

NTID Faculty Congress NFC Meeting Minutes
January 23, 2018
12 – 1:30 pm, SDC-2102

Chair: Jessica Trussell
Vice-Chair: Edward Mineck
Communications Officer: Austin Gehret

Attending: Catherine Clark, Tao Eng, Austin Gehret, Jennifer Gravit, Marcus Holmes, Adriana Kulakowski, Camille Ouellette, Mark Rosica, Jessica Trussell

Absent: Leisa Boling, Patti Durr, Edward Mineck

Notetaker: Firoza Kavanagh

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
1. Review Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan 9th Minutes sections amended for clarification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 3d, 4.1.b, 4.1.e, 4.2.b, 4.2.c, 4.3.b, 6.2, 6.2.a, 6.3, 6.4.a, 6.6. b. 4.1.f modified to include that students and professional staff voted in prior years; previous minutes do not indicate who voted; for 1yr NFC had videotaped minutes, not written minutes. c. 4.2.a Lecturer voting rights not currently being discussed or on agenda at Academic Senate. However, it is #1 of 14 charges at Faculty Affairs Committee. d. 4.2.b review Annual Report annually to track number of lecturers and consider what that means for our faculty. • Vote to accept revised Jan 9th Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Austin – motion to accept Jennifer – second Approved (fyi - only 50% votes required for quorum to approve Minutes) 	
2. Check availability of New Spring Semester Reps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patti Durr – absent • Leisa Boling – absent due to conflict with class • Jessica – MSSE travel from Feb 8th-22nd ; Ed may run NFC mtgs. 	<p>Jessica – ask Joe Bochner, Kim Kurz: who will attend 2175 meetings? [Status:]</p>
3. Topics for 2175 after By-Laws are approved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing discussion of CEOCA Report – Communication Requirements: As part of CEOCA, there may be more stringent communication requirements; this has not been decided or announced yet, it is currently being tested. Through unofficial chatter we have heard Intermediate+ may no longer be used for faculty next year. Once proposed by-laws are approved, this issue should be reviewed/discussed through NFC, and Katie Schmitz informed, as she is faculty rep to Administration. 	
4. Present revised By-Laws at Dept Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status by dept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business, Science&Math, MSSE: done Communication Studies & Services: Thu Jan 25th at 11am in sdc-2445 	<p>Jessica – ask Joe Bochner: when can NFC present at DCCS dept meeting? [Status:]</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
	<p>ASLIE: Fri Jan 26th at 9am ICS: Fri Jan 26th at 1pm Liberal Studies: Wed Feb 1st Engineering: Fri Feb 9th at noon VCS: Ed will take care of DCCS: to provide meeting date/time for NFC to present At-Large: Mark will email them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations to dept include: explain history/background, explain major differences between 2005 and proposed by-laws, open up for q&a 	<p>Mark – investigate who are the At-Large faculty that are not part of other depts [Status:]</p>
<p>4. Discussion of feedback on by-laws</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from Business Studies (Adriana): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmed for Mark Pfuntner that Lecturers can give feedback; they didn't seem to feel neglected but there was no feedback from them. b. Jessica noticed at presentation that dept may still have some confusion about 'faculty' and 'voting faculty.' c. Mark P. said he will provide feedback this week but nothing so far. • Feedback from Science & Math (Austin): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Very little feedback. Chair is in full support of proposed by-laws. b. Keith Mousley supported most of the proposed by-laws, but had one suggestion re last para Article 7c – that NFC members should not be the only ones voting. In companies, often the Board is not the only one voting. c. Not all Boards go outside the board for voting; they have stricter rules for passing by-law amendments. Boards with large membership do include all in voting. Some issues require full membership to vote. d. Academic Senate By-Laws <i>Article XIII. Provisions for Amending the Charter</i>, reviewed. May be hard for us to get 2/3 of total population of eligible voters to vote, but that may be what we need to do. Academic Senate follows '2/3 of those participating' so we could get approval of 2/3 of those who do vote. e. Including all voting faculty in the vote, would mean more visibility for NFC, inclusive of all, transparency, following Academic Senate policy, and not excluding any voting faculty. f. 2005 by-laws state '2/3 of people present [must approve] to adopt'. For now, we must follow the 2005 by-laws which states only NFC members vote. 	<p>Executive Committee – ask Katie Schmitz how to get the voting faculty email distribution list; excluding lecturers and professional staff (not eligible to vote). [Status:]</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
	<p>g. It might be cumbersome to have a vote now [to accept current proposed by-laws], and then again some time later [to accept proposed amendments from faculty feedback].</p> <p>h. This ‘catch-22’ situation only comes up for amendments to by-laws which does not happen often. After detailed discussion, it can be resolved by having multi-step vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. update by-laws based on feedback from depts; call it ‘Revision B’ ii. NFC votes to approve proposed 2017 by-laws, as required by 2005 bylaws iii. send Revision B to institute to review with message that this is the updated version that NFC plans to vote on in 1 week. iv. All institute voting members vote to approve Revision B. v. NFC votes to approve Revision B (which includes Mousley’s suggestion). <p>i. NFC members should explain updates in proposed by-laws to encourage their depts. to vote in favor of Revision B. NFC reps represent their dept faculty, so NFC’s vote should be representation supporting what faculty want.</p> <p>j. Lin Hoke sends out emails to NTID on behalf of NFC. Katie Schmitz should be able to help us to suggest how to exclude lecturers and professional staff from that list since they are not eligible to vote.</p> <p>k. Discussion on hold – to be continued/decided at next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote to adopt Mousley’s suggestion to have institute vote on by-law changes: Austin – motion to accept Jennifer – second Approved • Vote – all feedback collected, reviewed, discussed, and revise proposed by-laws in preparation for our vote: Jennifer – motion to accept Mark – second Approved 	
Next Meeting	• Tue Jan 30th noon – 1:30pm, sdc-2102	Executive Committee – Send meeting minutes to ASLIE. [Status:]

1-29-18 fjk