November 6 NFC meeting all present except for Jessica Trussell.

Guests Gary Behm and Peter Hauser.

Sharon Lott (ASLTE Coordinator) and Katie Schmitz were invited to address questions throughout presentation

Topic: discuss the new sign language evaluations being developed and the impact on policy regarding the sign language skill level required for promotion and tenure.

Mark started the meeting with welcomes brief summary of the discussion with Peter Hauser from last week's meeting. Mark introduced Gary Behm who will discuss policy implications, a possible process for amending policy and gathering ideas. Austin reminded us that we had gathered questions and concerns from our constituents and we had several of those questions highlighted for discussion today.

1. Peter reviewed the evaluations discussed last week:

   a. The SLPI, CSLA (much like the SLPI) and the GCOT (Group Comm. Observation Test which is not very stringent/not controlled) are currently available.
   b. ASL – DT is a discrimination test developed with Joe Bochner and others. It focuses on phonology and is ready to take now.
   c. ASL – CT is a comprehension test, multiple-choice and can be taken repeatedly. It is not quite ready for administration.
   d. ASL – OVE is a vocabulary test taken online. It is currently not ready but will be in the fall of 2019
   e. FAN – CT (finger spelling and number comprehension test) is a receptive test that can be taken several times and will be ready in the fall of 2019.
   f. SRT – L2 (sentence repetition task for L2 signers) Should be ready by the fall of 2019. It contains 20 sentences that are signed and the individual must sign them back for accuracy.

      The tests (b-f) are used to establish a baseline and taken again to show progress. Unlike the SLPI, there is no language in the ratings of these new assessments, only the distance from the mean. This is done to give the big picture of an individual's sign language skills.

2. Gary Behm: Policy and History: the SCPI was created in 1992 under the administration of Jim DeCaro. The intent was to document effort, progress and evidence of one's sign skill and progress over time, and there was no administrative involvement at this point. It served as an original benchmark. The administration realized that some people were not successfully being promoted due to communication issues and there was a lack of clarity in how "effort" was being determined and evaluated. Also, Provost Haefner felt one instrument for evaluation was insufficient and that's when Gerry talked to Peter Hauser about looking into additional assessments. Gary realizes that the SLPI are individual one-on-one ratings and they do not necessarily measure performance in the classroom. We are also aware of the range of communication skills that our students have, from completely oral to completely ASL. Being able to evaluate how we communicate with the range of students that we have is critical, and

This document serves as minutes from the meeting. It is not a detailed record of all points addressed.

we want NFC to be involved to determine what is a reasonable measure. Gary believes this is an opportunity for growth and to have more evaluations to choose from would result in a better assessment. We focused on some of the questions that were highlighted on the NFC summary received from faculty. Gary also mentioned that the assessments are a way to document skills for promotion and we should expand the focus from one evaluation to possibly two or three different tests. The administration is very interested in feedback from NFC, and we don't want to set the bar too high then set faculty up for failure. One idea is to start with the SLPI and then move up to include the CSLA? Gary mentioned that the timeline is a challenge and does not think the new portfolio idea will be ready very soon. He stressed the need for this to be evidence-based and not a subjective evaluation. Gary explained the Gerry's intention was not to raise the bar from what was established in 1992 but wanted to remove the vague meaning of "effort". All he also reminded us that Gerry's intention was never to cause confusion and that he was additionally responding to the student concerns at the time he indicated a change in the process. He suspects that Peter will need six months to one year to develop evidence-based assessments that will be useful for everyone. Gary reiterated that he was interested in all of us working together.

3. One member reminded Gary of the student evaluations we have and maybe the Provost didn't realize that we had such evaluations when he cautioned about using only one instrument. Peter mentioned that he tells all pre-tenure faculty that he advises to put the student evaluations in their documentation.

4. One member felt that the current SLPI is inaccurate and gives a "false – positive" (i.e. they perceive somebody with intermediate plus skills is given "advanced" …pointing out the inadequacy of the instrument being used alone.

5. Peter mentioned that he still has to complete two or three more assessments with volunteers to determine the accuracy of these instruments. He is looking for many/all faculty to volunteer to participate in the assessments' development. He emphasized that this is critical to the completion of the tests and wanted to know how to make it happen (e.g., paying faculty, add to POW, etc.). He was also believed to have stated that the first year (or maybe longer) that the assessments were in place would be a trial period. This indicates that the tests may likely need tweaking. Getting volunteers ASAP is of high priority.

6. Several questions were raised regarding the impact that a new policy would have on faculty going forward, or will people be grandfathered with a new policy. We will probably need to consult legal affairs on this issue. It was also mentioned that the expectations are different for faculty versus staff. Staff, unlike faculty, can be categorized across a spectrum of "high – low contact" with students that translates to a categorization of "high – low risk". The focus now will just be on faculty and we will later look at these issues as it relates to staff.

7. There is no expected level of communication proficiency stated in the policy for mid-tenure review. Some chairs hire faculty with no sign language skills because of their technical expertise and they acquire the communication skills on the job. Katie Schmitz mentioned that the tenure clock is on hold until faculty reach intermediate (or intermediate plus)??(need to verify). Or do faculty expect to reach intermediate or intermediate plus by the time they

This document serves as minutes from the meeting. It is not a detailed record of all points addressed.

complete their third year? Somebody mentioned that in the move from lecturer to senior lecturer requires the same communication expectations, but we need to confirm this as well.

8. Sharon Lott expressed concern if people are talking about eliminating the SLPI. Other assessment tools are not quite ready and the CSLA requires more effort, staff and time. Maybe a new version of the CSLA needs development? It was suggested that we have both a short-term and a long-term plan to reassess what is needed, how to best evaluate and clarify in the policy. Gary mentioned that we have no intention of eliminating the SLPI, but did comment that it was insufficient and does not realistically measure classroom communication skills.

9. Items to do:
    a. It was suggested that we find the current promotion policies regarding communication expectations for all faculty ranks and post them on the NFC website.
    b. Determine which and how many assessments are to be included in the new portfolio.
    c. We realize that the rating of "advanced" is a result of the rating associated with the SLPI. This means a new term might be needed to reflect one's skill level as determined by a variety of instruments.
    d. It was commented that the various departments all have different expectations and operating policies and we should look towards a level of standardization in order to be fair and clear. We also need clarity on what is expected of current faculty versus new hires.
    e. Gary said he would review these issues with all the chairs, Peter Hauser and Katie Schmitz. The goal is to improve the experience that will come up with a new system that helps everyone.
    f. Mark asked Peter Hauser if he could send us a description of the various assessments and what some of the strengths and weaknesses are of each instrument.
    g. We need to confirm if there is a sign language expectation moving from lecturer to senior lecturer.

Appendix

Questions from the NTID Constituents: Sign Language Expectations

Policy:

1) Frequency of evaluation? Is there a proposed frequency of evaluation and expiration?

2) Impact on Promotion and tenure
   a) TT faculty (i.e, assistant, associate, full) **Same policy for lecturer/TT**
   b) Lecturer ranks (i.e, lecturer, senior, principal) **Same policy for lecturer/TT**
   c) Administrators **Not answered**
   d) Staff- (staff council may be interested) **Need to categorize before assessing further**

3) Impact to part-time faculty? **Not answered**

4) How specifically will the results of the new evaluation be used and in conjunction with the SLPI and/or other evaluation? **Will continue to be used, but new assessment will allow for its expansion. CSLA**
   a) What happens if faculty member uses multiple measurements with varied results? **Not answered**

5) Will people with sufficient SLPI ratings for promotion and tenure be "grandfathered" with their previous SLPI ratings? **No grandfathering for scholarship, uncertain about communication for grandfathering. May or may not happen**

6) What is the current policy? What will be the process of policy revision for sign language expectations IF there is a policy revision? **Been following 1992 policy "intermediate + with evidence; wants NFC involvement in making a final decision.**

7) Who/how are new faculty supported to achieve these skills? **NFC could consider whether to extend the 2yr clock to get onto TT position as one example.**

8) Are there enough resources to support the measurements and those striving to achieve the expectations? **CSLA has limited resources currently, would likely have to prioritize individuals who sign up for it (i.e., faculty ahead of mid-tenure review)**

9) How do individual faculty get feedback (through videos and review) on skills without it being used for tenure and promotion? **Not answered**

10) Focus on definition of communication (different methods---Signed English, PSE, cued speech, etc.) and language use (ASL or English). Want to see definitions used correctly, separately, and consistently in policy and practice. Not to be used interchangeably. **GB wants a new system that addresses effective communication, we can throw out SLPI and not be attached to ADVANCED if necessary.**

*This document serves as minutes from the meeting. It is not a detailed record of all points addressed.