

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** August 13, 2009  
**TO:** Members of the Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Ida Cook  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** **STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING on August 13, 2009**

---

Meeting Date: Thursday, August 13, 2009  
Meeting Time: 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. (*please note the non-standard time*)  
Meeting Location: College of Arts and Humanities, Room 192A (*new location*)

### A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Minutes of April 30, 2009 and June 4, 2009**
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
  - Provost's update
5. **Old Business**
  - Standing and Reporting Committee assignments
  - Budget response update
  - Student Perception of Instruction
  - Call for topics for standing committee action
6. **New Business**
  - H1N1 (Swine Flu) Virus response
7. **Other**

*Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting*  
**April 30, 2009**

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of April 9, 2009 were approved as recorded by unanimous vote.

**Steering Officers Present:** Drs. Cook, Wink, Chopra, and Kassab.

**Steering Committee Members Present:** Drs. Belfield, Chase, Covelli, Daniell, Gause, Goodman, Koons, LiKamWa, Lynxwiler, Moslehy, Oetjen, Pennington, Rahrooh, Schulte, Seidel, and Sivo.

**Administrators Present:** Drs. Hickey and D. Chase.

**Steering Committee Members Not Present:** Drs. Brown, Cash, Edwards, Kaufman, and Kovach.

**Recognition of Guests:** Drs. Dulniak and Vittes.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Provost's Update

Provost Hickey welcomed the new members of the Steering Committee. The state budget has been resolved between House and Senate and must now be voted on. The provost encourages faculty to thank our legislators for coming to the aid of higher education. The proposed \$57 million cut (26% of the budget) was reduced to a cut of \$35 million in recurring funds (14% of budget) for this coming year. As of July, UCF will have lost 30% of our general revenue budget. We will receive \$18 million a year for 2 years (2009-10 and 2010-11) from federal stimulus money which will help with the transition that will be necessary. With a budget cut of \$35 million, the university will still have to make program cuts. Eventually, differential tuition will help build back up the revenue, but for 2009-10 the anticipated revenue from differential tuition is \$6 million. That revenue will grow every year and in a few years will be approximately \$25 million.

This year, the budget is likely to contain an 8% base tuition increase and a 7% differential tuition increase. Base tuition is built into the long-term expenditures of the university, while differential tuition is restricted in use. For differential tuition, 30% is mandated to be used for student financial aid and the remaining funds must be spent on undergraduate education on items directly related to student success, such as advisors. There will be no university faculty and staff pay cuts; however, this increased the overall budget cut to UCF.

Additional cuts are anticipated in 2010-11. Differential tuition is expected to provide \$10 million in 2010-11 and \$15 million in 2011-12. Some differential tuition will be distributed to the units. In order to have a balanced budget once the stimulus money runs out, program eliminations will be necessary, although not as many as previously expected. The university will attempt to accommodate students as much as possible and will try to mitigate the impact on graduation. The goal is to ensure that all full-time students in their junior and senior years are

able to graduate with their current majors. The next step is to decide which programs to eliminate. The criteria for that determination were outlined in the most recent Provost's Update email, and include centrality to the university and productivity. These decisions will have to be carried out in a logical, business-like manner, based on current program performance. UCF does not have the luxury to protect programs that might one day succeed. Regarding the timetable, decisions will have to be made relatively quickly in order to give notifications of layoffs in July. Notification of layoffs must take place before August 8<sup>th</sup>, which is the date the new contract is issued. Faculty who have been with UCF for three or more years must be given two full semesters of notice; those employed for less than 3 years must have one semester's notice. Although it will need to be handled quickly, the process will be as consultative as possible.

Question: Will the process will be transparent and shared with the senate? Answer: Yes. Senate and faculty focus groups will be held to discuss the process for determining the proposed cuts and for members of the faculty to provide their opinions and feedback. The first meeting will be Wednesday May, 6<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 a.m. in the Fairwinds Alumni Center. A phase-out plan will be implemented for each program being eliminated. The eliminations must be accomplished by the time that the stimulus money runs out. All units are to be reviewed, including centers and institutes, academic units and administrative units.

#### Introduction of Members

All members of the Steering Committee introduced themselves. Drs. Cook and Wink noted that they welcome input to bring to the upcoming budget meetings.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### Committee on Committees

Dr. Wink provided a brief overview of the role of the Committee on Committees (ConC). Over the summer, the ConC will work on populating the Senate standing and reporting committees. Dr. Wink will be contacting the ConC members to set up a meeting. The ConC faces the challenge of finding good members for the various committees, and Dr. Wink encourages the ConC members to find a means by which they will be able to send notices to all of the faculty in their colleges. Dr. Cook provided an overview of the Senate standing committees.

##### Constitutional revisions

Various issues have arisen that may require revisions to the Faculty Senate constitution. Dr. Cook proposed setting up an ad hoc committee of the steering committee to work on constitutional revisions. In order to be able to complete the work within the upcoming academic year, the committee will need to begin in the summer.

##### Standing Committee Liaisons

There is a liaison from Steering to each of the standing committees. The liaisons are non-voting members who report back to the Steering committee and assist and guide those committees as

they do their work. Those Steering members interested in serving as a liaison should email Dr. Wink or Dr. Cook.

#### Ad Hoc Constitutional Revision Committee

Dr. Cook called for a motion to establish an ad hoc constitutional revision committee. Motion made to establish an ad hoc committee with the codicil that it be constituted in July once the impact of the budget cuts is known. Motion seconded. Discussion followed. Motion carried unanimously. Dr. Cook made a call for volunteers. The members of the ad hoc Constitutional Revision Committee will be: Bob Pennington, Rich Gause, Stephen Goodman, and Reid Oetjen. The committee will be looking for more members.

#### Issues for the 2009-2010 Standing Committees

Dr. Cook opened the floor for suggestions of items that might be addressed by the 2009-2010 standing committees. The following items were suggested:

- The potential affects of the Bologna Accord in Europe, particularly with regard to degree equivalencies.
- Technology/online course management.
- Student perception of instruction.
- Promotion and Tenure guidelines: consistency between colleges; clarity of college-specific rules.
- Transparency of budget cuts and the overall philosophy guiding the budget priorities.

Further suggestions are welcome and should be emailed to Dr. Cook.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

The Advisory Council of Faculty Senates will be meeting next week in Tallahassee, and Dr. Cook will be attending. By that time, the state budget will have been finalized. Dr. Cook will report back on how other universities are dealing with the current situation.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

*Faculty Senate Steering Committee*  
Special Called Meeting  
Minutes  
**June 4, 2009**

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

**Steering Officers Present:** Cook, Chopra, and Kassab.

**Steering Committee Members Present:** Brown, Cash, A. Chase, Daniell, Edwards, Goodman, Kaufman, Koons, LiKamWa, Lynxwiler, Oetjen, Pennington, Schulte, Seidel, and Sivo.

**Administrators Present:** President Hitt, Provost Hickey, D. Chase, Huff-Corzine, Morrison-Shetlar.

**Steering Committee Members Not Present:** Belfield, Covelli, Gause, Kovach, Moslehy, Rahrooh, and Wink.

**Recognition of Guests:** Bill Merck and Judy Monroe (Administration and Finance); Heidi Watt and Lucretia Cooney (Faculty Affairs); John Schell (Office of the President).

Dr. Cook opened the meeting and turned it over to Drs. Hitt and Hickey to talk about changes occurring in the UCF budget. Dr. Hitt provided an overview of the budget cuts that have occurred in the last two years, which total \$77 million, a 27% cut of the recurring revenue. For the coming two years, UCF has received a federal stimulus package of \$18 million per year. Those two years will serve as a glide path to allow expenditures to match the new revenue level. It will not be possible to continue to make across-the-board cuts, and it is now necessary to make targeted cuts. Five programs have been identified for the targeted cuts. They are:

- Cardiopulmonary Sciences (College of Health and Public Affairs)
- Engineering Technology (College of Engineering and Computer Science)
- Management Information Systems (College of Business Administration)
- Radiologic Sciences (College of Health and Public Affairs)
- Statistics and Actuarial Sciences (College of Sciences)

Eliminating these programs will affect 45 faculty members, six staff members, and the 1092 students who major in programs offered by those departments. The cuts will save \$6.1 million. Program closures will happen over the next two years, providing a two-year teach-out path for students in those programs. Undergraduate within 36 credit hours of completing their majors should be able to do so in the time allotted. Masters students should also be able to complete their degrees. All faculty and staff will have two semester termination notice, and some will remain employed for the full two years.

Additional budget cuts will also be made on the administrative side. Although entire units will not be closed, a percentage of the administrative budgets will be removed. That percentage will be the same as the percentage of cuts to the academic budgets due to program closures. The cuts to the administrative budget will total \$3.7 million.

Dr. Hickey provided an overview of the budget projects for the next two years. (A summary spreadsheet was distributed.) In 2009-2010 there is still a gap of \$7.2 million that must be filled in order to keep the budget at its current level. This will necessitate using reserve funds. There is a similar gap for 2010-2011. At the end of 2010-2011, when the federal stimulus money expires, there will be a gap of \$12 million. That figure takes into account the \$6.1 million in cuts the president discussed today. That gap could widen dramatically if the legislature institutes additional cuts.

Questions were invited from the floor.

Question: What other options is the university considering in addition to or instead of the program cuts? Will there be a dialogue with faculty? President Hitt responded that the administration is willing to listen to ideas, but without program cuts, to cut millions of dollars would cripple ongoing operations. The provost noted that he has received suggestions in response to the Provost's Update emails and has considered all of them, but they would not garner significant monetary savings.

Question: Will specific details of the administrative cuts be provided? There is such a specific plan for the cuts to the academic units, and it seems that a similar one should be in place for the administrative cuts. The president replied that the administrative units will be giving up the \$3.7 million, but the form of those cuts is not going to be prescribed. Specification of strategic cuts were necessary for the academic cuts due to contractual notification requirements, but are not necessary in the same way for the administrative units. The specifics of the cuts will be a matter of public record and can be made available.

Question: Regarding the steps for the approval of the program eliminations, what happens if during the process committees and/or colleges recommend against the eliminations? The provost replied that those recommendations are duly noted. Follow-up question: What was the process that got us to where we are right now? The provost began discussions with deans months ago about the possibility of program cuts. Institutional research compiled data from the program evaluations. The provost, president, and vice presidents went through the list of all the programs and evaluated them on the five measures of centrality, quality, demand, comparative advantage, and cost.

Since the Steering immediately preceded the Senate meeting in the same room, several senators arrived during the Steering portion. At 3:22, Dr. Cook announced that it was time to segue into the full Senate meeting.

2011-12 Estimated Budget Deficit by College (after program reductions)

7/31/2009

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
College	2009-10 Budget Reduction	Non-recurring Stimulus Funds	+ Non-recurring Reserves*	+ Recurring Differential Tuition	= 2009-10 Funds Allocated	2009-10 Recurring Red. (B+E)	- Est. 2009-10 30% Reg. Cam. Participation	= Estimated 2011 & 2012 Diff. Tuition	= Estimated 2012 Deficit (G-H)	Estimated 2012 Prog. Reductions	Total Estimated 2012 Deficit
BHC	(\$173,053)	\$107,152	\$65,901	\$0	\$173,053	(\$173,053)	\$0		(\$173,053)		(\$173,053)
BSBS	(\$523,439)	\$0	\$0	\$523,439	\$523,439	\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0
CAH	(\$2,663,942)	\$1,644,320	\$1,011,283	\$8,339	\$2,663,942	(\$2,655,603)	\$22,732		(\$2,632,871)		(\$2,632,871)
CBA	(\$2,432,812)	\$1,494,955	\$919,421	\$18,436	\$2,432,812	(\$2,414,376)	\$14,232		(\$2,400,144)	\$1,693,144	(\$707,000)
CEC	(\$2,564,005)	\$1,557,771	\$958,055	\$48,179	\$2,564,005	(\$2,515,826)	\$22,784		(\$2,493,042)	\$1,322,531	(\$1,170,511)
CED	(\$1,539,468)	\$854,421	\$525,482	\$159,565	\$1,539,468	(\$1,379,903)	\$21,827		(\$1,358,076)		(\$1,358,076)
CHM	(\$702,888)	\$305,439	\$187,850	\$209,599	\$702,888	(\$493,289)	\$145		(\$493,144)		(\$493,144)
CHP	(\$1,593,980)	\$758,345	\$466,394	\$369,241	\$1,593,980	(\$1,224,739)	\$9,472		(\$1,215,267)	\$827,324	(\$387,943)
CON	(\$470,652)	\$300,908	\$185,063	(\$15,319)	\$470,652	(\$485,971)	\$19,697		(\$466,274)		(\$466,274)
COP	(\$93,526)	\$54,968	\$33,806	\$4,752	\$93,526	(\$88,774)	\$0		(\$88,774)		(\$88,774)
COS	(\$3,345,831)	\$1,914,394	\$1,177,383	\$254,054	\$3,345,831	(\$3,091,777)	\$116,825		(\$2,974,952)	\$398,376	(\$2,576,576)
REG	(\$2,751,908)	\$1,233,955	\$758,903	\$759,050	\$2,751,908	(\$1,992,858)	(\$227,714)		(\$2,220,572)	\$403,625	(\$1,816,947)
TBA								\$11,135,252	\$11,135,252		\$11,135,252
Total	(\$18,855,504)	\$10,226,628	\$6,289,541	\$2,339,335	\$18,855,504	(\$16,516,169)	\$0	\$11,135,252	(\$5,380,917)	\$4,645,000	(\$735,917)

\* Non-recurring general revenue, graduate education support, and university carry-forward funds.

## Feedback on Proposed SPoI Content

*Feedback received summer 2009; numbered for discussion purposes.*

1) I find the above referenced form(s) to be 'entirely' unacceptable. The subjects addressed in the evaluation statements are not 'partially' or 'mostly' true or false. Respectively, they are either true or false.

In my judgment, the current assessment document, though faulty and with several shortcomings, is preferable to the jibberish being offered in the revised forms.

\*\*

2) I just reviewed the questions for the Student Perception of Online Instruction on the faculty senate website. I am pleased with the types of questions posed and I think that they cover a variety of issues that will help our instruction.

However, I would like to suggest one additional question: "I was encouraged to interact with my peers during this course." (with accompanying Likert answers). One strength of online teaching is student-to-student interaction, even if it only occurs on discussion boards. If we are to embrace Web 2.0 and 3.0, then we must embrace the idea that social interaction (networking) is a critical component of any learning event. A question of this type may prompt our faculty to include interaction "events" in courses, rather than envisioning students as isolated and simply checking off content.

Please consider my suggestion. I will be happy to discuss this with anyone, for further information.

\*\*

3) I read with some surprise that starting fall 09 student evaluations for face to face classes will be conducted online. I emphatically disagree with this decision. Unless I force my larger classes (>200 students) to attend by offering quizzes etc., on average 25-50% of the class is absent at any time. A significant number of these students NEVER come to class except to take tests. What I fail to understand is why a student who has by their own choice skipped class for most of the semester and does not come to see me in office hours should be allowed to evaluate my teaching. If anything this approach will dilute the comments of those who have experienced my teaching first hand and are qualified to make an accurate assessment. The decision to conduct evaluations online is a perfect example of using technology to collect and compile data in a way that defeats the very purpose of collecting that information in the first place.

\*\*



4) Feedback on student form:

This is an improvement over the (nearly useless) pink forms. However, the form is very soft on faculty; there are very few ratings of actual classroom or out-of-class lecture/interaction quality. Mostly the questions are good, but not all are well answered.

Faculty:

Add:

I had adequate resources for teaching this class this semester (Number of TAs, computer hardware, software, support, administrative).

- a. agree      b. mildly agree      c. mildly disagree      d. disagree

I am happy about being assigned to this course this semester.

- a. agree      b. mildly agree      c. mildly disagree      d. disagree

Student F2F:

I would edit:

7. The instructor provided a syllabus.

- a. Yes      b. No

→ 7. The syllabus was

- a. excellent      b. good      c. fair      d. poor      e. missing; none was ever distributed

9. The instructor provided a course schedule.

- a. Yes      b. No

→ 9. The course schedule...

- a. was detailed      b. was general      c. was not handed out

Also, I would add:

1. Regarding prerequisites:

- a. I had the prerequisites for the class.  
b. I had most of the prerequisites and permission of the instructor  
c. I had few of the prerequisites, but had permission of the instructor  
d. I had few or none of the prerequisites and did not have permission of the instructor

2. The prerequisites prepared me for the course:

- a. very well      b. adequately      c. minimally      d. not much

3. The course should have required  
(comment box)

4. The course need not have required  
(comment box)

5. I felt prepared for the course when I started  
a. very well      b. adequately      c. minimally      d. not much

6. The required course materials were  
a. excellent      b. good      c. fair      d. poor

7. I feel the course prepared me for the next step in my degree or career  
a. very well      b. adequately      c. minimally      d. not much

8. The course schedule was followed closely  
a. agree      b. tend to agree      c. mildly disagree      d. disagree

9. I was able to understand the instructor's speech  
a. very well      b. adequately      c. minimally      d. not much

10. The instructor treated students with respect  
a. agree      b. tend to agree      c. mildly disagree      d. disagree

11. The quality of lecture was high  
a. agree      b. tend to agree      c. mildly disagree      d. disagree

12. The quality of section instruction was high  
a. agree      b. tend to agree      c. mildly disagree      d. disagree

13. I speak English  
a. Natively with little accent  
b. Natively but accented  
c. non-natively but well  
d. non-natively but adequately  
e. non-natively and not well

14. I enjoy the topic  
a. more than before the course.  
b. the same as before, which is a lot  
c. the same as before, which is not much  
d. I do not enjoy the topic

\*\*

5) I just reviewed the proposed feedback forms for th face to face classes and teh faculty response form. They are GREAT! I especially appreciate the faculty form. This will help me organize my thoughts per class instead of reading all the feedback, trying to get past the negative ones ("I hate morning classes") and see through to the patterns that illuminate where I can make improvements. I also appreciate the question asking students how often they missed class. That way we can tell if someone was there for only half the classes their response should be weighted accordingly.

\*\*

6) This committee has worked hard to change the forms and these are much better than what we are using right now. I think the online version will make shorter and look better with radio buttons to click on etc.

Good job!

\*\*

7) Kudos to all committee members who generously gave of their valuable time and expertise.

I reviewed the new "Spol" online questionnaire for all class configurations. I am pleased that these evaluations will be divided in sections and scored separately. Section III on "Instructor" should stand alone and be the only ratings used for our faculty annual departmental assessments.

In section III, question #10 regarding class materials, may be a problem for some departments. In the Speech Department, the faculty does not have an individual choice of which textbook is used. Therefore, when students assign a score to the textbook question, the rating may be unfairly counted against instructor and thus lower overall evaluation score.

Just a thought Overall, well designed evaluations.

\*\*

8) I think these are major improvements and I realize there was a lot of work involved.

I suggest one missing element pertains to computer-lab courses where learning is contingent on the availability, reliability, and access to the computers and properly performing software.

I have taught these types of courses for years. The students, and instructor, get very frustrated when the software/hardware does not work properly and nobody is available to fix the problem(s). Consequently, students tend to blame the instructor when in fact the lab operation/performance is beyond his/her control.

I teach grad courses at night. We do not have a computer support person on duty at night despite numerous catastrophic failures over the years that have stopped midterms and final examinations.

The same applies to study abroad evaluations. In the study abroad environment, there are factors related to travel, accommodations, the failure of the host institution to deliver the promised curriculum, and a host of other conditions beyond the instructor's control. Regardless, the instructor gets the credit or blame.

I think both of these special circumstances need to be addressed.

\*\*

9) First, I want to applaud the individuals who obviously worked hard to create the new SPoI forms. That was a huge task and I am sure it took many hours to create these new forms. Thank you for your hard work and dedication.

The only comment I have about the new SPoI forms is regarding the SPoI form for W courses. I believe that item #12 ("The instructor was available to assist me at prearranged times outside of class either online or in person") could be clarified more effectively for W courses. The notion of time and place is so grounded in F2F courses, however the idea of a "prearranged time outside of class" isn't very applicable in virtual students' experiences. In my experience teaching W courses, most students \*only\* used the Course Mail option for correspondence. Although I provided other options for communication (F2F office hours, chat room meetings, etc.), most students didn't take advantage of the additional options. In fact, most of my students didn't have a need to come to my office because they knew that they would receive an answer to an e-mailed question within hours of it being sent. Perhaps that item could be revised to something along the lines of...

"During the semester, the instructor was available to assist me either online or in person."

Other ideas???

\*\*

10) In general I think the form is too long and may be overkill if the goal is to inform program evaluation issues. I assume that the forms would be beta-tested with a group of students filling out a realistic number of forms for the average course load before implementation - "form fatigue" seems likely if there are several courses for a student to evaluate.

I prefer a model in which a minimal question set is used to screen major issues. For example rather than 5 questions about the web-course element, one could apply a single Likert question about satisfaction of web resources and an open field for particular comments. In the rare cases where a score is poor, this can trigger the program evaluation committee to make a more in-depth review.

I suspect that many items are not truly independent (and therefore are redundant). If a student is generally satisfied with an instructor then 15 questions are not needed to find this out! If an instructor wants specific student advice on what to improve, this can be elicited informally or by an open-ended question.

Some of the items included seem to be available with basic data mining, rather than burdening students with too many items (which may then be answered non-selectively anyway). For example, the enrolment characteristics, how often people use web resources etc.

What are the "major domains?" For me: something about enrolment, course organization, course (web) resources, faculty performance, assessment, workload motivation to continue in the field. Likert scores are flags for program evaluators; open field answers are great for faculty that have the motivation to read and act upon them.

\*\*