

NTID Faculty Congress NFC Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2019
12 – 1:30 pm, CSD-2102

Chair: Jessica Trussell
Vice-Chair: Mark Rosica
Communications Officer: Adriana Kulakowski

Attending: Mark Rosica, Tao Eng, Edward Mineck, Marcus Holmes, Sandra Bradley

Notetaker: Adriana Kulakowski

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
1. Review previous meeting Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vote on 10/22/19 Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Motion: NFC Member ● Second: NFC Member ● Approve: Unanimous 	
2. Communication and language task forum	<p>Concerns from NFC that surfaced regarding the Communication Task Force and Administration forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apparently, there is a perceived lack of support of ASL sign language classes and resources for faculty members to achieve the SLPI rating of “Advanced”. 2. Sign Language Proficient Interview: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is a general lack of confidence of the SLPI. There is discrepancy and lack of trust regarding its rating results. b. SLPI tends to focus the assessment on the general use of ASL rather than ASL used in the classroom; it’s not a good measurement of one’s ASL or overall communication skill level. c. There is evidence and history of variation of the SLPI, parts of the assessment have been changed without others being aware. SLPI then is different from the SLPI now. d. The SLPI at NTID is measured differently in comparison to other institutions. 3. What are we doing for the future of NTID...is it for the best for NTID? The students? The faculty? The classroom? Most of the students arriving at RIT/NTID do not use strong ASL skills, so shouldn't that be reflected in faculty communication skill requirements? 4. The administration is citing, as problematic, the challenge promotion/tenure committees face in assessing a candidate whose score is Intermediate Plus and has provided evidence of 'sustained effort etc.' But, is that a 'problem' or is it the duty of the committee and, indeed, the purpose for having such a committee? The ambiguity is not bad in and of itself. Discerning 	

	<p>the satisfaction of 'sustained effort etc' in these special cases is the same type of judgement that committees make related to the value of each item of scholarship claimed by the candidate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. What is the rush? Why is there suddenly an urgency to eliminate the possibility that a candidate who scores Intermediate Plus may be worthy of promotion/tenure in a few situations, especially when the new assessments have not been finalized? 6. What is going to replace the discretion of the special circumstance of a person with Intermediate Plus who should be granted promotion/tenure? There are two levels of issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How are you going to evaluate one's communication skills with these new instruments? b. Are we ok to eliminate the intermediate plus level? What impact will this have on the faculty who have worked hard to improve but cannot get promoted? Are we willing to just let them go? 7. How practical is it for all faculty members to be at the advanced level? Is this realistic? 	
6. New Business	No new business	
Meeting adjourned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Motion: NFC member ● Second: NFC member ● Approved: Unanimous 	