

NTID Faculty Congress NFC Meeting Minutes
December 4, 2018
12 – 1:30 pm, SDC-2102

Chair: Jessica Trussell
Vice-Chair: Mark Rosica
Communications Officer: Austin Gehret

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

Absent:

Notetaker: Austin Gehret

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announcements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announcements: Mark Rosica reminded people that registration for the shared governance summit (12/11) is nearly full. If people are really interested in participating, contact him. Mark then gave a brief review of the purpose of the summit to the committee. 	
<p>2. Review previous meeting Minutes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Minutes from 11/27/18 meeting: Vote on 11/27/18 Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marcus – motion to accept Sandra – second Approved – unanimous; Abstention – 2 (Catherine, Jennifer) 	
<p>3. Review of spring meeting schedule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair’s review of spring semester schedule for NFC Jessica projected the spring semester schedule of meetings for NFC and reiterated to members that most meetings would be held in 2102. 	
<p>4. NFC discussion on executive committee meeting with administration (11/29/18)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion points: Executive committee meeting with administration went well. The focus of the meeting was discussing topics that NFC had summarized from the last NFC meeting (topics gleaned to lack resolution at NTID based on 10/30 and 11/6 presentations). Administration reiterated that the language for communication in the current promotion policies was also intended to be temporary. They (administration) are motivated to make changes to the existing policy. The administration and executive committee came to an agreement that a task force (TF) should be established with undertaking this. NFC should be involved in drafting a proposal of the charge that will go to this TF. The administration wants input from faculty to develop clear, effective communication in the classroom, in 1:1 settings, etc. and clearer terminology/definition of what is the required for promotion/tenure. The current written policy will remain in effect until the work of the TF is completed and the administration calls for a vote on any new policy. We were told that the original communication task force (1991) required three votes to pass the current language so this 	

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
-------------	---------------------	--------------

	<p>may be an extended process. Administration recognizes this will be tough work and will indubitably involve the development of a portfolio of communication skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The administration made a recommendation for hiring back an NTID retiree to chair the TF. This recommendation was made in part given the individual’s knowledge and experience with the original communication task force committee. One NFC member raised the point that bringing back a retiree to play an integral part in this process may not be forward thinking. Should we instead identify a person (or persons) currently at NTID that would be good for chairing the TF. Given that a retiree has more time, could a co-advisory role would be best to mitigate bias with the old communication policy? ● Other suggestions for TF membership were posed. One suggestion was that the TF should have some representation from NTID research centers given the new environments that now exist in the classroom. Representation from ASLIE on the TF should also be priority. Ultimately, TF composition will include names recommended from both NFC and administration and should holistically represent the institute’s current needs, experience and perspectives as well as students’ expectation. ● In developing the TF charge, language should be Included that encompasses effective communication in the various teaching environments that currently exist at NTID. The TF will really need to focus on the language that needs to be in the Tenure/Promotion policy, work back from that to help define “effective communication.” Charge will be developed first before any individuals are suggested for the TF. Katie Schmitz should provide the original 1991 Communications TF report to the executive committee, this report could help initiate charge development. ● Administration was also supportive of the idea of a communication portfolio with some assessments required (i.e., student evaluation, peer evaluation, SLPI, classroom observation). They also emphasized the desire for faculty who satisfy communication skills still be expected to maintain a communication development plan; ongoing communication development is critical for ALL faculty at NTID. An NFC member reminded the committee that precedent for this practice is already in place for scholarship (i.e., scholarship workload guidelines specify the need to maintain publication/presentation/products irrespective of rank.) ● Miscellaneous points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some recommended names from NFC to serve on TF: Edward Mineck (self-nominated), ASLIE rep, Research Center rep, Denise Kavin/Rick Postl, Peter Hauser 	<p>Mark – Will reach out to Katie Schmitz to get the original 1991 Communications TF report (she agreed to share this with Executive committee at 11/29/18 meeting).</p> <p>Mark and Jennifer – Will be work on constructing</p>
--	---	--

Agenda Item	Discussion / Status	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A few committee members will convene to work on a rough draft of the charge for the TF (i.e., goals of charge: what does “Advanced” mean for effective communication in the various teaching environments, benchmarking with bilingual institutions) ● If NTID is willing to pay for someone (i.e., retiree), preference should be made to pay for a researcher for the validity and other research perspectives of putting together a communication portfolio. (Ron Kelly and Joe Bochner were suggested as possibilities) ● The CEOCA report could also be used to help develop the charge, the LCBQ results could provide us with a better picture of our students’ needs ● Addendum from NFC Executive Committee meeting (12/7/18): Executive committee briefly discussed the need to promote faculty to take Peter Hauser’s new assessments (for data collection purposes only). Since administration made this request at a recent chair’s meeting, executive committee feels that NFC reps should confirm with their chairs that this happened and if there is a plan for chairs to share this request at a future department meeting. 	<p>a rough draft of the charge this week or next.</p>
4. Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tuesday Jan 15, 12-1:30pm, Room-55-2102: 	