

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

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

**Attending:** Jessica Trussell, Austin Gehret, Catherine Clark, Mark Rosica, Patti Durr, Tao Eng, Edward Mineck, Marcus Holmes, Adriana Kulakowski

**Absent:** Leisa Boling, Jennifer Gravitz, Camille Ouellette

**Notetaker:** Firoza Kavanagh

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
1. Review Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Jan 23<sup>rd</sup> Minutes edited for clarification. Vote to accept revised Minutes:</b></li> <li>Ed – motion to accept</li> <li>Austin – second</li> <li>Patti – abstain (because absent on Jan 23)</li> <li>Approved</li> </ul>	
2. Present revised By-Laws at Dept Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Status by dept - update:</b></li> <li>DCCS: Wed Feb 7<sup>th</sup> at 11am – Ed will present</li> <li>VCS: Fri Feb 9<sup>th</sup> dept meeting – Ed will present</li> </ul>	
3. Discussion of feedback on by-laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Summarizing prior discussions:</b></li> <li>1. During last NFC meeting, it was proposed that (decide order for ‘d’ and ‘e’):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. we gather feedback now and create a new proposed doc.</li> <li>b. send out new proposed doc again to all faculty, and tell them we will vote in 1wk – gives them chance to review updated/edited by-laws based on feedback received the first time around.</li> <li>c. gather feedback again, then NFC discuss, then vote</li> <li>d. include full faculty vote as part of the amendment</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Feedback can be collected as survey responses, electronically, etc</li> <li>3. Steps for accepting new by-laws are same as Academic Senate – we collect feedback from all groups and if accepted, actual language and content of by-laws is changed (unlike US Constitution – changes added as Amendments)</li> <li>4. Past distribution lists have not always accurate if list not updated with HR info. We need to manually update lists with input from Katie’s office to make sure no-one is omitted or incorrectly listed.</li> <li>5. Reiterate that Principal and Senior Lecturers are included to vote, but not (regular) Lecturers, per Academic Senate guidelines. University By-Laws state</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
	<p>that all groups must follow those by-laws. Issue of Lecturer being included in vote has been on Faculty Affairs agenda for few years. Every RIT Standing Committee has Rep(s) from NTID. Add to NFC agenda for NTID to address it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Feedback from Communication Studies and Services (Catherine):</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSS has 2 faculty and the rest are all professional staff.</li> <li>2. CSS Chair’s comments – question about NTID’s practice of hiring individual for position that comes with certain label (Lecturer, Professional Staff). Labels set up barriers for career advancement.</li> <li>3. &lt; Discussion continued in ‘potential 2175 agenda topics’ &gt;</li> </ol> </li> <li>● <b>Re proposed amendment to include all faculty vote to approve proposed by-laws (K. Mousley feedback):</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ‘Approval vote from 2/3 of faculty who vote’ could result in low participation</li> <li>2. Academic Senate by-laws say ‘2/3 of faculty’ but they are not concerned with minimum participation, we at NTID are.</li> <li>3. Could add ‘50% [of all eligible faculty] must vote’ + send reminders till majority/all vote; part of faculty responsibility – required to vote.</li> </ol> </li> <li>● <b>Brainstorm options to increase voting participation:</b> <p>Clicker, at dept meeting, cell phone, ‘abstain’ option, voting area with computer (no-one to run so may not be feasible), online vote (dce/login – not confidential), qualtrics, clipboard, provide incentive to vote, one open college-wide meeting to collect votes, discussion group (still includes name), type up and drop off, current (2005) and proposed (2017) by-laws posted for faculty to compare, improve NFC image so faculty see NFC has authority and Admin support, include agenda of what NFC plans to discuss to raise interest.</p> </li> </ul>	
4. Potential Agenda Topics for 2175 after By-laws approved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Additional comment for CEOCA Report – Communication Requirements:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Re Intermediate+ rating not being used for faculty starting next year – ‘shared governance’ means Administration decisions <i>should</i> include discussion with faculty (NFC); that is not <i>required</i>, but they <i>should</i>.</li> <li>2. NFC role was not as prominent in recent past. Admin knows that NFC is in process of improving and clarifying its role.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Discussion related to Department Head eligibility?:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One person reported that Initially staff were told they could apply, then after hired, changed position title to Department Head. Person brought to discussion the issue of administration changing the title from Chair to Dept. Head</li> <li>2. New motion from Faculty Affairs (Stacey Davis NTID Rep) re Clinical Faculty; related to professional staff issue; could benefit staff in future. Prof Staff who teach could become faculty; we don't have label yet but we will address.</li> <li>3. Per Provost's guideline – practice now is for Associate Professor to be the minimum level, to become Chair, but others have been told it is okay for them to apply. NTID's practice used to be to have Tenured faculty only as Chairs but there has been exception. What if no-one in dept is Associate Professor? Perhaps 'grandfather clause' can be used; lot of concerns about it</li> </ol> </li> <li>● <b>Eligibility for voting membership:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty Affairs committee is responsible for this issue – it is on their agenda to discuss this year or next year.</li> <li>2. Academic Senate dismisses Lecturers – NFC should discuss with our Faculty Affairs rep.</li> </ol> </li> <li>● <b>AACC agenda topic presented as desire for colleges to rotate their Chairs:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AVPAA met significant concerns from Chairs and is open-minded and open to opposing viewpoints.</li> <li>2. Discussion seems to be 'in 3yrs [Chair] have to reapply'.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	
Next Meeting	● <b>Tue Feb 13<sup>th</sup> noon – 1:30pm, sdc-2102</b>	<b>Executive Committee</b> – Send meeting minutes to ASLIE.

2-7-18 fjk