for the new buildings in San Marcos and in Round Rock. Our committee is interested in knowing how to address university initiatives, and are there opportunities for faculty to discuss and evaluate how current programs are operating—and how we will evaluate future programs.

**Council of Chairs:** We will be using Follette (Bookstore will be closed Novem 1-3) in the spring semester. We are currently using Verba.

**Finance Services:** This department is reviewing the PCR process. The Provost is looking to get more bandwidth (2100 faculty) in Faculty Qualifications as this area is understaffed. This department needs help to become more efficient. Some new faculty still have not been processed.

**Video Conferencing Meetings:** Ken Pierce is looking at options to address distance meeting needs with technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item#s</th>
<th>Initiative(s)</th>
<th>Lead(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>NLF recognitions at Convocation &amp; Years Of Service calculations – Discuss plan for going forward to make changes in the current process <strong>Update:</strong> Suzy reported faculty are recognized for making tenure at university convocation, not NTL faculty. She is drafting a letter to the President to request NTL faculty be included and recognized for promotion at convocation (Assistant to Associate). The letter should be sent to the President in the next couple of weeks.</td>
<td>Sherwood Bishop Suzy Okere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Retirement benefits as it relates to NLF – Janet and Amy asked the Provost’s office if NLF could be added to the Phased Retirement Plan (<a href="http://policies.txstate.edu/university-policies/04-04-51.html">http://policies.txstate.edu/university-policies/04-04-51.html</a>). Debbie Thorne responded: The phased retirement program is predicated on the fact that tenure carries an entitlement to continued employment as a member of the faculty at Texas State. Therefore, tenure must be formally relinquished. The ability to retain the continued employment entitlement is secured by the phased retirement agreement at the time a faculty member relinquishes tenure. No other faculty titles/positions carry this entitlement. Non-tenure line faculty may seek employment at a reduced percentage of workload after retirement. This appointment is contingent on student demand and other factors. Next steps: 1. Clarify what “reduced percentage of workload” is for NLF. Clarification from Provost’s office: “NLF may be hired as per-course or percentage FTE (less than 100%) as a transition toward retirement (or for other reasons). This arrangement is based on the instructional needs of the academic department and negotiations with the department chair/school director. There are also rules regarding retirement and subsequent state service.” 2. Create a survey to gather data from NLF on this issue. Fall 2018. Need members to take lead on survey creation. Amy, Dan and Shannon have agreed to develop this survey. They will bring a draft survey in October. Committee members are encouraged to submit questions for the survey.</td>
<td>Amy Meeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NLF eligibility for career paths, roles and opportunities at the university. Next steps: 1. Create a draft of an NLF career path at Texas State. 2. Create a way to generate increased funding for NLF salaries.</td>
<td>Amy Meeks Sherwood Bishop Rose Pulliam Matthew Bower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjournment:** Chair Bezner adjourned at 3:28 pm.
Respectfully submitted,
Jo Beth Oestreich, Secretary

NEXT Meeting – Friday, November 16, 1:00-3:00 PM
Review NLFWR applications (n=11). Members are asked to review and tabulate the applications and send to Janet prior to our meeting.
I. Event Statistics:
   a. **Date/Time:** Thu 9/20/2018 4-6pm
   b. **Venue:** Alkek Library (7th Floor) Wittliff Collections Gallery
   c. **RSVP’s:** Total Estimated attendance of 150 (167 ~ 10% no-shows)
      i. 166: 121 NLF’ers + 23 Guests (after de-duping and corrections)
      ii. 20: VIP’s (President Trauth, Gene Bourgeois & Debbie Thorne +)
      iii. 4: Vendor/Sponsors
   d. No-Shows from the guest list: 74 (or 51%) but Rain/Storms in the area!
   e. **Actual Attendance:** 71 (had leftover food and beverages)

II. Perceptions & Reactions:
   a. A super nice event
   b. ALL were impressed with the VIP’s in attendance
   c. Brief program was slightly delayed due to the rain and VIP arrival
   d. President Trauth’s comments were WELL Received by all and ALL the VIP’s stayed for the entire event let alone mixed and mingled with the attendees!
   e. Food and beverages were SUPER again but we had leftovers (due to no-shows)

III. The Financial Aspects
   a. **Sponsorship $:** $7,350 (External: $3,100, Internal: $4,250)
   b. **Expense Items:**
      i. Dagar’s Catering: $3,295.30
      ii. Specs (Net of returns): $360.97
   c. **Net Profit:** $3,693.73

IV. Lessons Learned:
   a. Purchase of Beer & Wine
      i. Form AP-12 is/was REQUIRED
      ii. A physical P-Card is required for purchases & returns
   b. P.O. is required for the catering contract (route to Purchasing FIRST)
   c. A reminder email could have been done (I debated it for the day before or day of) as some may have simply forgot but I also think the RAIN mixed the attendance mostly
   d. **Door Prizes:** Well received and impressive
      i. Opted to use the pre-printed name badges assuming most would be in attendance AND wanting to state their name and department
      ii. ALL NLF committee members were to be PULLED from the potential winner bucket but some were missed (and actually won a prize)
      iii. Awarding them proved painful due to the number of no-shows but turned it into an enjoyable experience

V. Next year items to consider:
   a. What about Round Rock?
   c. Consider something in the spring
   d. Other Items?