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Hi everyone, Happy Wednesday middle of the week. I'm happy that you're all able to join us. You know we have — we had one town hall open meeting yesterday, open forum. It went very well with a good turnout. We heard a lot of different perspectives. I'm also happy that you're able to join us now today.

I'm going to send out everyone the link in the chat.

It's all of the communication that took place between NFC and the workload committee, with administration as well as the response from the committee and the response from an administration, so this proposed workload guidelines have already been posted and I will send you that link right here.

You can go ahead and click on that (<https://www.rit.edu/ntid/committees/nfc#reports>) and take a look at it. There are four documents. Feel free to take a look at those.

We're all here together to improve and have a good foundation for our workload guidelines.

I want to make sure that people understand, I heard yesterday from some people that there are still some important things from — that need to be looked into and other areas that may be put on hold. But then, Gary will explain a little bit more that.

You know we can't continue to have diverse workloads between the colleges and so the guidelines changed in 2019 and we are working on the update for 2023. This is the first time that faculty has ever had an open conversation about workload in this manner and communicated with administration.

So I have to say, thank you so much for the administration being willing to work with us and have this open conversation, especially with NFC. I hope you know your representatives who have been involved with this workload committee. They have been gathering your feedback as well as documenting that.

And there were 27 questions from the departments at NTID that were gathered as well as concerns or feedbacks or suggested edits. And so it's important to know that it we're working on being as transparent as possible as well as getting all of the information in that we can because we want an equitable workload. We want it to be simple guidelines to be able to follow and to have a consensus among our college.

So I'm going to stop talking because the most important thing is to share that report. So I am going to turn it over to Kelly Davis, who is the chair for the workload guideline committee and her committee has been working on it for a little more than a year. So we want to say thank you so much to Kelly and to your team for all of your very hard work, and I will hand it over to Kelly.

>> I am going to share the PowerPoint. Thank you Brian for sending that out.

So I wanted to start with thanking the Associate Dean for allowing us in as the committee and allowing us to the space to have this conversation with the current workload guidelines and to be able to bring forth some edits and modifications and give feedback. Also thank you to the committee. They were an excellent team to work with and I can tell you who they were momentarily, but I could not do it without them. In addition to the NFC. Thank you so much for giving me this platform to have this conversation and to have some consensus with the guidelines.

So the committee members, this is our goal for today. We'll talk about who was on the committee, the charge, the timeline, the response to NFC feedback, summary of the changes and then lastly questions and answers.

So I am Kelly Davis and I was the chair of the committee member. Each person had different positions because they were elected to represent their areas. The coordinator for business cross registered students is my particular role. We have a mixed model.

Janine Butler is tenured faculty. She is a teacher and tutor with the mixed model as well.

Then we have Marge Carrillo who is the director in ASLIE program in additional in addition to teaching.

Patrick Graham, PJ, who is the director of the MSSE program, also tenured faculty as well.

Marcus Holmes, who is the program coordinator for Engineering Studies, for our faculty teaching.

And then we have Karen Tobin, who is a teacher, a tutor and follows the mixed model as well.

So, all of these different disciplines were represented. They followed the model for the workload and we've had some very interesting conversation and it was a real learning experience.

So this was our charge the Provost Granberg gave us last year.

The comment about POW, one thing is we were supposed to work on developing a POW that would be the same for all of NTID. However, we decided to put that on hold because of Faculty Senate. They are going to be having that conversation as a whole university. So we thought let's finalize this first and then we can plan ahead once that conversation has started, has started and we can talk specifically as a college.

Here's the timeline. It has taken over a year. It feels like a really long time, but we have made progress. The committee was established in September 2022. We met and provided feedback to the Associate Deans. They responded to our committee. We shared the workload guidelines with the NFC and the revisions, but it was towards the end of the semester, so there wasn't enough time to gather feedback and enough space to be able to work with that. So we put that on hold until the end of fall semester.

And then, there was a letter from the NFC that was sent to the committee with these certain deadlines.

As the chair of the committee, we met with the Associate Deans Gary, Pat and Chris — Matt and Chris. And narrowed down the questions and answers that were really crucial that if there were any repetitious questions we could pair it down and streamline what we were answering. Then us as a committee met with the associate Deans. We all agreed with the responses.

Then we submitted that to Brian, the NFC chair. And we gave him our responses as well as the associate Dean.

And those responses are on the website link that Brian provided.

So we're going to discuss a summary of the changes on the next slide. There were the 27 questions that Brian mentioned that were submitted and we put them into separate categories, those that we were able to respond to those recommended considerations and changes. The number seems a little bit off, but there are some categories, that are also worth further consideration.

There were five main things in the college wide document that served the purpose of encouraging departments to develop their own internal workload guidelines. It cannot be any looser than the college wide guidelines.

Also emphasizing a clear description of student contact hours that was really emphasized to make that more clear.

There was an emphasis on communication between chair and faculty specifically, and making sure that communication is transparent. That allows for the ability to negotiate with the workload, within reason.

And also having that transparency, third is the review of scholarship expectations. You know, we didn't really go in depth on that because we don't have the ADR association of the associate — for the research department. It's really their responsibility.

We were responsible with writing something that was in line with promotion and document and expectations of tenured faculty.

We talked about direct and indirect instruction. What counts as direct contact hours versus indirect contact hours?

And we also talked about teaching and tutoring. If there's a column that we'll talk about lecturing, separating and clearing that up for promotion as well as the range of percentage of change.

Um, that should be present in that table. So what are the in service needs and adjust — adjust the POW with your chairperson and have that conversation. The more time is you're focused on service then that will affect that communication and it will it will impact promotion in the future. And having that conversation about promotion, there were a few other tiny changes the report title needed to be revised.

We changed some language from tenure track and tenured faculty to all tenure track faculty. So that was some of the language that we changed as well. Tenure and tenure track because when people go into tenure track until they are a full professor and retire, it doesn't matter what level you are, you're on that track. So we were able to change that language to be more consistent throughout the document.

And then the communication section, we had a week long intensive sign language course changed that one where people take it to measure their skill and ability it we changed the name of that to NSLARC.

And that was just a minor revision as well. I think that really summarizes everything. So I'm going to turn it back over to Brian.

>> OK. Hi again everyone. Thank you, Kelly for that summary.

I did send the link again to everyone in the chat that does have the most recent proposed workload guidelines.

So for about the next hour, the floor is yours. I would like to ask faculty members to raise your hand and ask questions, you can send me a direct message that I will sign the question for you, or you can send a message out. And really, again, the floor is all yours to have any questions or concerns answered.

Does Gary or Matt have anything that they would like to add?

>> This is Gary. I'd be happy to. Hi everyone. I just wanted to follow up on Kelly's point about scholarship specifically. Kelly mentioned that we're waiting for the Associate Dean of Research, the ADR. Right now that is a vacant position.

We had Bob Pollard in that position. We then had Peter Hauser in that position.

And now we do have the position open. We're in the process of doing a nationwide search.

But in the meanwhile, the workload guidelines guided by Kelly and her committee we didn't want to hold off on because of the lack of ADR.

So yes, we are holding as Brian mentioned on making any more firm decisions until we hire that individual. Hopefully that will be done this fall and then that new individual will have an opportunity to review and come back to all of us, not just me, but to all of us within NFC to see what additions or modifications might be needed.

And I'm not sure we'll have to see, you know, depending on what the process looks like if we go back to the same committee or not. But I do want to thank both Brian and Kelly for that.

>> This is Matt. Same thing I added yesterday that I'd like to add again today. I've been working here now since 2007 and just as Brian already mentioned, this is the first time that we've come together to have a good faculty wide discussion involving all faculty within NTID to contribute to the conversation.

To make sure that everyone is on the same page on the workload guidelines. And I think it's important because every instructor needs to be empowered to understand their work and also to understand how their work connects to other folks and their work.

And we need to make sure that workloads are being distributed equitably throughout the department. And we're hoping that these discussions are going to empower folks during the next appraisal period and plan of work, development period and spring semester, that's ultimately the goal is we wanted to have these guidelines ready and available before spring semester for all of you to be able to utilize again during the appraisal review and when you're establishing your POW for the next academic year.

So we do appreciate any discussion and question.

>> Anyone can pop up anytime or again. You're also welcome to send me a direct message if you'd like, and I'm happy to sign your question for you.

Umm, let me spotlight you. Hold on.

>> Hi everyone. This isn't a question, but I wanted to let you know that I had the opportunity to review the work and I just want to honestly say congratulations on a fabulous job, well done revising these workload guidelines. I'm thrilled to see some of the changes in place and the clarifications that are there. I just ultimately wanted to recognize and thank you for your hard work.

>> That's great. Yeah, you too,###. You spent hours as well. #####?

>> I'm still reading through the specifics.

But I do have a question in the meantime. How much flexibility and negotiation will be necessary with chair people?

I'm just thinking for example. If next fall, I'm developing a new course that I would like to teach and there will be additional time constraints and requirements for that course development.

That wouldn't be a typical year for me, if that makes sense. So teaching a three to four course workload.

And maybe that means that there would be the addition of a summer contract, but I guess I'm just wondering what sort of discussion has occurred for a scenario like that. I have not read through every aspect of the documents yet, just fair warning, but I am curious what sort of conversations are out there or what the thoughts are on what those negotiations would look like when it comes to talking with chair people?

For different faculty and their individualized needs.

>> Thank you who would like to answer Kelly. Great.

>> Hi, nice to meet you. I don't think I've met you yet, #####, but I hope to see you again around campus.

The negotiation power really is the goal of having the conversation with the chair and having these guidelines. If you feel like you can't develop curriculum with your typical course workload, then that's something that you can have the conversation about. So depending on how heavy your grading or assignments that you have in the certain courses all the way through student contact hours that you are having in courses, you can put that as a part of service.

You can list that as a part of development. It's more of having that conversation and making sure your chair understands the time that is going to be involved in developing that course. Really, that's key is having an open conversation.

Can I do this and yet also if so, this is going to be my limit or I may need additional pay or you know, maybe that needs Gary's approval. If so and you're supported, then you are able to do what you need to do. Obviously I don't know if Matt and Gary would like to add.

>> This is Matt. Yeah, I do agree with Kelly and I would also like to expand upon that most recent point. For any project, regardless of the project, you'll notice that the guidelines are much more broad now talking about the time that will be necessary for focusing on a certain project or a certain job or a certain course or what have you.

We would encourage that when you're developing a course, when you sit down with your department chair to have that conversation about your plan of work for the following semester or following year, that you have that foresight to think through what you will need to contribute and invest in that. Is it going to be 3-4 hours a week for the course development? If so, that's decently easy to convert then in terms of how it would relate to a full course or half course that you would be teaching, that's fairly easy to calculate. What would then be appropriate?

But then also every department should be having conversations and discussions within. When developing your personal departments interpretation of the guidelines, there are some general understandings of what release time would look like, because if one person in the department is getting full release time and someone else is only getting half then that could cause issues within the department and I would strongly encourage each department to have good healthy conversations about just that, what the expectations look like in terms of course release.

>> And just as a follow up, this is Gary. Excellent Kelly and Matt, excellent way to answer. Another example, let's say a faculty is needing to develop a new course for example, and it's not because I just decided I feel like developing a new course for some reason. I guess it depends on the business need for the department. Is there an actual need for that course like for instance in business studies in that department a while ago I approved an online course offerings. It was a new curriculum, it was a new course.

And so during the semester I really supported and approved that because I wanted to establish this online course. There was a business need for it and I wanted to encourage the faculty to work on that as overload or course release in that way. So if there is a need for it for the important service, as I explained yesterday, someone pointed out if they were on a.

Search committee for the new president of RIT just a hypothetical situation. Well, that's a really important role to be on that search committee for the new president. So clearly I would support that and maybe provide a course release for the amount of time involved in that extensive process.

So there are certain examples and things that will help us to really encourage people, whether it's course development or certain particular circumstances in general. But I just wanted to clarify if there is a need for those things that we support that Matt, Matt would like to add as well.

>> One more small point. I know it was initially a question about developing a new course, but also in the guidelines everyone or anyone teaching courses we're expecting. Well, there will always be some need to update the curriculum within the course and the course content.

And there wouldn't be release time for that quote unquote normal work, because it's part of the responsibilities of teaching a course.

If you're doing normal curriculum updates asking for some sort of release, you would need to have a conversation with your department chair and document that in your plan of work to make sure that everything is clear and that you're following again your departmental interpretation or expectations in terms of what course release looks like.

#####?

>> Can you all see me OK?

>> I'll spotlight you.

>> I was reading through the document and there was one question that was maybe more just specific to me.

Or more specific to our program. Most of NTID programs are associate level degrees, but our program is a little bit larger and it varies, but the goal is to have 160 students at any given time, so the expectations may be a little bit higher, especially for administrative roles like myself. I'm the program director, so I saw in the document it said an estimated 9 to 10 hours per week for that type of administrative rule. But I'm wondering if they are considering the number total number of students.

In the program when giving that estimated number and if it would be an increased number given a bachelor's degree.

So our students need a lot of help with certain things in terms of co-op and internship and finding help to help them in those areas. So there's a lot of additional hours.

We have CCI orientation –

>> Ohh, CCEI, accreditation. Thank you.

>> And therefore there's a lot more responsibilities that we need to do to meet those requirements for accreditation. So I guess I'm just wondering if those types of things are going to be reflected or is that a part of the negotiation with our own chair?

>> This is Kelly. We originally thought about incorporating different coordinators and directors roles and trying to figure out how we could get those all documented. We do recognize that the ASLIE department is unique and Marge did bring that up multiple times during our conversations.

The MSSE program is also unique. It's graduate level and the future. There might be additional graduate or even PhD programs and we were trying to figure out what those would look like. We wanted to keep it more general for now with the understanding of the, you know, the broad coordinators.

Or any program director in general feeling like that would be 9 to 10 hours a week. So for example, just putting it out there for my plan of work under teaching and instruction, it's half of my time is with the support coordinator role, and half of my time is with teaching and tutoring.

And that quote unquote balances out, But you know, it might fluctuate depending on the semester. We all know that.

We did not want to separate it out by each individual department because again, you as a department can develop your interpretation or guidelines because every department can be said to be unique. And as mentioned, I believe each of the RIT groups have their own disciplines too. But within NTID, we have so many disciplines within one college versus the College of business. All of their disciplines are business related.

So again, we're encouraging you to talk with your program director or your department chair to talk about what those changes or expectations should be. And then they would talk with Gary or the associate deans to talk about any sort of unique situations. Just have those conversations and it doesn't have to stop with your chair. You can have those conversations with Gary too, but it goes back to the main concept if we did have those conversations as a committee.

>> I agree with Kelly and also I would like to add with the guidelines. It's really meant to be flexible. The goal is to be able to identify as many different responsibilities that exist in NTID, although each department is uniquely different. So I strongly suggest and recommend that we think more deeply about context hours.

I'm invested in each type of job or responsibility. My recommendation would be that you try to develop a good idea of how much time it is that you are required in your specific position as a coordinator. What contact hours are you doing on average every week? And then figuring out how much you would need within your service area for your POW and going from there. What time is over your normal service hours?

Over those particular hours. And instruction hours, et cetera. So taking a look at the hours that are required within your specific duties and then converting those to a certain percentage within your POW's. So I would just emphasize that service part can cover some of the coordinators responsibilities, but also can be some sort of course release if appropriate.

>> Gary?

>> I think both were great answers. I do just want to clarify too though that these are general guidelines and those are essentially the foundation.

That was from the great work of Kelly and her committee. Each department then will be able to set up your unique individualized plans or understandings of your department, So you'll have those opportunities. Obviously we're talking about our personal experiences, which is great, but we also need to have an agreement within departments and within the college.

So suppose that you move on to a different role and someone were to replace you. The expectations should be the same. There wouldn't be any uniqueness there. So I'm hoping that as a department, you'll be able to come together and talk about what is unique about your individual departments and why you would need to have additional or different expectations. NFC would be overviewing things.

Obviously, we know that ASLIE is unique. We agree with that, but we don't want anyone to, you know, say ohh, well, I heard that ASLIE is different and unique, but what about us?

Again, these are just to increase transparency. We have the engineering department has their unique needs. Every department will have their unique needs. I do agree with Kelly, we have 10 different departments that are all quite different in terms of disciplines from ASLIE to MSSE to VCS and etcetera and it's tough.

So we really can't have a good one-size-fits-all. We had tried with the original guidelines, which is why I'm personally thrilled that Kelly and her committee was willing and able to take all of this on and make these additional changes.

>> Can I add? First of all, I should mention thank you to this committee. You have done excellent work and I sincerely appreciate it. But then also talking about contact hours, that perspective I think helped me a lot. That's wonderful.

I guess the only thing that I was considering and thinking about is it says approximately 9 to 10 hours. And I thought that that was very — it says approximately, and I understand that.

Mine is way over that so I thought maybe it would be more flexible with the contact hours and providing that estimate might be a better wording than just saying a specific number of hours because I do think that that's based on associate programs. I understand where you're coming from, just putting a specific number in there and mine is so much further over than over that I just thought maybe it could be worded differently.

>> And that's a great point about the 9 to 10 hours and having that understanding.

The emphasis of meeting flexibility I think is great. So that's a wonderful perspective to have.

Any additional comments? Kelly.

>> That's something that I can bring back to the committee. It's a good point. I can follow up with the associate deans. I think we tried to not focus so much on the percentage and the hours, but focus on the time spent with students. So, yeah, that's a good point. I can take that under consideration. Thank you.

>> I would really like to thank Patrick Smith for getting the technology set up to be on Zoom today. Thank you, Patrick.

He also helped to coordinate the projections for yesterday's open forum as well in person, and it's nice to have Patrick supporting us. I would also like to thank our interpreters today. We had both Donna and Jenna interpreting for this forum, so thank you to both of them.

Are there any additional questions or comments?

>> There are some in the Q&A. There are three questions.

>> Sure, I can read the 1st. The 1st is “I have a question about the teaching load for tenure track faculty. I see that the courses for tenure track faculty are two to three courses per semester. So how do the department chairs decide whether faculty will teach two or three courses each semester? What is the guideline for their decision making?”

Matt?

>> It depends on your contact hours. For example on the balance, we assume that instructors are going to have a weekly average of 15 contact hours per week, but each instructor is going to be a little different. For example, science and math.

There are some faculty that have two different 3 hour lab sections in addition to two 3 hour lecture sections, and that adds up to 9 hours plus office hours. So they're getting close to 15, but it may not be exactly 15, which then means you may need to find some other type of instructional responsibility. Maybe it's tutoring for a couple hours or in the College of Science or it could be something in the NLC with tutoring, math, et cetera. So really.

We don't need to focus so much on how many courses but the total number of time that is associated with your instructional responsibilities contact hours. I understand that if it says an average of 15 hours per week that that could then mean for the full academic year the average could be 15.

So the fall may be 9 or the fall might be 20 and then the next semester could be 10. That would average out to 15. So it doesn't have to be 15 every semester, it can be average per year. So there the goal is to design flexibility and to really focus on contact hours with students.

>> There's another question in the chat or in the Q&A rather.

“This is a follow up question if the tenure track faculty have to increase the course load because their scholarship output is lesser than expected. What is the level of scholarship activity?”

That is appropriate for a department - Gary.

>> So I just want to clarify, we're talking about tenure year track. So a person who is in a tenure year track probationary hours, it's for six years. So that's why it's called a balance.

A balanced portfolio, 2 courses, two or three and then 40% of your time is focused on scholarship. So during the 10 year track time, I don't expect there to be a reduction in one or the other a reduction in scholarship. You have to do both.

And you need to get ready for tenure year promotion in your 5th or 6th year and you have to be able to show what you've done. So how the committee is going to look at your teaching as well as your scholarship, your student feedback et cetera. All of that in addition to what have what is your scholarship output, have you gotten grants, have you gotten patents, have you put out research, have you been published? You need to have both of those ready for tenure year purposes.

So that's why a chair has to be a little bit more stern in making sure that tenure track are doing their balanced portfolio of both instruction as well as scholarship. It's not just oh, if I have low output, I might have to do something else here, maybe a chairperson says this person, such an excellent instructor, I want them to teach more. I understand how that can benefit our students, but in order to serve the faculty member well is that it would be a disservice and it could affect their ability to be promoted for tenure.

So does that answer your question?

>> I think it was really a question on what's the appropriate level of scholarship. So you're saying that there needs to be a balance. But in terms of production or output, what is the appropriate level of scholarship activity?

>> OK. Thanks Brian. That's a good clarification. Really it depends on the department. For tenure year track in DLS department, it's very different requirements for scholarship as opposed to tenure track in the science and math department or VCS. They're all very unique and different. So the expectations of scholarship are defined by each department. RIT has nine colleges in total and eight colleges each have their own expectation for what?

Scholarship means in their area a College of Art and Design has what they call artifacts. It's not even a published type of work, it's a production of a sculpture or an artistic piece of work, a video or a film. And so they need to produce artifacts for scholarship within their field for VCS.

Science and math may need to do more traditional research and publications, chemistry related things, et cetera. So if I give you a specific number of expectations, it would really depend on each department and what it is that they're field expects for output in scholarship. The ADR, whoever is that comes in will help me to define that more clearly.

We have more general expectations that you will have a few publications or peer reviewed publications. We do have some things established already, but I do want to make it clear more clear down the road for each department. I really believe that each department is unique and will have different expectations.

Brian?

>> There's another question. Ohh, Matt, did you have a comment related to that first one though? Go for it.

>> Just briefly the person who asked this question.

I think they're already familiar with the two documents I hope for tenure and promotion document because that has a lot of information spelled out related to scholarship expectations and some guidelines from the previous Provost regarding scholarship and what that means.

And what peer review means and TID. We also have our own documentation related to scholarship expectations and you will find both of those documents on the website in the chat. When we're done here, I'll find the link and I will post it and copy it and paste it in there.

It would be nice to have when the new ADR arrives to help with those scholarship guideline and to update — update those documents. It's a little outdated at this point, umm it was probably written 10 years ago now. So it really is time for a revisit and a fresh set of eyes to look at it and think about what is it that we need to do to update that document.

>> Thank you, Matt. Try to buy you time to look for that URL to post in the chat.

We do have another question that was sent in. It was mentioned a lot of discuss with your chair about your plan of work. But it was also mentioned that each department is not supposed to be more loose than the guideline. So how is that supposed to work?

>> So if you remember, this is a foundational document.

So for example, if you are a lecturer and you teach four to five classes per semester you can't go below that range. You have to focus on contact hours. So by looser we mean you can't go below what the expectations out are already set.

Unless you have a unique situation or negotiation with your chair um with Garry's office to try to figure out something. But again it goes back to this is foundational. This is the ground level of expectation. So those other department — departmental clarifications will be built on top of this foundation.

So comments about talking with your chair and talking about your department. You can't just teach one course and be a lecturer. You will not be meeting the minimum requirements. Again, unless there's some special circumstances, but that is what we mean by that.

>> Now RIT wants to focus on developing certificate programs even though those programs are non-credit, for those of us who are nontenure track, will we be receiving credit equivalent to teaching a three credit course towards tenure for teaching in those programs?

>> This is a really tough question. Because I'm aware that RIT certified and other departments within RIT have established different certifications.

Some things in RIT certified they have instructors that counts as adjunct or overload in RIT. That's part of their workload in RIT's perspective. We need to discuss this point within NTID because if the intention is to establish more certificate, certificate programs.

And they are going to count some departments like ICS.

They have courses that will help prepare students for industry and to receive certification that once they successfully passed this test, they have an industry approved certification and it also does take — count as credit of course credit.

And so you should receive credit for those things. If and have it be a part of your POW. But if it's noncredit bearing, I don't have the answer for that. I'm thinking that it needs to somehow fit our system and we haven't figured out those kinks yet.

>> It is still a learning process of course, and we're trying to establish more certificate programs. Some departments are really leading the way in that, for example, ASLIE has four or five different certificates that they offer and we're trying to manage those currently as overload. Reason being we don't want to have confusion when it comes to traditional tuition based courses because we faculty are getting paid through tuition. Students enroll in college, they pay tuition and those tuition funds then in turn pay us.

Less certificate programs are separate except for Brian's situation. And actually the same thing happens in business studies as well with the Microsoft Office Preparation Certificate program. And what is it? QuickBooks I think it's called.

At the same time, they get a certificate at the end. But this is we're talking different types of programs, ASLIE interpreting, related educational interpreting or healthcare interpreting. So right now the model that we're using is keeping those separate.

Because when folks register for those certificate programs, they pay and they don't pay full tuition. It's not tuition based, but they might pay, I don't know, some sort of fee. And that fee associated then comes to the department and the department can use that money to hire adjuncts or overload folks.

But that's kept separately. Moving forward, what that's going to look like, Matt, is right. It's not clear what the future looks like right now, but that's how we've been doing it. And there's a very similar model with RIT certified with the adjunct concept. Just for clarification purposes, let's go back to Brian.

>> I'm going to keep Gary on Spotlight because the question is related to ADR.

“When that person comes in and takes a look at the concept of inclusivity of publishing certain works as um, done an ASL would that also be a consideration?”

>> Good question. I know Gallaudet has something in place. I forget the name of it. Is the journal on deaf education maybe?

>> He froze for me.

>> Same.

>> OK? So for example, if I'm publishing in engineering, the audience is typically going to involve hearing engineers.

And that's standard practice. But if we're trying to be inclusive of folks who do prefer their first language and our culturally preferring sign language.

Oh, I see. A note from ### #### in the chat. There are two peer reviewed journals that are done in sign language. ###, could we maybe spotlight you to give some additional information there?

>> Sure. No, no problem. Yeah, there are currently 2 peer reviewed journal articles that are in sign language, correct. One of them is Deaf Studies in Ed. That is through Gallaudet Press. It is not been active recently and I am not sure exactly why. The other is called the Journal of ASL Literacy and Lit. And those are the two that I know of. For now, yeah.

>> Great.

>> All right back to Brian.

>> I think another question popped up. It says, “Yes, this is a learning curve, but for those of us tenure year track faculty, we were led to believe that we do not get credit toward tenure track for our certificate work. So the workload seems unbalanced. How will that be addressed regarding workloads?”

Matt?

>> My answer about workload is. Really, it's always generalized that you need to have a discussion with the department chair on if the activity is appropriate. And that's to protect yourself later on. When it comes to tenure year review, you'll need to make sure that your plan of work includes what that agreement has been, what you've agreed that you will do, and that might mean work towards a certificate or certification. Then you can show what type of work it is that you're doing.

But you also need to understand that it's possible that the certificate work could be part of your service within your plan of work.

It might be in teaching and tutoring. It might be in service. There are different plans of work out there, but it needs to be documented. All of the work that you should be doing needs to be documented. When you're writing any appraisal, make sure that it's clearly documented and explained in there.

How that work impacts students, how it has impacted your personal professional development.

There have been a lot of rumors about what counts and what doesn't count. But really it all boils down to have that conversation with your department chair to talk about what your work expectations need to be.

>> I know also there are some other departments who offer certificates such as ASLIE department. They have a new certificate that's soon coming online and instructors who work on those programs should receive credit for that toward tenure track as part of. It's almost as if it's part of program development.

>> That's going to depend on your specific role. So, for example, what I understand about ASLIE is that most folks who teach in the certificate programs are not full-time faculty members here within NTID.

They're adjunct, which means that they aren't thinking about tenure. They aren't thinking about their portfolio.

And NTID and ASLIE pays them as adjunct faculty. That being said, I could envision folks within the department are also helping to develop the curriculum.

And they may serve as guest instructors for certain courses or what have you that might end up that they're up to their teaching load for the semester. And then their work would need to be documented again in their plan of work as something that could be potentially service related for curriculum development that can be in the service component of your plan of work teaching. For now it's.

A little bit sticky. Because again of the question on if it's for credit or not.

But again, it boils down to have the conversation with your department chair.

And if necessary, the chair can discuss with Gary to make sure everyone's on the same page on what counts. But ultimately, everything needs to be in your plan of work.

Kelly?

>> I also just wanted to add and emphasize that this document is meant to protect you as faculty. So I know that there are some areas that seem a little fuzzy, but again, a lot of disciplines are not able to be combined into one general document. It makes it very difficult as a faculty member myself who's hoping to go up for promotion in the near future. I know that we're sick and tired of hearing talk to your chair, talk to your chair.

But it is crucial for opening up the conversation to make sure your chair supports you for promotion and having that conversation.

You will then know if they can support you and if not and there's a weakness in your resume, they can help you to bridge that gap to improve over the next couple of years before promotion comes up, before it's too late, whether that's teaching more or doing more scholarship. So it is really important to have that conversation.

>> So we are approaching the end of our time. It looks like we can wrap up please again anytime if you have any feedback, reach out to your NFC representative. We have been communicating with the workload guideline committee ongoing as well as with the administration. We are all working very hard together to serve you. So again, thank you for attending the meeting today.

Thank you to Kelly for being willing to answer all of these questions. We really appreciate that. So thank you again and we hope you have a fantastic afternoon.

Yeah, Thanks for hosting the meeting.