

**NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG)  
Final Report**

Frank Caccamise (Ed.)  
National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID)  
Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT)  
Rochester, NY 14623-5604  
fccncr@rit.edu

January 2005

## Table of Contents

	pages
Introduction.....	1
Summary of Progress for CTF Five-Year Review Implementation Plan Research Recommendations #1, 2, 3, & 5	
Recommendation #1: The Steering Committee on Communication (SCC) and the NTID Center for Research, Teaching, and Learning (CRTL) establish a standing relationship to coordinate and prioritize research (by December 2001) .....	2
Recommendation #2: The Dean and CRTL establish a 3-year Communication Task Force (CTF) communication research plan, including timelines and resource needs (by January 2002) .....	2
Recommendation #3: Progress reports on CTF communication research should be shared with the Dean in June, 2002-to-2004, with a final report to be submitted in January 2005 .....	3
Recommendation #5: The Dean, SCC, the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS), and CRTL recommend an institute wide database for sign language and other aspects of communication to assess future influence of CTF guidelines on faculty communication skills (by March 2003) .....	4
Progress for Research Priority #1: Communication Assessment Options Projects	
Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA).....	4
Students' Judgments of Faculty Members' Communication Skills.....	7
Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT).....	10
Progress for Research Priority #2: Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Reliability Project .....	11
Progress for Research Priority #3: Faculty Characteristics Projects .....	14
NTID Database Study .....	14
Aptitude Predictors for Acquiring Sign Skill <u>and</u> Longitudinal Study of Recently Hired Faculty .....	16

## Table of Contents (cont.)

	pages
NTID Deaf Faculty/Staff Perceptions of the Communication Environment at NTID .....	18
Conclusion .....	19
References/Readings.....	20
Appendixes	
A: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) Implementation & Research Recommendations .....	24
B: One Option for Developing a Communication Observational Tool for Use by Chairpersons & Peers.....	29
C: Confidentiality and Access to Institutional Data .....	30
D: Proposed Process for Sharing Information in NTID Databases with NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) Project Teams.....	34
E: Access to NTID Institute Wide Faculty/Staff Communication Database.....	35
F: Six Sign Language Linguistic Features Rated by Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Observers.....	36
G: Sample Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Report.....	37
H: Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Process Evaluation Feedback.....	41
I: Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS) Items.....	43
J: Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT) .....	45
K: Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Rating Scale .....	49
L: How Does Our Communication Environment Measure Up? Perceptions of NTID Deaf Faculty & Staff – Survey Conducted Spring 2003.....	50

## NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) Final Report

### Introduction

In February 1991, by NTID faculty vote, the NTID Communication Task Force (CTF) *Recommendations to the Dean, NTID, for Institute Expectations and Guidelines for Faculty Communication Skill Development* (November 1990, 2nd ed.) were approved. These recommendations addressed expectations and guidelines for spoken communication and sign language communication, including Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) skill level ratings expected at time of tenure and promotion. In July 1994, following a three-year phase-in period, CTF recommendations were fully implemented at NTID. In 1999 the NTID CTF Five-Year Review Committee was convened to review implementation of CTF recommendations from 1994-through-1999. This committee was charged to assess whether faculty have been satisfactorily supported by the Institute during this implementation and to make recommendations both for improvements in implementation and for prioritization of future CTF related research. In February 2001, the *Final Report of the Communication Task Force (CTF) Five-Year Review Committee* (Barefoot et al., 2001) was submitted to the Dean, and in July 2001, an implementation plan to respond to the recommendations in this report was completed (Licata, 2001). This implementation plan included the following research recommendations:

1. The Steering Committee on Communication (SCC) and the NTID Center for Research, Teaching, and Learning (CRTL) establish a standing relationship to coordinate and prioritize research (by December 2001).
2. The Dean and CRTL establish a 3-year Communication Task Force (CTF) communication research plan, including timelines and resource needs (by January 2002).
3. Progress reports on CTF communication research should be shared with the Dean in June, 2002-to-2004, with a final report to be submitted in January 2005.
4. The Dean and the SCC develop an implementation plan based on communication research results/findings (by September 2005).
5. The Dean, SCC, the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS), and CRTL recommend an institute wide database for sign language and other aspects of communication to assess future influence of CTF guidelines on faculty communication skills (by March 2003).

This document, which is the final report referred to in #3 above, provides a summary of progress for recommendations #1, #2, #3, and #5 above, and it is intended to provide the Dean and the SCC with information and recommendations that will assist them in developing an implementation plan as stated in recommendation #4 above. A summary listing of implementation recommendations is provided in Appendix A of this final report. In addition, Appendix A provides a summary listing of recommendations for continued/future research.

**Summary of Progress for CTF Five-Year Review Committee  
Recommendations #1, 2, 3, & 5**

**Recommendation #1: The Steering Committee on Communication (SCC) and the NTID Center for Research, Teaching, and Learning (CRTL) establish a standing relationship to coordinate and prioritize research (by December 2001)**

During AY01-02, from among recommendations in the CTF 5-Year Review Committee report, NTID administration, with input from the SCC and CRTL, identified three research priority areas (Licata, 2001):

1. To identify communication skills assessment options, in addition to the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), for NTID faculty/staff.
2. To continue studies on the reliability of the SCPI.
3. To investigate background and environmental factors that may influence development of sign language communication skills, with a focus on achievement of the SCPI Advanced rating and on why some faculty improve but others receive lower ratings on subsequent SCPIs.

**Recommendation #2: The Dean and CRTL establish a 3-year Communication Task Force (CTF) communication research plan, including timelines and resource needs (by January 2002)**

During AY01-02 an NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) was established. This group was divided into three project teams, with each team designated to investigate one of the three research priority areas identified above; that is, for priority #1, the Communication Assessment Options Project Team, for priority #2 the SCPI Reliability Project Team, and for priority #3 the Faculty Characteristics Project Team. Each of the F/SCRG Project Teams prepared project proposal documents, with first drafts completed and submitted to the SCC and Dean for review in December 2001. These proposals were then revised, resubmitted to the SCC and Dean, and approved by the Dean in January 2002. (See NTID F/SCRG Proposals in **References/Readings** for this final report.) Progress for the projects in these proposals up through the AY04-05 Fall Quarter is provided in the next three sections of this final report.

In addition to the projects in the approved proposals referred to above, during AY02-03 an additional project was recommended by the SCC:

...that the Dean, in consultation with the SCC, establish an NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team which will be given the charge to develop a set of questions/items regarding faculty members' communication skills in group situations (for example, the classroom, committee meetings, department meetings, & group projects), that may be used by Chairs and peers (latter selected by faculty

members) to provide faculty members with feedback on their communication skills...that the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team be included as one of the Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group Project Teams.

The above two recommendations were approved by the Dean, and in May 2003 Chris Licata called together the first meeting of this new project team. This project, entitled Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT), was added to the projects being conducted by the Communication Assessment Options Project Team, and progress for this project is included in the next section of this final report. (The SCC proposal for this project is included as Appendix B in this final report.)

Also, during the initial meetings of the Communication Assessment Options Project Team, the importance of investigating changes in the Institute communication environment was discussed. The importance of this kind of study or a series of studies is consistent with the following observation from the *NTID Faculty Congress (NFC) Response to the Communication Task Force Five-Year Review Committee Report* (2001):

The original CTF was created in an effort to address perceived problems in communication at NTID. Has the CTF affected that problem? The NFC also calls for research needed over the next 5-year period to benchmark satisfaction among students and faculty/staff with the communication environment. The reason for a 5-year study is to examine any perceived changes in the communication climate and environment.

Considering the above, during AY02-03, a study of deaf faculty and staff members' perceptions of the NTID communication environment was initiated. Progress for this project is included in this final report following the progress summaries for the three research priority areas identified by NTID administration.

**Recommendation #3: Progress reports on CTF communication research should be shared with the Dean in June, 2002-to-2004, with a final report to be submitted in January 2005**

As recommended, F/SCRG annual progress reports were submitted to the Dean in June of 2002, 2003, and 2004 (Caccamise). (See NTID F/SCRG Annual Reports listed in **References/Readings** for this final report.) As indicated above, subsequent sections of this final report provide summaries of the progress included in these three annual reports and information about progress during the AY04-05 Fall Quarter. In addition, these subsequent sections provide recommendations for implementation based on this progress and recommendations for continued/future research efforts. As stated earlier, a summary listing of these recommendations is provided in Appendix A of this final report.

**Recommendation #5: The Dean, SCC, the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS), and CRTL recommend an institute wide database for sign language and other aspects of communication to assess future influence of CTF guidelines on faculty communication skills (by March 2003)**

During AY01-02, efforts were initiated to provide F/SCRG Project Teams reasonable and timely access to information needed in order to conduct their approved research projects. The work of the SCC Research and Evaluation Subgroup (RES) provided a solid base upon which to address this need. (See NTID SCC RES Reports in **References/Readings** for this final report.) Building on the work of the SCC RES, a proposal that addressed confidentiality and access to Institute data was prepared by John Albertini, and, following review and discussion, this proposal was approved by the SCC and Dean. (See Appendix C of this final report). Building on this proposal, Frank Caccamise prepared and submitted to the SCC and the Dean a proposal entitled *Proposed Process for Sharing Information in NTID Databases with NTID Faculty/Staff (F/S) Communication Research Project Teams* (See Appendix D of this final report). During AY02-03 an institute wide F/S communication database for information needed for NTID F/S communication research was established. This database, which is maintained by the NTID Division of Institutional Services (DIS), includes information provided to DIS by the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) and the Department of ASL & Interpreter Education (ASLIE). Guidelines for access to this database are included in Appendix E of this final report. During AY03-04 and the AY04-05 Fall Quarter refinements to this institute wide database needed for investigating SCPI reliability were identified and efforts were initiated to implement these refinements. In addition, plans and recommendations have been made for comparing NTID faculty members' results across the following tools: the SCPI, the Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA), and the Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS). (See following section entitled **Progress for Research Priority #1: Communication Assessment Options Projects**.) If it is decided to proceed with these comparisons, consideration should be given as to how to best ensure CSLA and SFCS results are available to project team members conducting these comparisons. Considering the above, experiences with the institute wide F/S communication database, and continued/future research, access guidelines for the institute F/S communication database, and information in this database, should be reviewed and modified as appropriate.

**Progress for Research Priority #1: Communication Assessment Options Projects**

**Research Priority #1: To identify communication skills assessment options, in addition to the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), for NTID faculty/staff.**

**Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA)** (Frank Caccamise, June Reeves, Geoff Poor, & Joan Carr)

Progress Summary

The primary goal of this project is to develop an assessment of instructors' classroom sign language communication skills that may be used to assist in planning sign language communication skills development. A second project goal is to provide NTID faculty with this

assessment information in a manner that allows them to include it in their annual appraisals and tenure and promotion documentation.

During AY01-02 project efforts were initiated that focused on developing a classroom assessment that would include both the positive aspects of the Sign Language Skills Classroom Observation (SLSCO), an assessment tool that was developed by an earlier NTID project team (Reeves, Newell, Holcomb, & Stinson, 2000), and additional aspects that would allow achievement of both project goals. SLSCO aspects adapted for this new assessment tool, the Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA), included the sign language linguistic features identified as important for effective classroom communication with deaf students by the SLSCO project team via a literature review and interviews with NTID students and faculty. In addition, since instructors' SLSCO evaluation feedback forms indicated that a follow-up meeting was one of the most beneficial aspects of the SLSCO process, it was decided to include a follow-up meeting as one of the steps for this new assessment tool. Development of the CSLA continued during AY02-03, with training of potential CSLA Team members and piloting of the CSLA initiated during the AY02-03 Spring Quarter. This development included refinement of the descriptors for the sign language linguistic features included in the CSLA (see Appendix F), construction of two rating scales for these features (see Appendix G), and development of an examples sheet for these features to assist CSLA Team members with their CSLA observations and reports. During the AY03-04 Fall and Winter Quarters, CSLA training and piloting continued, with official CSLA use with NTID faculty implemented under the coordination of the NTID Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) during the AY03-04 Spring Quarter. Five NTID instructors received CSLA services during this implementation quarter, and CSLA results for these five instructors were recorded in a spreadsheet to help facilitate future CSLA training, services, and research. Also, during AY03-04 a progress report for the CSLA was provided in the *NTID Research Bulletin* (Caccamise, Reeves, Poor, & Carr, 2003).

Throughout the CSLA training and piloting, and now implementation, refinements to CSLA materials and procedures have continued, and these refinements are reflected in current editions of the CSLA materials and procedures documents (Caccamise, Reeves, Poor, & Carr, 2004a & 2004b) and in a document that provides samples of CSLA Observations and Reports (Reeves, Poor, & Caccamise, 2004). As described in the CSLA materials and procedures documents, steps in the CSLA process are as follows:

1. One videotaping session of the instructor teaching in her/his classroom using a lecture format.
2. Viewing of this videotape by trained observers to provide (a) ratings, and examples as appropriate, for six sign language linguistic features; and (b) feedback/other comments pertinent to instructors' classroom use of sign language, including comprehension skills if clearly observable.
3. Additional viewing and observer discussion as needed to finalize ratings.
4. Preparation of an observation report for the instructor. (See Appendix G for a sample CSLA Report.)

5. A follow-up meeting between the instructor and a CSLA Team member to discuss the observation report, review the observation videotape, and discuss suggestions for improving sign language communication skills.

During AY03-04 a form for obtaining instructor evaluation of the CSLA process was developed (see Appendix H) and administered with formal implementation of the CSLA during the AY03-04 Spring Quarter. Of five instructors receiving CSLA services during the AY03-04 Spring Quarter, all five returned completed CSLA Process Evaluation Feedback forms. On a six point rating scale, with six being the highest (strongly agree), in response to “The CSLA process has provided me with valuable feedback on my classroom signing,” four of these five instructors circled “6” and one circled “5”. Feedback comments have included “I strongly recommend this for veteran signers” and “This was a very positive experience...the benefits directly impact student/classroom communication. It is a win-win program.”

#### Implementation Recommendation

As stated earlier, official CSLA use with NTID faculty was implemented during the AY03-04 Spring Quarter under the coordination of OCAS. It is recommended that CSLA services continue to be provided throughout the academic year under the coordination of OCAS.

#### Continued/Future Research

1. Instructors’ and CSLA Team members’ evaluation of the CSLA process should continue and, based on this evaluation feedback and continued experiences with CSLA services, refinements should be made to the CSLA process as appropriate.
2. Information on the reliability of CSLA observers’ ratings should be collected.
3. CSLA results should be included within the context of a study designed to compare results obtained via the SCPI, the Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS), and the CSLA.

## **Students' Judgments of Faculty Members' Communication Skills** (Carol DeFilippo, Gary Long, Frank Caccamise, Ron Kelly, & Lynn Finton)

### **Progress Summary**

Charge. This project is part of a three-year research plan recommended in 2001 by a review committee that assessed research needs related to the 1991 expectations and guidelines established for faculty communication skill development (Barefoot et al., 2001). One of the identified research priorities was to develop options, in addition to the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), for assessing communication skills of NTID faculty. The need originated with faculty who believed it was important to have a measure of communication in a classroom setting. Among the strategies proposed to address this research priority was to collect NTID students' ratings of their instructors' communication skills. It was requested that the current study take a global perspective, encompassing sign language, spoken language, simultaneous communication, use of visual materials, and any other aspects relevant to communication during classroom (group) instruction.

Developing the Survey. During the first year, AY01-02, the research team designed a project to develop a new instrument, administer it over a three-year period, collect comparative communication data (including SCPI ratings and in-class observations), and describe the statistical characteristics of the tool in relation to the comparative data. The team examined existing instruments and drew on previous research findings in order to draft potential items for rating instructors' communication and for describing participants' background. After considering several hundred items, 20 were selected that pertained to general visual communication, sign communication (simultaneous communication included within this category), and speech communication. We also examined various response formats. We decided to fashion the new tool after the existing Student Rating Survey (SRS), and to administer it at the same time and in the same manner, in anticipation of integrating the communication items into the SRS system at some future time. Faculty would use the new survey instead of the existing SRS survey, thus reducing the assessment burden on all participants. As shown in Appendix I, in order to allow faculty to satisfy institute requirements regarding student ratings, the new survey includes the four summative items from the SRS. In addition to these 24 items, also included are 10 items that request information about the student's/respondent's background (preferred communication mode, self-ratings of communication skills, etc.).

Collection of First-Year Data. By the beginning of AY02-03, the new instrument, named the Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS), was ready to be administered. Participants were recruited through quarterly announcements about the study and how to participate. Committee members also attended department meetings, center meetings, chairperson meetings, and new staff orientation to inform faculty directly, respond to questions, and encourage participation. Correspondence in the first year totaled approximately 375 electronic messages regarding queries, concerns, or misunderstandings. The research team collaborated with the Department of Educational Resources (ER) to administer the survey rating forms, consulted with ER and the Department of Institutional Services (DIS) to enable recording and storing of data electronically, and worked with the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) and DIS to establish a confidential process for obtaining SCPI ratings for participants who agreed to release this information.

Data analysis during the first year of data collection was restricted to summaries for the purpose of determining that students were using the survey as intended and that there was an orderly relation between students' ratings and other indicators of communication skills. The research team met periodically to monitor data collection and address issues, which included using the survey in co-taught courses and with students who have normal hearing. We also discussed strategies for analyzing the mid-point on the SRS response scale, "neutral/does not apply." A revised survey form was drafted to clarify the response scale, but was reserved for future use so as not to obfuscate data collected during the current three-year project.

In the first year of administration, we prepared and mailed 85 packets of forms to obtain consent and gather participant- and course-related data. A total of 53 faculty members from 17 departments used the survey in one or more quarters: 29 individuals participated for one quarter, 18 for two quarters, and 6 for three quarters. Participation was even across quarters, with 27 in fall and 28 in both winter and spring quarters. All but 7 of the 53 participants had an SCPI rating and consented to release their rating for the study. There were no ratings lower than Intermediate. Each participant also provided a self-rating of sign skill: 13 reported excellent skills; 31, good skills; and 9, fair skills. At the end of each quarter, we requested and distributed certificates to the library café as a token of appreciation to each faculty participant.

Collection of Second-Year Data. In AY03-04, the second year of administration, we worked to maintain participants from the first year and continued recruiting new participants, mostly through electronic communication, which totaled more than 250 exchanges over the three academic quarters. During AY03-04, the SFCS was administered by 50 members of the faculty: 34 faculty in fall quarter, 12 in winter, and 8 in spring, including 11 new participants. There were 14 individuals who previously participated, but did not request forms this year. Four people used the form in two quarters. Ease of administration of the SFCS was enhanced this year by staff in the Department of Educational Design and Resources (EDR). Beginning in winter quarter, an option was added on the SRS web site to choose the SFCS instead of the SRS. One advantage was to raise awareness of the SFCS option and a second advantage was to reduce the number of errors made during the request process (e.g., requesting both SFCS and SRS formative items).

In a report requested by the SCC during the second administration, we assessed the factor structure evident in the previous year's data (only the AY02-03 data set was complete at the time). The 1300 student responses collected that year were submitted to principal components analysis, principal factor analysis (with rotations), and correlation analysis to calculate Cronbach's alpha on clusters of the 24 items. Three distinct factors emerged and were labelled Sign-related, Speech-related, and Teaching-related. Cronbach's alpha was high for all three scales constructed from items that loaded on these factors, and was high for every survey item in each scale. In addition, Cronbach's alpha was high ( $r = 0.96$ ) for the entire survey (24 items), indicating that, statistically, the instrument is measuring one construct.

Collection of Third-Year Data. AY04-05 was projected to be the final research administration of the SFCS. The project team again collaborated with EDR staff who manage the mechanisms by which faculty request, receive, and return survey forms; the Systems Development and Support Services staff who create and manage the database of responses to the survey; and OCAS staff

who provide SCPI ratings of consenting faculty participants. In the final year, the goal was to add Classroom Sign Language Assessment findings (CSLA) to the comparative database. To aid this objective, a plan was established to actively recruit up to 18 previous SFCS participants to have a CSLA in their classrooms this year.

Preliminary Findings. As of the end of fall quarter, AY04-05, a total of 3051 surveys had been completed. On average, responses were highly favorable, although individual responses ranged from "Strongly Disagree" (numerically coded "1") to "Strongly Agree" ("5") on every item of the survey. The four SRS summative items received a grand mean rating of 4.32 ( $SD = .826$ ;  $n = 3030$ ). The 20 communication items received a grand mean rating of 4.20 ( $SD = .706$ ;  $n = 3051$ ). The seven speech-related items averaged 4.03 ( $SD = .811$ ;  $n = 3049$ ) and the ten sign-related items averaged 4.27 ( $SD = .735$ ;  $n = 3044$ ). Analysis of the three general visual communication items requires a larger data set.

### **Implementation Recommendation**

It was intended that the items developed for this study become incorporated in the SRS item bank. Provision would have to be made for faculty to select a focus of interest, rather than individual items (which is the current option), as each focus on the SFCS is associated with a group of items. The system would then generate a survey containing all items appropriate to the area of interest.

### **Continued/Future Research**

1. Analyze the full data set, collapsed over three years. Three types of data are expected to be available for a small number of faculty; namely, student ratings from a global perspective in the classroom (SFCS), ratings of sign communication in an interview format (SCPI), and outcomes of classroom observation (CSLA). Two types of data, student ratings and SCPI ratings, will be available for about three-fourths of the SFCS faculty participants.
2. Determine adequacy of the data pool to assess the instrument. Issues of adequacy include the number of student observations per instructor, number and time-span of survey administrations per instructor, range of instructor sign skill, and availability of SCPI and CSLA outcomes.
3. Describe associations among student ratings, ratings of sign communication in an interview format, and outcomes of classroom observation.
4. Relate student ratings to student background information (communication preferences, self-rated communication skills, etc.).
5. Based on outcomes of the above analyses, revise the instrument and conduct additional data collection and analyses.

**Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT)** (Joan Carr, Elissa Olsen, Karen Beiter, Paula Brown, Frank Caccamise, Carol DeFilippo, Donna Gustina, & William Rudnicki)

### Progress Summary

The goal of this project is to develop a set of items that may be used by chairs and peers to provide interested faculty members with feedback on their communication skills in group situations (group situations include the classroom, committee meetings, department meetings, & group projects). During the 2003-04 academic year (AY03-04), an observation form, termed the Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT) was developed, with communication items grouped into eight categories: organization, environment, visuals, moderation, pacing, presentation, interaction, and sensitivity to cultural diversity. An additional section for comments/suggestions allows feedback for items not included within the eight categories. In addition, a cover page with guidelines for use of this form was developed. During AY03-04 a version of the GCOT was shared with NTID Chairpersons, and, based on their feedback, modifications were made to the GCOT. (See Appendix J for a copy of the current version of the GCOT.) Pilot use of the GCOT was begun in the Fall of AY04-05 and is continuing through the Winter of AY04-05. During the pilot stage, members of the GCOT project team are recruiting willing participants to try the process and provide feedback on the forms used as well as the process itself. At the conclusion of the pilot stage the project team will determine changes that should be made to the GCOT process and/or forms. Also, in consultation with the administration, appropriate ways to inform the community about the GCOT need to be identified. Depending on progress made during AY04-05 pilot stage, during the Spring of AY04-05 the project team may announce the availability of the GCOT process as a way to obtain feedback on an individual's group communication skills.

### Implementation Recommendation

The GCOT project team needs to recommend ways to educate the community about the availability and use of the GCOT process. In addition, in consultation with administration, a determination needs to be made as to where information about the GCOT process and the GCOT forms should reside.

### Continued/Future Research

Not appropriate: This is a project to develop a communication observation tool based on the knowledge and experiences of project team members, chairpersons, and other faculty who choose to use this tool. It is not intended to be a research project.

**Program for Research Priority #2:  
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Reliability Project**  
[Frank Caccamise, Vince Samar (AY04-05), Sara Schley (AY01-02-through-AY03-04), &  
Michael Stinson (AY01-02)]

**Research Priority #2: To continue studies on the reliability of the SCPI.**

Progress Summary

This project was designed to build on reliability studies for SCPIs conducted via the SCPI Three Rater Team Process at NTID from AY93-94 through AY95-96 (see Caccamise, 2004). As discussed in the F/SCRG reliability proposal (Caccamise, Schley, & Stinson, 2002), in addition to the SCPI Three Rater Team Process, SCPI ratings may be conducted via the SCPI Individual Rater Process (see Newell & Caccamise, 2004). Since NTID used the SCPI Three Rater Team Process up through AY00-01, and then changed to use of the SCPI Individual Rater Process in the AY01-02 Fall Quarter, the F/SCRG reliability project proposal addressed both the SCPI Three Rater Team Process and the SCPI Individual Rater Process.

The SCPI Three Rater Team Process involves three raters meeting together and rating each candidate's (person taking SCPI) SCPI interview videotape. After watching the interview, the three raters independently rate the candidate's sign language communication skills using the SCPI Rating Scale (see Appendix K). If all three raters are within one rating level of one another, raters proceed to discussion for determining an official rating, which requires all raters to agree on a single rating. If all raters first independent ratings are not within one level of one another, raters re-watch interview and make second independent ratings prior to discussion for determining each rater's final rating and the official rating.

The reliability studies by Caccamise for NTID AY93-94 through AY95-96 SCPIs conducted via the SCPI Three Rater Team Process addressed three questions for SCPI rating consistency: (1) How consistent are raters in interpreting the SCPI Rating Scale considering that official ratings theoretically represent appropriate interpretation of the SCPI Rating Scale?; (2) How consistent are ratings within SCPI Rating Teams (of 3 raters)?; and (3) How consistent are ratings across SCPI Rating Teams? Relative to the first question (consistency of raters in interpreting the SCPI Rating Scale), for the AY93-94-through-AY95-96 191 NTID SCPIs receiving official ratings analysis showed that: (1) of 573 first independent ratings, 546 (95.3%) were the same or within one level of official ratings; (2) of 168 second independent ratings, 164 (97.6%) were the same or within one level of official ratings; and (3) considering both first and second independent ratings (when needed), by second independent ratings 569 (99.3%) of 573 ratings were the same or within one level of official ratings. Relative to the second question (consistency of SCPI Raters within SCPI Rating Teams), analysis of these same 191 SCPIs showed that the three members of NTID SCPI Rating Teams: (1) were within one level of one another 136 times (72.2%) for first independent ratings, and (2) were within one level of one another 181 times (94.8%) by second independent ratings. These results were interpreted to support: (1) that NTID SCPI Raters are able to consistently interpret the SCPI Rating Scale, and (2) that ratings within NTID SCPI Rating Teams of three are consistent. In addition, when all three raters' first independent ratings are not within one level of one another, second independent ratings significantly improve consistency across raters prior to discussion among raters. Relative to the

third question (reliability of SCPI results across SCPI Rating Teams), analysis of results for five SCPI interviews rated by three NTID SCPI Rating Teams showed that all three teams had the same ratings for four interviews, with two teams having the same rating and one team a rating one level lower for the 5th interview. In addition, of four interviews that were rated by two teams, both teams had the same ratings for three interviews, with two teams differing by one level for the 4th interview. These tentative (due to small number) results support that SCPI results across NTID SCPI Rating Teams (of 3) are consistent.

Since, as stated above, NTID changed to use of the SCPI Individual Rater Process in the AY01-02 Fall Quarter, F/SCRG project efforts initially focused on investigating reliability of NTID SCPI ratings conducted via the SCPI Individual Rater Process. This rating process involves two raters independently rating each candidate's SCPI interview. If the two raters have the same rating, this is the official rating. If they are not in agreement, a 3rd rater rates the candidate's interview, and if 3rd rater is in agreement with one of 1st two raters, this is the official rating. If 3rd rater is not in agreement with either of first two raters, interview tape is given to another set of raters or candidate is scheduled for another interview.

During AY02-03 a preliminary analysis was conducted for SCPI Individual Rater Process research study results for 11 candidates with official ratings of Intermediate, Intermediate Plus, and Advanced. These 11 SCPI candidates' tapes were rated independently by either seven or eight NTID SCPI raters. Analysis of these ratings supported that ratings obtained via the SCPI Individual Rater Process were inconsistent across SCPI raters for these SCPI ratings; that is, for six interviews, ratings spanned across four SCPI rating levels and for five interviews ratings spanned across three SCPI rating levels [Schley, Caccamise, Newell, & Poor (2003)]. Depending on the raters, therefore, different ratings could have been obtained for these 11 candidates. Considering the importance of the Intermediate-to-Advanced rating range for NTID faculty/staff, the analysis of results for the F/SCRG SCPI Individual Rater Process research study, and the results of the SCPI Three Rater Team Process reliability studies for AY93-94-through-AY95-96 NTID SCPI ratings, Schley et al. recommended that NTID return to use of the SCPI Three Rater Team Process. Schley et al. stated that the SCPI Three Rater Team Process has several advantages, including a built-in mentoring and training component for less-experienced raters and a built-in level of reliability in that discussion about rater's final ratings generally do not occur until all three rating team members are within one SCPI rating level of one another. In addition, raters complete a summary worksheet that includes the official rating, functional descriptor, general descriptors for each form category, and examples for form categories. This helps to insure that rating teams' descriptors for candidates match official ratings. Schley et al. also made recommendations for selection of SCPI Rating Teams of three, monitoring of raters' first and second independent ratings, and SCPI Team member in-service training, including the development of self-instructional SCPI in-service training materials. These recommendations have been approved by NTID administration, and are currently being implemented. This has included re-implementation of the SCPI Three Rater Team Process in the AY03-04 Fall Quarter. The F/SCRG AY03-04 report for this project reported that analysis of AY03-04 Fall Quarter SCPI Three Rater Team Process results showed that inter-rater reliability "from this preliminary analysis is good - a second viewing prior to team discussion was required in only 2 of the 18 tapes." As stated above, this second viewing occurs when the three team members' independent ratings following first viewing of SCPI interviews are not within one SCPI rating level of one another.

As reported for Recommendation #5 progress (page 4), during AY03-04 and the AY04-05 Fall Quarter, refinements to the NTID centralized database for F/S communication research needed for investigating SCPI reliability were identified and efforts were initiated to implement these refinements. In addition, during the AY04-05 Fall Quarter the importance of conducting a study on the reliability of SCPI ratings across SCPI Rating Teams (of three raters) was identified as a priority and planning for this study was initiated.

#### Implementation Recommendations

1. Continue use of the SCPI Three Rater Team Process.
2. Provide on-going SCPI in-service training, including training via self-instructional materials, to help ensure consistency across NTID SCPI Team members in interpreting the SCPI Rating Scale.

#### Continued/Future Research

1. Continue data collection and analysis of inter-rater reliability within SCPI Rating Teams of three raters.
2. Conduct a study on reliability of SCPI ratings across SCPI Rating Teams (of three raters); each SCPI videotape included in this study should be rated by (a minimum of) three SCPI Rating Teams.

### Progress for Research Priority #3: Faculty Characteristics Projects

**Research Priority #3: To investigate background and environmental factors that may influence development of sign language communication skills, with a focus on achievement of the SCPI Advanced rating and on why some faculty improve but others receive lower ratings on subsequent SCPIs.**

#### NTID Database Study (Janet MacLeod)

##### Progress Summary

This was the first examination of the current OCAS database in combination with personnel records maintained by NTID data systems. The study serves as a guide for future data collection related to sign skills acquisition. The data file consisted of hearing faculty members who began to learn sign language upon hire by NTID, and who had taken the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) at least once. Individuals were not identifiable except by authorized personnel in the OCAS/ASLIE departments who assign their own unique identification number, one which cannot be linked with any other identifier used in other personnel data bases. The file contained 50 individuals meeting the selection criteria.

Patterns of SCPI taking and ratings revealed that over half (N=27) of the sample had the same SCPI rating for First, Highest, and Most Recent ratings. This meant in most cases, that these faculty had taken the SCPI only once, therefore, all three points had the same rating. However, a little over a third of them had taken it multiple times and also received the same level. About one fifth of the faculty had improved their scores from their first rating, and had taken the SCPI anywhere from two to eleven different times. One individual improved their score two levels higher, and another improved theirs four levels. However, these were the exceptions. There were seven faculty for whom their most recent rating was actually lower than their highest rating.

Overall, this group of faculty began learning sign language when they were thirty-something, and had their first SCPI interview around 15 years later. First ratings were generally at the *Intermediate* (5) level and on average individuals had two and half SCPI Interviews. Recent SCPI interviews around two years later and ratings were higher overall – closer to *Intermediate Plus* (6). While it is possible for individuals to receive lower or higher ratings than these, the scores for this sample ranged *Survival* (3) to *Advanced* (7).

On average, the faculty members had been working at the college for eighteen years. Although some had been here only one year, others had been here as long as 30 years. Half had been here less than 18 eighteen years and half longer than eighteen years. Related experience and college teaching experience prior to coming to NTID were small relatively, although a few had over ten years prior related experience. The most relevant factor is that sign language was learned later in one's career, and SCPI interviews were done after quite some time in the environment, especially for longer term employees. Although one individual had eleven SCPI interviews, the majority had no more than two.

This profile offers a very general picture of the faculty in terms of communication and educational status. At first glance there appears to be some differences among the groups. For

example, those who achieved an *Intermediate* rating started learning sign language at a slightly younger age than those with *Survival* or *Survival Plus* ratings. They also took relatively more sign language courses and had taken the SCPI more times. Conversely, the number of times the higher rated faculty took the SCPI was higher than for those with lower ratings. Faculty who had been at NTID longer, demonstrated relatively lower SCPI ratings. However, cursory observations can be misleading so statistical tests of significance were done. The T-Test procedure was used for this purpose because it is most appropriate for this sample size.

The faculty fell into two almost equal groups. Group I contained 23 individuals whose most recent SCPI ratings were *Survival*, *Survival Plus*, or *Intermediate*. Group II contained 27 individuals whose most recent ratings were either *Intermediate Plus* or *Advanced*. Number of times one had an SCPI was the only variable that even approximated a relationship to one's recent SCPI rating, and was not statistically significant. Although this suggests that the more interviews one has, the more likely it is that the current rating will increase, it cannot be stated as fact. However, motivation to improve one's rating probably relates to number of times one takes the SCPI, both interacting to result in a positive effect. Intuitively, we would assume that age when one began to learn sign language and number of sign language courses taken would also positively affect one's rating. However, that relationship did not meet significance criteria either.

The study was completed during the AY02-03 spring quarter and a written report was completed by MacLeod (2003).

#### Implementation Recommendation

As more faculty take the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview and the database is expanded, the ability to make inferences about the sign language learning data should be enhanced. Moreover, faculty who were hired over the past five years or so, have undergone a different sign language curriculum than their predecessors, a change that may bring about different outcomes and relationships than observed in this study.

#### Continued/Future Research

Continue adding to the faculty sign language data base. Further research should focus on the assessment and modification of sign language curriculum and evaluation, addressed in part via two additional studies, the results of which follow.

**Aptitude Predictors for Acquiring Sign Skill** (Susan Fischer, Janet MacLeod) and  
**Longitudinal Study of Recently Hired Faculty** (Janet MacLeod, Susan Fischer, Cynthia Campbell)

Progress Summary

The precursor to these two sign language studies, *Correlates of Success in Signing* (Fischer, Foster, Gustina, & Senior, 2002), administered the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) with 12 hearing faculty who were also interviewed. Results indicated that the younger the age at which someone learned to sign, the better the results. While the numbers were too small to be conclusive, a tendency was observed for those with higher MLAT scores to also have higher SCPI ratings.

The purpose of the *Aptitude Predictors for Acquiring Sign Skill* study, was to both expand the previous work and to include both hearing and deaf faculty to determine whether the (MLAT), was useful in predicting levels of sign language proficiency among new hires. Scores were compared with faculty Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) rating levels, hearing status, and gender.

The second of the two studies, *Longitudinal Study of Recently Hired Faculty*, was designed as an in-depth prospective investigation of newly-hired faculty to follow their learning path in light of demographic and other data NTID collects on their personal characteristics. All faculty hired in the last 5 years as well as new faculty hired to date were identified, the focus being on faculty with little or no previous sign language experience before arriving at NTID. They were interviewed about their sign language learning experiences and also took the MLAT.

In order to achieve a sufficient sample size for running statistical analyses relative to MLAT and SCPI scores, the decision was made to combine outcomes of the two studies. Both studies were completed and reported on in the summer of 2004.

There were several clear findings. One is that deaf persons learn sign language better than hearing persons do. A contributing factor is that the deaf respondents began learning sign language at slightly younger age relative to the hearing faculty. But exposure and the need to learn likely play as large a role in the learning curve differential.

Another primary finding from these studies is that NTID is doing a good job of hiring and training new personnel. That is, NTID has accelerated the hiring of faculty (some of whom are alumni) who enter the environment already having some sign language skills and/or experience with deafness and deaf persons. As a result, deaf and hearing faculty who come to NTID have healthy positive attitudes and expectations about learning to sign. In general, the attitude among the faculty in this recent study was overwhelmingly positive. The stated motivation for learning was primarily the desire to communicate better and thereby, become an excellent teacher of deaf students. External rewards such as promotion and tenure were incidental.

A majority of faculty interviewed believed that the SCPI, while a valuable assessment tool, did not by itself provide an accurate reflection of their signing skills. This concern has been mitigated by the fact that in the recent past, NTID has introduced alternative methods for

evaluating faculty sign language skills, providing a broader assessment of individual sign proficiency.

Both studies were completed spring of 2004 and a report submitted summer of 2004 (MacLeod, Fischer, & Campbell).

### Implementation Recommendations

The assessment measures data - MLAT and SCPI - combined with analyses of candid commentary offered by participating new faculty provide the basis for support for the following recommendations to the Institute regarding the faculty sign language learning:

1. Write and distribute to newly hired faculty, the *Learning American Sign Language First* rationale during the new faculty orientation. A faculty member from the department of American Sign Language and Interpreter Education (ASLIE) should provide a presentation addressing the rationale. This will help prepare the newly hired faculty for incorporating their ASL skills into their overall communication strategies employed in the classroom. This recommendation addresses the fact that apparently a number of faculty are not aware of the rationale for teaching ASL prior to introducing signing in English and simultaneous communication.
2. Replace the policy in the Office of Communication and Assessment Services current handbook with a newly revised policy, containing the rationale and the timeline of intensive American Sign Language (ASL) training.
3. Employ as complementary measures, the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview assessment tool, and the newer classroom observation to provide newly hired faculty the tools to assess and measure their signing skills.
4. Emphasize that newly hired faculty are required to attend spoken communication workshops to learn more about various communication tools and strategies, and emphasize the fact that it is in spoken communication workshops (as well as in some specialized courses) that signed English and simultaneous communication skills can be worked on.

### Continued/Future Research

Designate to the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) the continuation of the longitudinal study of faculty sign language learning as part of their current record keeping of classes/workshops/trainings taken by faculty, one-on-one interviews, and SCPI ratings. The rationale for this recommendation is that OCAS has access to data that it is often difficult for members of the Research Department to get at; thus this solution would enable OCAS to maintain confidentiality and control over their data.

**NTID Deaf Faculty/Staff Perceptions of the Communication Environment at NTID**  
(Ron Kelly, Lynn Finton, & Keith Mousley)

### Progress Summary

The original CTF was created in an effort to address perceived problems in communication at NTID. A more recently raised issue by the NTID Faculty Congress also called for research needed to benchmark satisfaction among students and faculty/staff with the NTID and RIT communication environments. During AY02-03, Keith Mousley, Lynn Finton, and Ron Kelly initiated a study of *Deaf Faculty and Staff Perceptions of the Communication Environment at NTID*. A survey instrument was constructed that asked questions about communication pertinent to departments, centers, NTID-wide, and the greater RIT campus. A 5-point rating scale was used for communication items in each environment category followed by open-ended comment boxes for spontaneous suggestions and perceptions of respondents. This survey was distributed to NTID deaf faculty and staff members in March 2003. Of 99 people on the mailing list, 56 responded (35 faculty & 21 staff members). A preliminary analysis of the data was completed during AY03-04, culminating in a presentation to the NTID community in March 2004 (Mousley, Finton, & Kelly). Appendix L of this final report provides a summary of the faculty and staff rating responses for the department, center, college-wide, and the greater RIT campus items. Subsequent analyses were conducted comparing results between faculty and staff who prefer to communicate with hearing people using sign only versus sign and speech, as well as their preferences for communicating with deaf people on the same variables. Additionally, the number of years experience at NTID was examined for differences in perceptions. A draft of the final report is nearly completed and will be reported to the SCC on January 20, 2005 with the final report targeted for submittal to the Vice President and Dean of NTID by January 31, 2005.

### Implementation Recommendations

While it is positive that 2/3 of the deaf faculty perceived sign communication in department meetings as clear and understandable with easily followed turn taking procedures, nonetheless 1/3 saw room for improvement. This suggests a need for continuing emphasis on clearer sign communication and turn taking procedures in department meetings. Also, access to signing in public areas is still a concern of 50% of the deaf faculty and staff members. A re-emphasis and commitment to signing in public areas should become an Institute priority. And finally, a perceived lack of interpreting support is also an area of concern on NTID committees when there is an “outside” RIT member, and an even greater problem on RIT-wide committees. This is clearly an area of importance and concern that needs to be addressed.

Thus, the findings of this survey provide the basis for the following recommendations:

- Review and reconsider the interpreting prioritization for deaf faculty and staff
- Address Simultaneous Communication issues
  - Define the limitations
  - Provide training to assist in overcoming the limitations (especially in group settings)
- Prepare written Institute expectations and guidelines for general communication in the NTID environment
- Expect and support full access signing in public places

### Continued/Future Research

- Using this initial study as a baseline, a survey should be conducted on a regular basis (e.g., every 3-5 years) to assess any changes (increase or decrease) in the satisfaction of deaf faculty and staff members' pertinent to the NTID communication environment.
- A similar satisfaction survey should also be designed and implemented to assess NTID students' perceptions of the communication environment. The initial survey should be used as a baseline comparison for future periodic assessments.
- Because 40% of the respondents perceived that the NTID communication environment doesn't consistently support their ability to do their job, conduct a research study to examine the promotion patterns and in-rank durations of deaf and hard-of-hearing faculty members.

### Conclusion

This final report of the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) has provided a summary of progress, and recommendations based on this progress, for four of the five research recommendations in the implementation plan developed in response to the *Final Report of the Communication Task Force (CTF) Five-Year Review Committee* (Barefoot et al., 2001). The recommendations in this final report, which address both implementation and continued/future research, are intended to assist in achieving the remaining fifth implementation plan research recommendation; that is, "The Dean and the SCC develop an implementation plan based on communication research results/findings (by September 2005)." Appendix A of this document provides a summary listing of these recommendations, and, as stated in this appendix, readers are referred to the main text of this final report for information that supports these recommendations.

## References/Readings

### **NTID Communication Task Force (CTF) Documents**

NTID Communication Task Force (1990, November). *Recommendations to the Dean, NTID, for Institute Expectations and Guidelines for Faculty Communication Skill Development* (2nd edition). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Barefoot, S., Bement, L., Dony, S., Gershwind, R., Hoffmann, K., & Stinson, M. (2001, Feb.). *Final Report of the Communication Task Force Five-Year Review Committee*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

*NTID Faculty Congress (NFC) Response to the Communication Task Force Five-Year Review Committee Report*. (2001). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Licata, C. (2001, July). *CTF 5-Year Review Recommendations: Implementation of Research Recommendations*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

### **NTID Steering Committee on Communication Research and Evaluation Subgroup (SCC RES) Reports, Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY**

*Research and Evaluation Plan: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, February 1993. (H. Lang, Chair)

*AY93-94 & AY94-95 Research & Evaluation Plan Report: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, May 1995. (F. Caccamise & B. Newell, Co-Chairs)

*AY95-96 Research & Evaluation Plan Report: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, May 1996. (F. Caccamise & C. Monikowski, Co-Chairs)

*AY96-97 Research & Evaluation Plan Report: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, June 1997. (C. Monikowski, Chair)

*AY97-98 & AY98-99 Research & Evaluation Plan Report: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, May 1999. (R. Whitehead, Editor)

### **NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG Proposals)**

Caccamise, F., Long, G., Kelly, R., Peterson, R., & Poor, G. (2002, Jan.). *NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group Proposed Assessment Tools & Correlation Studies*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Caccamise, F., Schley, S., & Stinson, M. (2002, Jan.). *NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group: Proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Reliability Studies*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Campbell, C., Fischer, S., Foster, S., Lang, H., & MacLeod, J. (2002, Jan.) *NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group: Faculty Characteristics - Preliminary Project List, Timelines, and Resources*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

### **NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (FSCG) Annual Reports**

Caccamise, F. (ed.) (2002, June). *NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group AY01-02 Report*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Caccamise, F. (ed.) (2003, June). *NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group AY02-03 Report*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Caccamise, F. (ed.) (2004, June). *NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group AY03-04 Report*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

### **Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Project Documents**

Reeves, J., Newell, W., Holcomb, B. R., & Stinson, M. (2000). The Sign Language Skills Classroom Observation: A Process for Describing Sign Language Proficiency in Classroom Settings. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 145, 315-341.

Caccamise, F., Reeves, J., Poor, G., & Carr, J. (2003). The Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA): A Process for Assessing & Supporting Development of Instructors' Sign Language Skills. In *NTID Research Bulletin*, 9 (1), 1, 3-5, NTID, Rochester, NY.

Caccamise, F., Reeves, J., Poor, G., & Carr, J. (2004a, December). *Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) goals, materials, & procedures* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Caccamise, F., Reeves, J., Poor, G., & Carr, J. (2004b, December). *Classroom Sign Language Assessment observation, report, & follow-up meeting process steps*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Reeves, J., Poor, G., & Caccamise, F. (2005, January). *Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) sample observations & reports* (4th edition). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

## **Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Reliability Project Documents**

Newell, W., & Caccamise, F. (2004, October). *Options for Conducting & Sharing Results of SCPI Ratings* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Caccamise, F. (2004, October). *The Importance of SCPI Reliability Studies and Monitoring Ratings by SCPI Team Members* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Schley, S., Caccamise, F., Newell, W., & Poor, G. (2003, May). *NTID SCPI Rating Procedures, Training Materials, & In-Service Training*. Personal Communication, Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

## **Aptitude Predictors for Acquiring Sign Skill and Longitudinal Study of Recently Hired Faculty Documents**

Caccamise, F., & Newell, W. (2005, January). *Fluctuations in SCPI Results* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Carroll, J.B. & Sapon, S.T. (1959). *Modern Language Aptitude Test (Form A)*. Cleveland, OH: The Psychological Corporation, Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich.

Communication Task Force Report, Section IV A. (1990, November). *Institute Expectations and Guidelines for Faculty Communication Skill Development*. National Technical Institute for the Deaf. Rochester, NY: Author.

Fischer, S. D. (1998). Critical periods for language acquisition: Consequences for deaf Education. In A Weisel (ed.), *Issues Unresolved: New Perspectives on Language and Education* (pp. 9-26). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Fischer, S., Foster, S., Gustina, D., & Senior, G. (2002, January). *Correlates of Success in Signing*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

MacLeod, J. (2003, October). *Communication Task Force Subgroup: Faculty Characteristics NTID Data Base Study: #2 Internal Report*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

MacLeod, J., Fischer, S., & Campbell, C. (2004, August). *Communication Task Force Internal Reports: Project #3: Aptitude Predictors for Acquiring Sign Skill and Project #4 Longitudinal Study of Recently Hired Faculty*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Mayberry, R., & Eichen, E. B. (1991). The long-lasting advantage of learning sign language in childhood: Another look at the critical period for language acquisition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 30, 486-512.

Oxford, R. L., & Ehrmann, M. E. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23, 359-386.

Reeves, J., Holcomb, S., & Newell, B. (April, 1999). *Recommendations of the faculty/staff sign language education program (FSSLEP)*. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Sparks, R. L., Ganschow, L., & Patton, J. (1995). Prediction of performance in first-year foreign language courses: Connections between native and foreign language learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 638-655.

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2002). *Dynamic testing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

### **Deaf Faculty/Staff Perceptions of the NTID Communication Environment Project Document**

Mousley, K., Finton, L., & Kelly, R. (2004, March). *How Does Our Communication Environment Measure Up? Perceptions of Deaf Faculty and Staff at NTID*. Presentation at NTID Department of Research Brown Bag Seminar, Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

## Appendix A

### NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) Implementation & Research Recommendations

Prepared by Frank Caccamise  
January 2005

This appendix provides a summary listing of F/SGRG Project Teams' implementation and research recommendations that are based on research conducted by these teams from AY01-02-through-the AY04-05 Fall Quarter. Readers are referred to the main text of this F/SCRG final report for information that provides support for these recommendations.

#### NTID Institute Wide Faculty/Staff (F/S) Communication Database

1. Access guidelines for the NITD institute wide F/S communication database and information in this database, should be reviewed and modified as appropriate.
2. If it is decided to proceed with comparing NTID faculty members' results across the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), the Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA), and the Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS), consideration should be given as to how to best ensure CSLA and SFCS, as well as SCPI, results are available to project team members conducting these comparisons.

#### **Research Priority #1: To identify communication skills assessment options, in addition to the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), for NTID faculty/staff.**

Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) (Frank Caccamise, June Reeves, Geoff Poor, & Joan Carr)

#### Implementation Recommendation

Official CSLA use with NTID faculty was implemented during the AY03-04 Spring Quarter under the coordination of OCAS. It is recommended that CSLA services continue to be provided throughout the academic year under the coordination of OCAS.

#### Continued/Future Research

1. Instructors' and CSLA Team members' evaluation of CSLA services should continue and, based on this evaluation feedback and continued experiences with CSLA services, refinements should be made to the CSLA process as may be appropriate.
2. Information on the reliability of CSLA observers' ratings should be collected.
3. CSLA results should be included within the context of a study designed to compare results obtained via the SCPI, the Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS), and the CSLA.

Students' Judgments of Faculty Members' Communication Skills (Carol DeFilippo, Gary Long, Frank Caccamise, Ron Kelly, & Lynn Finton)

Implementation Recommendation

It was intended that the items developed for this study become incorporated in the SRS item bank. Provision would have to be made for faculty to select a focus of interest, rather than individual items (which is the current option), as each focus on the SFCS is associated with a group of items. The system would then generate a survey containing all items appropriate to the area of interest.

Continued/Future Research

1. Analyze the full data set, collapsed over three years. Three types of data are expected to be available for a small number of faculty; namely, student ratings from a global perspective in the classroom, ratings of sign communication in an interview format, and outcomes of classroom observation. Two types of data, student ratings and SCPI ratings, will be available for about three-fourths of the SFCS faculty participants.
2. Determine adequacy of the data pool to assess the instrument. Issues of adequacy include the number of student observations per instructor, number and time-span of survey administrations per instructor, range of instructor sign skill, and availability of SCPI and CSLA outcomes.
3. Describe associations among student ratings, ratings of sign communication in an interview format, and outcomes of classroom observation.
4. Relate student ratings to student communication preferences and self-rated skills.

Group Communication Observation Tool (Joan Carr, Elissa Olsen, Karen Beiter, Paula Brown, Frank Caccamise, Carol DeFilippo, Donna Gustina, & William Rudnicki)

Implementation Recommendation

The GCOT project team needs to recommend ways to educate the community about the availability and use of the GCOT process. In addition, in consultation with administration, a determination needs to be made as to where information about the GCOT process and the GCOT forms should reside.

Continued/Future Research

Not appropriate: This is a project to develop a communication observation tool based on the knowledge and experiences of project team members, chairpersons, and other faculty who choose to use this tool. It is not intended to be a research project.

**Research Priority #2: To continue study on the reliability of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI)**

Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) Reliability Project [Frank Caccamise, Vince Samar (AY04-05), Sara Schley (AY01-02-through-AY03-04), & Mike Stinson (AY01-02)]

Implementation Recommendations

1. Continue use of the SCPI Three Rater Team Process.
2. Provide on-going SCPI in-service training, including training via self-instructional materials, to help ensure consistency across NTID SCPI Team members in interpreting the SCPI Rating Scale.

Continued/Future Research

1. Continue data collection and analysis of inter-rater reliability with SCPI Rating Teams of three raters.
2. Conduct a study on reliability of SCPI ratings across SCPI Ratings Team (of three raters); each SCPI videotape included in this study should be rated by (a minimum) of three SCPI Rating Teams.

**Research Priority #3: To investigate background and environmental factors that may influence development of sign language communication skills, with a focus on achievement of the SCPI Advanced rating and on why some faculty improve but others receive lower ratings on subsequent SCPIs.**

NTID Database Study (Janet MacLeod)

Implementation Recommendation

As more faculty take the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview and the database is expanded, the ability to make inferences about the sign language learning data should be enhanced. Moreover, faculty who were hired over the past five years or so, have undergone a different sign language curriculum than their predecessors, a change that may bring about different outcomes and relationships than observed in this study.

Continued/Future Research

Continue adding to the faculty sign language data base. Further research should focus on the assessment and modification of sign language curriculum and evaluation, addressed in part via two additional studies, the results of which follow.

Aptitude Predictors for Acquiring Sign Skill (Susan Fischer,& Janet MacLeod) and  
Longitudinal Study of Recently Hired Faculty (Janet MacLeod, Susan Fischer, Cynthia Campbell)

### Implementation Recommendations

The assessment measures data - MLAT and SCPI - combined with analyses of candid commentary offered by participating new faculty provide the basis for support for the following recommendations to the Institute regarding the faculty sign language learning:

1. Write and distribute to newly hired faculty, the *Learning American Sign Language First* rationale during the new faculty orientation. A faculty member from the department of American Sign Language and Interpreter Education should provide a presentation addressing the rationale. This will help prepare the newly hired faculty for incorporating their ASL skills into their overall communication strategies employed in the classroom. This recommendation addresses the fact that apparently a number of faculty are not aware of the rationale for teaching ASL prior to introducing signing in English and simultaneous communication.
2. Replace the policy in the Office of Communication and Assessment Services current handbook with a newly revised policy, containing the rationale and the timeline of intensive American Sign Language training.
3. Employ as complementary measures, the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview assessment tool, and the newer classroom observation to provide newly hired faculty the tools to assess and measure their signing skills.
4. Emphasize that newly hired faculty are required to attend spoken communication workshops to learn more about various communication tools and strategies, and emphasize the fact that it is in spoken communication workshops (as well as in some specialized courses) that signed English and simultaneous communication skills can be worked on.

### Continued/Future Research

Designate to the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) the continuation of the longitudinal study of faculty sign language learning as part of their current record keeping of classes/workshops/trainings taken by faculty, one-on-one interviews, and SCPI ratings. The rationale for this recommendation is that OCAS has access to data that it is often difficult for members of the Research Department to get at; thus this solution would enable OCAS to maintain confidentiality and control over their data.

## **NTID Deaf/Faculty/Staff Perceptions of the Communication Environment at NTID (Ron Kelly, Lynn Finton, & Keith Mousley)**

### Implementation Recommendations

While it is positive that 2/3 of the deaf faculty perceived sign communication in department meetings as clear and understandable with easily followed turn taking procedures, nonetheless 1/3 saw room for improvement. This suggests a need for continuing emphasis on clearer sign communication and turn taking procedures in department meetings. Also, access to signing in public areas is still a concern of 50% of the deaf faculty and staff members. A re-emphasis and commitment to signing in public areas should become an Institute priority. And finally, a perceived lack of interpreting support is also an area of concern on NTID committees when there is an “outside” RIT member, and an even greater problem on RIT-wide committees. This is clearly an area of importance and concern that needs to be addressed.

Thus, the findings of this survey provide the basis for the following recommendations:

- Review and reconsider the interpreting prioritization for deaf faculty and staff
- Address Simultaneous Communication issues
  - Define the limitations
  - Provide training to assist in overcoming the limitations (especially in group settings)
- Prepare written Institute expectations and guidelines for general communication in the NTID environment
- Expect and support full access signing in public places

### Continued/Future Research

- Using this initial study as a baseline, a survey should be conducted on a regular basis (e.g., every 3-5 years) to assess any changes (increase or decrease) in the satisfaction of deaf faculty and staff members’ pertinent to the NTID communication environment.
- A similar satisfaction survey should also be designed and implemented to assess NTID students’ perceptions of the communication environment. The initial survey should be used as a baseline comparison for future periodic assessments.
- Because 40% of the respondents perceived that the NTID communication environment doesn’t consistently support their ability to do their job, conduct a research study to examine the promotion patterns and in-rank durations of deaf and hard-of-hearing faculty members.

## Appendix B

### One Option for Developing a Communication Observational Tool for Use by Chairpersons & Peers

(From *NTID Steering Committee on Communication Recommendations to the Dean for Supporting Effective Communication at NTID*, February 2003).

It is suggested that the Dean, in consultation with the SCC, establish an NTID Chairperson/ Peer Observation Project Team which will be given the charge to develop a set of questions/items regarding faculty members' communication skills in group situations (for example, the classroom, committee meetings, department meetings, & group projects), that may be used by Chairs and peers (latter selected by faculty members) to provide faculty members with feedback on their communication skills. Further:

1. That the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team include (a) (a minimum of) two NTID Chairpersons, (b) two NTID faculty in full time teaching positions, and (c) NTID faculty with expertise in sign, spoken, and written communication skills (faculty from ASLIE, Speech-Language, Audiology, English, &/or Research Depts.). The exact number of project team members should be based on the knowledge, skills, and experience needed to effectively conduct this project. The total number of people on the project team should be kept to a reasonable number by selecting individuals when possible who represent more than one area of expertise or knowledge.
2. That the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team develop "a broad-based approach to observing effective communication to include use of technology, use of visuals, use of print material, pacing, allowing time for students or peers to read print material, establishing eye contact before beginning communication, using appropriate turn taking strategies, clear signing, and effective simultaneous communication.
3. That the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team use as may be appropriate the following to assist in identifying/developing questions/items:
  - A. ASLIE Observation Course: Classroom Observation for Improved Communication
  - B. The Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA), which is under development
  - C. The NTID Student Rating Survey (SRS) items
  - D. The NTID Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS) (designed to provide students' ratings of instructors' classroom communication skills) which is under development
  - E. The Communication Ease Scale
  - F. Eisenhart Outstanding Teaching Award -
    - 1) Guidelines
    - 2) Forms Used
    - 3) Recommendations of Eisenhart Award Committee Members & Recipients
4. That the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team be included as one of the Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group Project Teams.
5. That the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team have their first meeting(s) during AY02-03 Spring Quarter, with the goal being to develop an AY03-04 plan-of-work.
6. That the NTID Chairperson/Peer Observation Project Team's AY03-04 plan of work be included in the *Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group AY02-03 Report*.

## Appendix C

### Confidentiality and Access to Institutional Data

# R·I·T

**Rochester Institute of Technology**

*NTID Center for Research, Teaching, & Learning  
Department of Research  
2410 Carey Bldg., 585-475-6276 (V or TDD)*

**To:** Chris Licata, Associate Dean, Sue Foster and Diane Heyden, Co-Chairs, SCC  
**From:** John Albertini  
**Date:** May 2, 2002  
**Re:** Confidentiality and Access to Institute Data  
**Cc:** Geoff Poor, Frank Caccamise, Rico Peterson

With this memo, I am requesting a new approval procedure for access to the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database and other Institute databases for research projects being conducted under the umbrella of the Communication Research Group.

**New procedure:** Basically, I am proposing that OCAS be the conduit of requests for data from its own database and from DIS and ASLIE databases.

**Rationale:** The SCC routing procedure was created in 1997 for researchers requesting communication data housed in DIS (see Attachment A). Since the “Faculty/Staff Communication Database” is now housed in OCAS and there is no longer an SCC Research & Evaluation Subgroup (RES), the procedure is out of date. To conduct the research projects planned by the Communication Research Group, investigators will need to compare a variety of variables from several databases. Two factors are important here: providing ready access to this data and maintaining the confidentiality of the data.

**Implementation of procedure:** I propose the following procedure in cases where variables must be associated with individuals. When, for example, individuals’ SCPI ratings and course histories are requested, OCAS will proceed as follows:

1. An investigator requests SCPI ratings and ASLIE course histories from OCAS.
2. OCAS provides ASLIE with the names of individuals and requests course histories.
3. OCAS matches course histories to ratings and assigns code numbers in place of names.

4. OCAS provides investigator with the list of course histories, ratings and code numbers. OCAS will also act as the conduit for data requests to DIS, following this same procedure, when variables such as start date of employment are involved. Not all of the variables kept by DIS are available to investigators. OCAS, in consultation with the Office of the Dean, will determine in advance which data fields are to be considered “highly confidential” and not to be used in research.

### **Confidentiality**

While I am proposing a new procedure for requesting data, I am not proposing any change in the Confidentiality Statement / Guidelines for the NTID Faculty /Staff Communication Database (see Attachment B). These assumptions and guidelines should remain in effect for all providers as well as requestors of the data. I hope you will agree that this statement and these procedures are reasonable safeguards of the confidentiality of this data. If approved, the procedures will allow access to databases needed for completing and moving forward on projects planned for this academic year. Frank will be sending additional suggestions based on our meeting of April 26. These suggestions may be most appropriately considered by the SCC next fall.

Attachments: SCC Research Proposal Routing (A)  
Confidentiality Statement/Guidelines for the NTID Faculty /Staff Communication Database (B)

## Attachment A<sup>a</sup>

### Research Proposal Routing Form: NTID Steering Committee on Communication (SCC)

NOTE: If you are requesting access to the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database, please read the confidentiality statement/guidelines on the other side of this form. Thank you.

Title of Project/Proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone #: \_\_\_\_\_ (V/TTY) E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Steering Committee on Communication (SCC) (Co-)Chair

1. Received by SCC (Co-)Chair: Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

2. Proposal is accompanied by statement of support from supervisor(s)/chairperson(s): \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No  
(If no, notify principal investigator to obtain)

3. Referred to SCC Research & Evaluation Subgroup (RES): \_\_\_\_\_ (Date) \_\_\_\_\_

#### SCC Research & Evaluation Subgroup (RES) Review

4. Review and Comment by RES re: Access to NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database:

\_\_\_ Access Not Requested \_\_\_ Recommend Access \_\_\_ Not Recommended for Access

Comment:

5. Returned to SCC Chairperson by REST (Co-)Chair: Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### SCC Committee

6. Decision of SCC: \_\_\_\_\_ Concur with RES \_\_\_\_\_ Do not concur with RES

Comment:

#### SCC Chair

7. Results of review shared with Principal Investigator/Research Team & RES \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

8. If access to NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database is approved, notification to Center for Information Services (CIS) authorizing access to database \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

9. Signature, SCC (Co-)Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Note: As per RIT policy, and consistent with federal regulations, studies involving human subjects require Institute Review Board (IRB) approval.

---

<sup>a</sup>From *AY95-96 Research & Evaluation Plan Report: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, May, 1995 (F. Caccamise & C. Monikowski, Co-Chairs)

## Attachment B<sup>a</sup>

### Confidentiality Statement/Guidelines for the NTID Faculty/Staff (F/S) Communication Database

Information in the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database is confidential, and this should be carefully considered in preparing research proposals that include a request for access to this database.

All information in the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database is coded to protect anonymity. If a study requires a match of names with SCPI ratings, permission for this must be requested from study participants via a subject clearance form.

If access to the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database is approved by the NTID Steering Committee on Communication (SCC), investigators are responsible for ensuring that data is reported in a manner that protects confidentiality of individual data. This requires careful consideration in grouping data; that is, the categories used for grouping data must not allow identification of an individual within a category/group (for example, the only secretary, the only research assistant, or the only administrator in a department).

In addition, investigators are responsible for ensuring that all handling of data (printouts, e-mail, etc.) is done in a manner that protects confidentiality of data for individuals.

If you have any questions or concerns about the confidentiality of data in the NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Database, please contact the (Co) Chair, Research and Evaluation Subgroup, NTID Steering Committee on Communication (SCC).

---

<sup>a</sup>From *AY95-96 Research & Evaluation Plan Report: NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Expectations and Guidelines*, May 1995 (F. Caccamise & C. Monikowski, Co-Chairs).

## Appendix D

### Proposed Process for Sharing Information in NTID Databases with NTID Faculty/Staff Communication Research Group (F/SCRG) Project Teams

Prepared by Frank Caccamise

May 15, 2002

(Consistent with John Albertini "Confidentiality and Access to Institute Data" Memo, May 2, 2002)

1. List of information in following institute databases shared with the Dean, the NTID Steering Committee on Communication (SCC), and the F/SCRG Liaison(s) to the Dean and SCC: (a) Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS), (b) Division of Institutional Services (DIS), (c) Department of ASL & Interpreter Education (ASLIE), and (d) other databases as appropriate.
2. The Dean, in consultation with the SCC and F/SCRG Liaison(s) to the Dean and SCC, determines the information from institute databases that is available to F/S Research Project Teams and that which is highly confidential and not available to F/S Research Project Teams.
3. The Dean shares the results of the #2 decision-making process with the F/SCRG Liaison(s) to the Dean and SCC, who share this information with F/S Communication Research Project Teams.
4. List of approved F/S Team Projects & Contact/Lead Persons for each Project Team sent by F/SCRG Liaison(s) to OCAS.
5. F/SCRG Team Project Contact/Lead Persons submit all Project Team requests for information to OCAS.
6. For information listed as available to F/SCRG Project Teams, the procedures for aggregate requests made to OCAS by F/SCRG Team Project Contact/Lead Persons are as follows:
  - A. OCAS provides ASLIE and DIS, as appropriate, the aggregate list of information requested by Project Contact/Lead Persons (for example, all senior faculty members with a minimum NTID employment of 10 years).
  - B. ASLIE and DIS provide OCAS with requested information
  - C. OCAS provides Project Contact/Lead Persons with all information requested, including SCPI results, with OCAS code numbers for persons who have taken the SCPI (no names). Information for persons not taking the SCPI may also be provided, but, again, with no names.
7. For information not listed as available to F/SCRG Project Teams and/or information requested for individuals, the procedures for requests made to OCAS by F/SCRG Team Project Contact/Lead Persons are as follows:
  - A. Permission slip listing the information being requested and signed by each individual must accompany all such requests for information.
  - B. OCAS provides ASLIE and DIS, as appropriate, the list of information requested by project contact/lead persons,
  - C. ASLIE and DIS provide OCAS with requested information, including names of person for whom information requested.
  - D. OCAS provides Project Contact/Lead Persons with all information requested, including names of persons for whom information requested.

#### NOTES:

1. Consistent with recommendation #5 of the implementation plan for the Communication Task Force (CTF) Five-Year Review Committee recommendations, it is recommended that the development of an institute wide F/S communication database be explored and, if possible, setup.
2. It is recommended that during AY02-03 the SCC review OCAS SCPI registration form(s) completed by faculty/staff, MSSE students, and others who may take the SCPI at NTID, and consideration be given to adding items that provide information needed by F/S Communication Research Project Teams.

## Appendix E

### Access to NTID (F/S) Institute Wide Faculty/Staff (F/S) Communication Database

Prepared by Frank Caccamise  
April 2003

1. The NTID Division of Institutional Services (DIS) maintains an institute wide Faculty/Staff communication database. This database includes information provided to DIS by the Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) and the Department of ASL & Interpreter Education (ASLIE).
2. List of approved F/SCRG Projects and contact persons for project teams sent to DIS and OCAS by the F/SCRG Liaison. Generally, there should be one contact person, with a maximum of two contact persons, for each project.
3. F/SCRG team project contact persons submit project team requests for database information to DIS.
4. For requests requiring written permission from individuals to access information, project contact persons: (a) send copies of signed permission forms to the OCAS Coordinator, and (b) maintain original copies of permission forms in their files.
5. For each request, DIS sends file of all information requested to OCAS Coordinator for review in order to help ensure confidentiality, as appropriate, is being maintained.
6. If OCAS Coordinator determines that confidentiality, as appropriate, is being maintained, DIS sends file of information requested to project contact person (s).
7. If there is concern about confidentiality, the OCAS Coordinator, project contact person (s), other project team members, and the F/SCRG Liaison meet to resolve concern. If resolution cannot be reached by this group, the group meets with the Associate Dean and/or Dean to discuss concern and for a final decision.
8. If information requested is not available from the database, the project contact person(s) making the request, DIS personnel, the OCAS Coordinator, the ASLIE Chair, the F/SCRG Liaison, and/or others, as appropriate, meet to determine if information should be added to database.

## Appendix F

### Six Sign Language Linguistic Features Rated by Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Observers

March 2004<sup>a</sup>

1. **Signs and Fingerspelling Accurately Produced:** This feature involves use of appropriate production characteristics of signs and fingerspelling. These include handshape, movement, placement/location, and orientation of the hands/arms while producing signs. Also included under sign and fingerspelling production are the appropriate positioning of hands and arms and their movement within the signing space.
2. **Sign Knowledge and Use Convey Message Intent:** This feature involves breadth of sign vocabulary knowledge and the ability to select and use signs appropriate to intended meanings. It also includes the ability to modify signs as appropriate to communicate more complex meanings; for example, number, size, degree, intensity, manner, distance, and time/duration.
3. **Space Used Effectively to Refer to Noun Referents:** This feature involves establishing and using referents for nouns in the signing space in order to discuss them and to compare and contrast ideas, people, and places. Skills important for this area are establishing points in space as referents, eye-gaze, producing noun signs so that they are consistent with real world orientation, using directional verbs consistently, and shifting of the body to show contrast/ comparison and for assuming roles when reporting indirect discourse (include role shift).
4. **Non-Manual Signals Convey & Support Meaning:** This feature involves the use of facial expression, eye gaze, head movement, body shift, and pausing to convey information regarding sentence types; that is, to distinguish statements vs. questions, to distinguish Wh (what, who, etc.) from yes/no questions, and to mark conditional statements, rhetorical questions and topics. It also includes use of non-manual signals to convey information regarding relative size, degree, intensity, manner, distance, and time/duration.
5. **Classifiers Convey Accurate Information about the Physical World:** This feature involves the use of specified handshapes to communicate efficiently and effectively about the physical world. These specific handshapes are used to show location and movement of nouns, to describe nouns, to show how objects are handled and used, and to show how the body appears/moves. Classifiers are referred to/written about in the following way: CL:B for table located there.
6. **Discourse Organization is Visually Effective:** This feature involves using signs and sign language techniques for organizing the whole, and the sub-narratives/statements within, in extended communication sequences (such as classroom lectures). Specialized signs (for example, NOW, FINISH & OFF-POINT) rhetorical questions, listing on the non-dominant hand for related items and sequence of events, and other signing techniques (for example, non-manual signals such as body shifts & pauses) are used to signal topic introductions, reviews, endings, transitions, and asides. These signs and techniques help to make the entire discourse visually clear and easy to follow.

---

<sup>a</sup>Adapted from descriptors in: Reeves, J., Newell, W., Holcomb, B. R., & Stinson, M. (2000). The Sign Language Skills Classroom Observation: A Process for Describing Sign Language Proficiency in Classroom Settings. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 145, 315-341.

## Appendix G

### Sample Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Report<sup>a</sup>

**Instructor:** #7

**Course:** Instrumentation

**Lesson Topic:** Jobs Available in IST

**Date of Taping:** DATE

**Primary Communication Mode(s) Used:** Simultaneous Communication

#### Ratings for Six Sign Language Linguistic Features Important to Effective Classroom Communication with Deaf Students

##### Rating Scale for sign language features #1 & #2:

Always/ Almost Always	Errors Did Not Interfere with Intelligibility	Errors Interfered Some with Intelligibility	Errors Interfered Significantly with Intelligibility	Generally Not Understandable
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

- Signs and Fingerspelling Produced Accurately & Clearly:** This feature involves use of appropriate production characteristics of signs and fingerspelling. These include handshape, movement, placement/location, and orientation of the hands/arms while producing signs. Also included under sign and fingerspelling production are the appropriate positioning of hands and arms and their movement within the signing space.

Rating: 4

Errors: ROCK, SEA, FAMOUS, DIFFERENT, EARTH, BLOOD, RAIN, HEART-BEAT, SOIL; signs made with index handshape sometimes are produced with little finger extended

- Sign Knowledge and Use Convey Message Intent:** This feature involves breadth of sign vocabulary knowledge and the ability to select and use signs appropriate to intended meanings. It also includes the ability to modify signs as appropriate to communicate more complex meanings; for example, number, size, degree, intensity, manner, distance, and time/duration.

Rating: 4

Positives: ANALYZE, CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, ALCOHOL, LOCAL, MILITARY, COMMON, CLONING, VITAMINS, MANY-very, RECENTLY-very

Errors: TRAIN for THERAPY, DESIGN for DIAGRAM, MEETING for MEET, FAR for 'a stretch', WAR for WEAPON, NORMAL for REGULARLY, BEAT-COMPETITION for BEAT/OVERCOME cancer, DIRTY for DIRT/SOIL

Suggestions: Consider fingerspelling more of the technical vocabulary in order to support students and your signs; for example, PHARMACUTICALS, DYE, CLONING, FORENSICS. Your sign for 'instrument' may not be appropriate for use outside the classroom.

**Rating scale for sign language features #3 to #6:**

Always/ Almost Always	Most of the Time	About Half the Time	Occasionally	Never/ Almost Never
5	4	3	2	1

3. **Space Used Effectively to Refer to Noun Referents:** This feature involves establishing and using referents for nouns in the signing space in order to discuss them and to compare and contrast ideas, people, and places. Skills important for this area are establishing points in space as referents, eye-gaze, producing noun signs so that they are consistent with real world orientation, using directional verbs consistently, and shifting of the body to show contrast/comparison and for assuming roles when reporting indirect discourse (includes role shift).

Rating: 3.75

Positives:

You used/ indexing and eye gaze to reference nouns; for example, jobs, how pollution moves, environment, lawyers, scientists-there, crime stories, Kodak, friend-he, Iraq- there, lecturer-he, and THAT directed towards item on list of non-dominant hand.

You used/ directional verbs to show relationships between nouns; for example, RELATE-TO nuclear medicine, REMOVE-FROM there and PLACE-there, QUESTION-me, HELP-them, GO-THERE-AS-GROUP, and TELL-ME examples.

You used body shift and indexing to contrast nouns; for example, big company vs. small company, WMD vs. NTID instruments, deaf scientists vs., jobs in field, chemistry vs. biology, last week vs. this week, and natural vs. man-made.

You used 'real world orientation' to show spatial relationships; for example, discussing Venn diagram on board and planets.

Errors/Omissions:

You sometimes voiced but did not sign pronoun referents (he, I, you); for example, "\_\_\_ used to work for EPA" and "\_\_\_ should write that down".

4. **Non-Manual Signals Convey & Support Meaning:** This feature involves the use of facial expression, eye gaze, head movement, body shift, and pausing to convey information regarding sentence types; that is, to distinguish statements vs. questions, to distinguish Wh

(what, who, etc.) from yes/no questions, and to mark conditional statements, rhetorical questions and topics. It also includes use of non-manual signals to convey information regarding relative size, degree, intensity, manner, distance, and time/duration.

Rating: 3

Positives:

You sometimes used appropriate facial expression for yes/no and WH questions; for example, ROOM WHAT?, SATISFIED?, and DISCUSS WHAT?

You sometimes held the last sign and maintained eye contact when questioning.

Errors/Omissions:

You sometimes did not use appropriate facial expression, pausing, and body shift for making conditional statements.

Your sentences sometimes tend to ‘run together’ with little pausing, body shift, and/or facial expression to separate ideas.

5. **Classifiers Convey Accurate Information about the Physical World:** This feature involves the use of specified handshapes to communicate efficiently and effectively about the physical world. These specific handshapes are used to show location and movement of nouns, to describe nouns, to show how objects are handled and used, and to show how the body appears/moves. Classifiers are referred to/written about in the following way: CL:B for table located there.

Rating: 4

Positives:

CL:FF for circles in diagrams and how they overlap

CL:B for fish

CL:5 for combining together

Errors/Omissions:

You use appropriate classifiers, however, production not always fluent/clear/controlled.

6. **Discourse Organization is Visually Effective:** This feature involves using signs and sign language techniques for organizing the whole, and the sub-narratives/statements within, in extended communication sequences (such as classroom lectures). Specialized signs (for example, NOW, FINISH & OFF-POINT), rhetorical questions, listing on the non-dominant hand for related items and sequence of events, and other signing techniques (for example, non-manual signals such as body shifts & pauses) are used to signal topic introductions, reviews, endings, transitions, and asides. These signs and techniques help to make the entire discourse visually clear and easy to follow.

Rating: 4

Positives:

You used rhetorical questions to organize lecture and to signal topics, subtopics and transitions; for example, THERE-WHAT-DO? and JOBS-WHAT KIND?

You used listing on the non-dominant hand to discuss related items; for example, experiments related to environment, discuss what we've learned so far, and analysis techniques.

You used body shifts and pauses to indicate transitions/ beginnings/endings; for example, last week - now this week, and Chemistry - Biology.

You used specialized signs for marking transitions; for example, FINISH, PUT-ASIDE, BACK-TO-POINT, NOW, OK? , OFF-POINT, BACK-UP-TO, and UP-TIL-NOW.

Errors/Omissions:

You could use Rhetorical Questions more effectively to organize lecture and to signal transitions; for example, "I want to discuss this because..." could be signed I WANT DISCUSS, WHY?

**Additional Comments (Optional):** Additional examples, comments about comprehension skills if clearly observable, & other comments pertinent to instructor's classroom use of sign language based on observation: None

### **Priority Sign Language Linguistic Features for Skills Development**

Inclusion of pronouns together with appropriate use of space for referents

Use of non-manual signals to convey and support meaning

Use of rhetorical question for lecture organization and transitions

### **Course/Activities Recommended for Skills Development**

Tutoring

---

<sup>a</sup>Based on a form in: Reeves, J., Newell, W., Holcomb, B. R., & Stinson, M. (2000). The Sign Language Skills Classroom Observation: A Process for Describing Sign Language Proficiency in Classroom Settings. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 145, 315-341.

## Appendix H

### Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA) Process Evaluation Feedback

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ (optional)    **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

To assist us in providing quality CSLA services, we would appreciate if you would complete this questionnaire and return it to NAME, NTID Office of Communication Assessment Services (OCAS) Coordinator, LBJ-ROOM #, E-MAIL. Thank you.

1. CSLA information received prior to taping of my class provided a clear explanation of the CSLA process.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2		1
Comments:						

2. My CSLA videotape provides a good example of my use of sign language for teaching deaf students.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2		1
Comments:						

3. The person conducting my CSLA Follow-Up Meeting provided a clear and thorough explanation of my CSLA written report.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2		1
Comments:						

(over)



## Appendix I

### Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS) Items

#### Background Information Items

1. Your gender.  
female, male
2. Your age.  
17-24, over 24
3. Year you first began at NTID/RIT.  
Fill in number bubbles to indicate the year.
4. Your race/ethnicity:  
Fill in one or more: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black or African American, White, Hispanic or Latino
5. Which communication do you prefer?  
Fill in one: Sign alone, Speech alone, Sign and Speech together
6. Rate your signing skills:  
Fill in one: Excellent, Good, Fair, Basic, No Skills
7. Please rate your skills in understanding speech when you are able to both speechread and use your hearing. I understand:  
Everything people say, almost everything people say, about half of what people say, only a few words, none of what people say
8. Please rate your skills in understanding a person when they use simultaneous communication (sign and speech together). I understand:  
Everything people say, almost everything people say, about half of what people say, only a few words, none of what people say
9. What grade do you expect in this course?  
Fill in one: A, B, C, D, F
10. Does your family use a Spoken language other than English in your home?  
Fill in one: Yes, No

Summative Items\*

1. I am satisfied with this instructor's teaching skill.
2. I am satisfied with this instructor's communication skill.
3. I learned a lot from this instructor.
4. I would recommend this instructor to other students.

Formative Items\*

1. I understood the instructor most of the time.
2. My instructor understood me most of the time.
3. My instructor made good use of visual materials (overheads, illustrations, videotapes, etc.).
4. My instructor's speech helped me understand.
5. My instructor used clear mouth movements for speech.
6. My instructor used pauses to help make his/her speech clear.
7. My instructor used facial expression appropriately.
8. When I didn't understand my instructor's speech, he/she said things a different way.
9. My instructor used writing to introduce new words before I tried to lipread them.
10. When I tried to lipread my instructor, I felt comfortable.
11. My instructor's overall sign language skills were good.
12. My instructor explained course content clearly in sign language.
13. My instructor's signing with speech was clear and easy to understand.
14. My instructor's signing without speech was clear and easy to understand.
15. My instructor's fingerspelling was clear and accurate.
16. My instructor knew signs for common "everyday" vocabulary.
17. My instructor clearly separated ideas when signing.
18. My instructor understood my signing.
19. When my instructor didn't understand my signing or fingerspelling, he/she let me know.
20. When my instructor signed in class, I felt comfortable.

\* Response scale:

Strongly Agree = 5

Agree = 4

No Opinion/Does Not Apply = 3

Disagree = 2

Strongly Disagree = 1

## Appendix J: Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT)

### What is the GCOT?

The GCOT is a tool for obtaining feedback regarding communication in group situations (meetings, workshops, classrooms, etc.). It is an optional tool for individual use and is not intended to be used as a formal test, measure, or rating of communication.

The GCOT form is a guide for recording feedback during an observation. This form is divided into eight communication categories with examples listed to help define each category. Examples are not exhaustive, but are representative of the type of behaviors that may be observed for each category. The listed behaviors are intended as a guide and therefore are not presented as a checklist. Comments regarding an observation should be entered in the appropriate space.

### Why was this tool developed?

The five-year review of the implementation of the Communication Task Force (CTF) Report led to a recommendation that more tools and strategies be developed for faculty to use in documenting communication effectiveness, including in group situations. The GCOT, developed by a faculty project team appointed by the Dean in response to a recommendation from the Steering Committee on Communication, adds to the options faculty have for obtaining communication feedback. Other options include the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), the Student/Faculty Communication Survey (SFCS), and the Classroom Sign Language Assessment (CSLA).

### Why use this tool?

By using the GCOT, faculty receive feedback on communication in group situations, including areas of strength and areas that may need improvement. GCOT feedback may be obtained through a self-initiated process or as part of an arranged observation by a Chairperson. Faculty may utilize information gathered through the GCOT in developing communication plans, in writing annual self-appraisals, and in preparing documentation for tenure and promotion purposes.

### What activities would facilitate the observation?

The following are recommended:

With your observer, decide how the observation will be conducted, including where and when it will be and whether it will be a one-time or repeated occurrence. You might want to schedule more than one observation to track changes in your communication effectiveness. In addition, since there are eight GCOT communication categories, you may want to set up multiple observations and focus on a few categories per observation.

With your observer, discuss the process for observation and feedback, including respect for confidentiality.

Meet with the observer after the observation(s) to discuss written comments and other feedback gathered with the GCOT form.

**What is next?** GCOT feedback may indicate that there is room for improvement in one or more of the GCOT communication categories. For help in addressing areas identified for improvement, faculty may use the following resources:

- Faculty Staff Sign Language Education program (FSSLEP) faculty and courses  
<http://www.ntid.rit.edu/aslie/programs/fsslep/overview.asp>
- Spoken Communication Techniques and Strategies (SCTS) program  
<http://www.NTID.RIT.edu/faculty/scts>

## Group Communication Observation Tool (GCOT)

Observed Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Setting: \_ Class      \_ Meeting      # of Participants \_\_\_\_  
 Observer: \_\_\_\_\_ \_ Lab      \_ Presentation  
 Observation Date: \_\_\_\_\_ \_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Categories	Comments
<p><b>I. Organization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shares pre-organizers or agenda before class or meeting.</li> <li>• Makes transparencies and handouts easily readable.</li> <li>• Allows realistic amount of time for agenda or lesson.</li> <li>• Writes helpful information on board as class or meeting progresses: key concepts, agenda items, vocabulary, future dates, etc.</li> <li>• Emphasizes new vs. old material, what is essential information, expectations.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>
<p><b>II. Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of room is appropriate for number of participants.</li> <li>• Lighting is good.</li> <li>• Adjusts lighting as needed (e.g., when viewing projected information).</li> <li>• Arranges furniture for clear visibility.</li> <li>• Places equipment to allow visual access to all.</li> <li>• Has appropriate writing surfaces/writing implements.</li> <li>• Acoustic and visual distractions are minimal.</li> <li>• Makes the best of a bad situation.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>
<p><b>III. Visuals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes projected print and illustrations appropriate in size and clarity.</li> <li>• Uses areas of the board that are visible to all participants.</li> <li>• Indicates on the screen (hand, arrow, pointer) what is being discussed.</li> <li>• Signifies incorrect answers/methods by crossing them out or noting them in some other way.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>
<p><b>IV. Communication Moderation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourages participants to interact.</li> <li>• Encourages turn-taking.</li> <li>• Encourages waiting to be recognized.</li> <li>• Identifies new speakers/signers.</li> <li>• Repeats questions and comments as necessary or asks speaker/signer to repeat them.</li> <li>• Discourages irrelevant or distracting side conversations.</li> <li>• Interrupts when communication breaks down.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>

<p><b>V. Pacing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses pauses to allow participants to think and respond.</li> <li>• Allows sufficient time for participants to view visuals before discussion.</li> <li>• Allows sufficient time to change eye gaze (e.g., between technologies and speaker/instructor).</li> <li>• Waits until facing the group to speak or resume speaking.</li> <li>• Allows sufficient time for completion of activities before discussion.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>
<p><b>VI. Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems to be understood by the participants.</li> <li>• Converses at a level of sophistication appropriate to audience and material.</li> <li>• Carefully introduces new vocabulary.</li> <li>• Gives visual clues when changing topic (e.g., pauses, lists on fingers).</li> <li>• Makes eye contact with participants.</li> <li>• Uses appropriate facial expressions and body language; is animated.</li> <li>• Uses discourse structure effectively (opening, closing, summarizing).</li> <li>• Produces signs and fingerspelling clearly and accurately.</li> <li>• Uses fingerspelling for emphasis.</li> <li>• If SimCom is used, what is said has the same meaning as what is signed.</li> <li>• Uses clear lip movement if using SimCom.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>
<p><b>VII. Interaction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is able to fully and fluently converse with deaf participants.</li> <li>• Understands participants' communication.</li> <li>• Monitors understanding by participants.</li> <li>• Asks for clarification when he/she does not understand a question or comment.</li> <li>• Is willing to repeat or rephrase when a participant expresses confusion about what was communicated.</li> <li>• Appears comfortable communicating with participants.</li> <li>• Participants seem comfortable communicating with instructor/presenter.</li> </ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>

<p><b>VIII. Sensitivity to Cultural Diversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Establishes or mentions communication guidelines.</li><li>• Makes communication accessible to all.</li><li>• Is sensitive to individual communication needs and preferences of those present and is able to adapt to them.</li><li>• Is sensitive to the visual nature of signed communication (e.g., maintains clear sight-lines to participants).</li><li>• Does not write and talk at the same time.</li><li>• Does not talk without signing.</li><li>• Uses appropriate attention getting behaviors.</li></ul> <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>Comments/Suggestions:</p>
--	------------------------------

**Additional Comments/Suggestions:**

Use back if additional space is needed.

## Appendix K

### Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SPCI) Rating Scale<sup>a</sup>

<u>RATINGS</u>	<u>DESCRIPTORS<sup>b</sup></u>
<u>Superior Plus</u>	<b>Able to have a fully shared and natural conversation, with in-depth elaboration for both social and work topics.</b> All aspects of signing are native-like.
<u>Superior</u>	<b>Able to have a fully shared conversation, with in-depth elaboration for both social and work topics.</b> Very broad sign language vocabulary, near native-like production and fluency, excellent use of sign language grammatical features, and excellent comprehension for normal signing rate.
<u>Advanced Plus</u>	Exhibits some superior level skills, but not <u>all</u> and not <u>consistently</u> .
<u>Advanced</u>	<b>Able to have a generally shared conversation with good, spontaneous elaboration for both social and work topics.</b> Broad sign language vocabulary knowledge and clear, accurate production of signs and fingerspelling at a normal/near-normal rate; occasional misproductions do not detract from conversational flow. Good use of many sign language grammatical features and comprehension good for normal signing rate.
<u>Intermediate Plus</u>	Exhibits some advanced level skills, but not <u>all</u> and not <u>consistently</u> .
<u>Intermediate</u>	<b>Able to discuss with some confidence routine social and work topics within a conversational format with some elaboration; generally 3-to-5 sentences.</b> Good knowledge and control of everyday/basic sign language vocabulary with some sign vocabulary errors. Fairly clear signing at a moderate signing rate with some sign misproductions. Fair use of some sign language grammatical features and fairly good comprehension for a moderate-to-normal signing rate; a few repetitions and rephrasing of questions may be needed.
<u>Survival Plus</u>	Exhibits some intermediate level skills, but not <u>all</u> and not <u>consistently</u> .
<u>Survival</u>	<b>Able to discuss basic social and work topics with responses generally 1-to-3 sentences in length.</b> Some knowledge of basic sign language vocabulary with many sign vocabulary and/or sign production errors. Slow-to-moderate signing rate. Basic use of a few sign language grammatical features. Fair comprehension for signing produced at a slow-to-moderate rate with some repetition and rephrasing.
<u>Novice Plus</u>	Exhibits some survival level skills, but not <u>all</u> and not <u>consistently</u> .
<u>Novice</u>	<b>Able to provide single sign and some short phrase/sentence responses to basic questions signed at a slow-to-moderate rate with frequent repetition and rephrasing.</b> Vocabulary primarily related to everyday work and/or social areas such as basic work-related signs, family members, basic objects, colors, numbers, names of weekdays, and time. Production and fluency characterized by many sign production errors and by a slow rate with frequent inappropriate pauses/hesitations.
<u>No Functional Skills</u>	<b>(May be) Able to provide short single sign and "primarily" fingerspelled responses to some basic questions signed at a slow rate with extensive repetition and rephrasing</b>

<sup>a</sup>Adapted from US Foreign Service Institute & ACTFL LPI Rating Scales by William Newell & Frank Caccamise

<sup>b</sup>For all SCPI rating descriptors, **first statement (in bold type) always a statement of ASL communicative functioning**, with all remaining statements (regular type) descriptors of ASL form (vocabulary, production, fluency, grammar, and comprehension).

## Appendix L

### How Does Our Communication Environment Measure Up? Perceptions of NTID Deaf Faculty & Staff — Survey Conducted Spring 2003

Keith Mousley, Lynn Finton, and Ronald R. Kelly  
March 2004

#### FACULTY (n = 35)

Department:

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Sign communication in department meetings is clear and understandable	3.9	0	1	10	17	7
I can easily follow turn taking in department meetings	3.7	0	4	8	17	6
There is enough time given for discussion during department meetings for me to understand and participate.	3.6	0	5	7	19	4
I am included in informal discussions outside of meetings on issues and topics important to the department	3.4	1	6	12	11	5
People seek me out for my perspective on issues and topics important to the department.	3.3	3	4	14	9	5
Signing occurs in all public areas within my department area.	3.5	0	8	9	12	6
I have to remind people to sign in my presence.	2.2	10	10	12	3	0
It is my sense that hearing people feel burdened by having to sign in front of me	2.9	5	10	7	11	2
I feel uncomfortable reminding people to sign in my presence.	2.9	8	7	7	5	7
It is my sense that department colleagues are sensitive to my need for communication access.	3.8	0	1	10	18	6

#### Center :

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Sign communication in Center meetings is clear and understandable	3.4	0	4	17	8	4
I have to remind people to sign in my presence.	2.4	7	10	12	3	1
It is my sense that hearing people feel burdened by having to sign in front of me.	3.0	6	4	11	8	4
I feel uncomfortable reminding people to sign in my presence.	3.0	6	6	8	6	6
It is my sense that Center colleagues are sensitive to my need for communication access.	3.5	0	2	14	15	2

**NTID :**

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Sign communication in College-wide meetings is clear and understandable.	3.3	1	4	13	14	1
Generally, I feel the signing of <b>faculty members</b> throughout NTID is clear and understandable to me.	3.4	0	1	21	11	2
Generally, I feel the signing of <b>staff members</b> throughout NTID is clear and understandable to me.	3.0	0	2	19	6	1
Signing occurs in all public areas.	2.8	1	12	14	8	0
When I serve on NTID committees, sign communication is clear and understandable	3.5	0	2	14	15	2
Interpreting support is available when I am interacting with non-signing RIT personnel on committees, meetings etc.	3.4	2	6	8	12	5
I hesitate to participate in NTID committee work because I feel there <i>will</i> be communication difficulties	2.6	10	7	8	5	4
When I attend professional development sessions, sign communication is clear and understandable among the participants and presenters.	3.5	0	2	13	17	1
I have to remind people to sign in my presence.	2.5	8	10	11	4	2
I feel uncomfortable reminding people to sign in my presence.	2.7	9	7	9	5	5
It is my sense that hearing people feel burdened by having to sign in front of me.	2.8	4	10	12	7	2
The NTID sign communication environment supports my ability to fulfill my work responsibilities and achieve tenure and promotion.	3.8	0	2	10	14	8

**RIT :**

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
When I serve on RIT committees, sign communication is clear and understandable.	3.0	2	7	8	9	1
Interpreting support is available when I am interacting with non-signing RIT personnel on committees, meetings etc.	3.3	2	3	12	8	3

**STAFF (n = 21):****Department:**

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Sign communication in department meetings is clear and understandable	3.5	0	2	8	8	2
I can easily follow turn taking in department meetings	3.7	0	3	5	9	4
There is enough time given for discussion during department meetings for me to understand and participate.	3.9	0	1	5	11	4
I am included in informal discussions outside of meetings on issues and topics important to the department	3.4	0	5	5	9	2
People seek me out for my perspective on issues and topics important to the department.	3.4	1	3	7	7	3
Signing occurs in all public areas within my department area.	3.4	1	3	6	9	2
I have to remind people to sign in my presence.	2.2	4	9	7	1	0
It is my sense that hearing people feel burdened by having to sign in front of me	2.9	1	6	10	2	2
I feel uncomfortable reminding people to sign in my presence.	3.0	3	6	5	3	4
It is my sense that department colleagues are sensitive to my need for communication access.	3.5	1	2	8	6	4

**Center :**

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Sign communication in Center meetings is clear and understandable	3.7	0	2	4	14	1
I have to remind people to sign in my presence.	2.3	2	11	7	1	0
It is my sense that hearing people feel burdened by having to sign in front of me.	2.7	2	7	8	4	0
I feel uncomfortable reminding people to sign in my presence.	3.0	3	6	5	3	4
It is my sense that Center colleagues are sensitive to my need for communication access.	3.5	0	2	9	8	2

**NTID :**

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Sign communication in College-wide meetings is clear and understandable.	3.7	0	1	5	13	1
Generally, I feel the signing of <b>faculty members</b> throughout NTID is clear and understandable to me.	3.5	0	1	9	10	1
Generally, I feel the signing of <b>staff members</b> throughout NTID is clear and understandable to me.	3.5	0	0	12	8	1
Signing occurs in all public areas.	3.5	1	1	7	10	2
When I serve on NTID committees, sign communication is clear and understandable	3.7	0	2	3	9	2
Interpreting support is available when I am interacting with non-signing RIT personnel on committees, meetings etc.	3.7	0	1	7	10	2
I hesitate to participate in NTID committee work because I feel there <i>will</i> be communication difficulties	2.7	3	3	7	2	1
When I attend professional development sessions, sign communication is clear and understandable among the participants and presenters.	3.6	0	1	7	9	1
I have to remind people to sign in my presence.	2.5	2	8	9	1	0
I feel uncomfortable reminding people to sign in my presence.	3.0	2	6	6	3	3
It is my sense that hearing people feel burdened by having to sign in front of me.	2.7	1	5	11	2	0
The NTID sign communication environment supports my ability successfully carry out my work responsibilities.	3.9	0	1	4	12	3

**RIT :**

Statements	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
When I serve on RIT committees, sign communication is clear and understandable.	2.5	4	4	3	4	0
Interpreting support is available when I am interacting with non-signing RIT personnel on committees, meetings etc.	3.4	0	3	6	8	1