

---

## **In Attendance**

---

Denise Kavin, Catherine Clark, Brian Trager, Sandra Bradley, Clayton Ide, Troy Olivier, Patrick Graham, Scot Atkins

Absent: Luane Haggerty

Additional guests: Ann Hager & Matt Lynn (to discuss workload guidelines)

---

## **Chair's Report – Brian Trager**

---

1. Communication Officer Update
  1. Minutes from last minutes approved?
    - A. Voted unanimously to approve.
2. Brian Trager (Chair) moved to forego formalities of meeting to make best use of time for discussion with Matt Lynn & Ann Hager
  - A. Seconded

Following were the gist of the questions and comments from the NFC REPs:

**NFC REP:** Why are you in a rush this semester to get it approved? Maybe its best to wait for the new provost as they will be using these guidelines?

**HAGER/LYNN:** Would love to have it approved, but no rushing on it is needed.

**NFC REP:** Maybe it's best to hold and wait to see what the new provost thinks? We also have POWs already for next semester so?

**NFC REP:** We can vote on May 9<sup>th</sup> IF we are ready. If not, we can wait until the fall.

**NFC REP:** Should add language to the workload guidelines to clarify that it doesn't apply to Professor of Practice (POP) positions.

**HAGER/LYNN:** Nervous about adding that language as it might open a can of worms. Maybe add something to the POP guidelines rather than this document? Besides, there won't be many POPs in service at the same time – maybe one or two.

**NFC REP:** Course sessions have 10-12 students Vs. classes who might have 8 or less classes? Should we reduce that expectations so that teachers can have these classes be considered a full load and continue to run

**HAGER/LYNN:** Wants to be careful about the document being too prescriptive. It should be a discussion between the chair and department.

**NFC REP:** Program coordinators add 9-10 hours a week, that should be reflected in the document. The wording should be changed on that.

**HAGER/LYNN:** Willing to change wording on it if needed, encourages negotiation with the chair.

**NFC REP:** Concern about the vagueness in some of the wording/language in the document in some areas. Could lead to different interpretations amongst chairs (especially when we are rotating chairs)

**HAGER/LYNN:** This really is to allow the department to see where the workload is an issue and allows them to do what is best for the individual departments. It is different here at NTID as we have so many different departments and distribution of assignments within departments. This allows negotiation and chairs/departments are allowed to figure out where help is needed. Department members absolutely have the right to negotiate with their chairs when it comes to workload.

(Again, the above is just some of the questions that were asked – most of the discussion was just us asking for clarifications on the document before we voted. There will be discussion amongst the NFC members at our final meeting on May 9<sup>th</sup> and a vote *might* be held)

### 3. Adjournment