

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 10, 2011
TO: All Faculty Senate Members
FROM: Ida Cook
Chair, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting on February 17, 2011

Meeting Date: Thursday, February 17, 2011
Meeting Time: 4:00-6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Student Union Key West, Room 218

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes of *January 20, 2011***
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
 - Provost's Update
5. **Old Business**

None.
6. **New Business**
 - Resolution 2010-2011-3 Approval of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form (*from Steering*)
 - Resolution 2010-2011-4 Evaluation of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form (*from Steering*)
7. **Standing Committee Updates**
 - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Carla Poindexter*
 - Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
 - Personnel Committee – *Kevin Haran*
 - UPCC – *Jill Fjelstul*
8. **Adjournment**

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
January 20, 2011

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the Faculty Senate to order at 4:07 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. Dr. Cook reminded the senators to sign the roll and check the Faculty Senate website to insure that their attendance record is correct.

A motion to approve the minutes of November 18, 2010 was made and seconded. Motion carried. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Tom Cavanagh, Assistant Vice President, Center for Distributed Learning
Diane Chase, Executive Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Joel Hartman, Vice Provost, Information Technology and Resources
Andrew Holloway, IT Infrastructure Manager, Computer Services and Telecommunications
Heath Martin, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Bob Yankello, Chief Technology Officer, Computer Services and Telecommunications

PROVOST'S UPDATE

Provost Waldrop was unable to attend the meeting. Dr. D. Chase, made the following remarks on his behalf:

Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education

The Carnegie Institute has ranked UCF in the highest research classification. UCF is one of 108 schools nationwide to receive this ranking, and it places us in the same category as University of Florida, Florida State University, University of South Florida, and University of Miami.

Faculty Pay Increases

Faculty pay increases will appear in the January 28th paycheck and will reflect the 3% rate increase. Human Resources is in the process of recalculating the retroactive pay, which should be done by April.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

W2 Forms

Dr. Cook offered a reminder that the W2 Forms are now available for download from MyUCF.

Academic Integrity

Dr. Cook called attention to an email that was sent regarding academic integrity, with the subject line "UCF Offers Help to Promote Academic Integrity, Address Misconduct." The email provides an overview of on-campus resources for promoting academic. Dr. Cook is serving on a university committee to improve and sustain academic integrity at UCF and welcomes any ideas and suggestion on the topic.

Faculty Senate Elections

Dr. Cook announced that the call for elections to the Faculty Senate went to the college deans today, including the list of senators in their unit who are eligible for election and the number of vacancies to be filled. Senators' terms are listed on the sign-in roster, and senators can check to see if they are in the first or second year of their terms. Members were reminded that we are now operating under the rules in the recently revised *Constitution*.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution 2010-2011-2 Revision of Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs (from Personnel Committee)

Kevin Haran introduced the resolution and noted it had been approved unanimously by both the Personnel and Steering committees. He read the resolution aloud. Discussion followed

A friendly amendment was made to remove the phrase "that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recommends" from the "Be it Resolved" clause. Amendment seconded and accepted.

It was suggested that the resolution was weak because it discussed keeping up with peer institutions but did not speak to the intrinsic value of non-discrimination. A friendly amendment was made to add the following as the first clause of the resolution: "Whereas, the Faculty Senate has long supported a broad interpretation of non-discriminatory practices, and". Amendment seconded. A suggestion was made to add an additional "Whereas" clause, which would be the first in the resolution: "Whereas the Faculty Senate considers non-discrimination and affirmative action to be of important value, and". Change accepted by motioner and seconder. In the discussion that followed, it was noted that the use of the word "long" might be misleading, as the Faculty Senate did not always take such a position. It was suggested that the word "previously" be used instead of "long". Amenders and seconders accepted the change. The friendly amendment was seconded and carried.

The motion to approve the resolution carried. The approved resolution read:

Resolution 2010-2011-2 Revision of Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs

[Whereas, the Faculty Senate considers non-discrimination and affirmative action to be of important value, and](#)

[Whereas, the Faculty Senate has previously supported a broad interpretation of non-discriminatory practices, and](#)

Whereas, the UCF Board of Trustees has recently approved a revision to extend the non-discrimination policy to include gender identity and gender expression as categories that are protected from discrimination, and

Whereas, peer and aspirational peer institutions have expanded their non-discrimination policies and regulations to include these two categories of individuals,

Be It Resolved, ~~that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recommends~~ that the UCF Faculty Senate endorse these revisions to **Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs**, as approved by the UCF Board of Trustees.

Migration to Exchange Email Platform – Joel Hartman

Dr. Joel Hartman presented information about the migration of the university's email system from Novell Groupwise to Microsoft Exchange. There are two parts to the migration: (1) migration to Microsoft Exchange for the university's email servers, and (2) adoption of Microsoft Outlook as the software users utilize to access email. The mass campus migration to Microsoft Exchange will occur between 5:00 p.m. on Friday, February 18 and 8:00 a.m. on Monday, February 21. The migration will occur automatically; however, faculty will be asked to perform several tasks in advance of this migration so that there are no surprises. Dr. Hartman asked everyone to look for emails labeled Exchange and/or Outlook for more information about these changes. Emails, calendars, etc. will migrate intact.

Dr. Hartman showed the Faculty Senate what the Microsoft Outlook interface looks like and indicated that interface provides a comprehensive view of all functions at the same time. Dr. Hartman stated that when users are off-campus, it is preferable that they utilize the web-based interface, which is similar to the regular product. For more information about the transition to the new email platform, university employees can visit <http://ucf2exchange.ucf.edu/>. In addition the site lists several training opportunities, including free sessions that are available on January 21st and February 4th.

Dr. Hartman opened up his presentation to questions from the Faculty Senate:

Q: Will there be a charge for mobile devices?

A: Using the web interface on mobile devices is free. There is a \$2.50 per device charge to sync to cellular phones and other handheld devices that faculty must pay to cover the software licensing costs that UCF pays. The charge will go to the department. It is up to the college/department if the faculty member is required to reimburse the department.

Q: Can users choose IMAP/POP rather than pay the \$2.50 monthly charge?

A: No, IMAP and POP are being discontinued due to security concerns.

Q: Does this work on a Mac?

A: Yes, there is a new native application on Microsoft 2011 entitled Outlook.

Q: Does the web interface timeout?

A: Yes, the standard log-in will last 15 minutes, but a 12 hour log-in can be selected.

Q: Will users be able to access their Groupwise archive?

A: Yes, there is free software to convert a Groupwise archive to an Exchange archive. Additionally, it is Florida law that all state employees must maintain all email messages for at least three years. The client archives, but the web interface does not.

Q: Why is the migration occurring over a weekend?

A: This is to all everyone to be moved over at once rather than in a piece meal fashion. The migration of archives will occur after this.

Q: Many faculty use other email clients, and Microsoft advertises that Exchange will support this through IMAP and POP. Why has UCF chosen not to provide the functionality that Microsoft builds into the product?

A: It is increasingly risky to transfer data using IMAP and POP.

Distributed Learning – Tom Cavanagh

Dr. Tom Cavanagh presented several new initiatives from the Center for Distributed Learning (CDL):

CURRENT INITIATIVES

IDL6543 Redesign

While the IDL6543 program has been successful at preparing faculty to develop and deliver online and blended courses, it has remained largely unchanged since its introduction in the mid-1990s. Based upon feedback received from deans, associate deans, department chairs, and instructional faculty, CDL decided to conduct an analysis of the program's current curriculum and delivery and determine what changes should be made.

During the Spring of 2010, CDL formed a committee of faculty and administrators from across the university to drive the program analysis and provide recommendations for revision. The committee polled colleagues who had completed IDL6543, benchmarked alternative practices at other institutions both local and national, and provided a list of recommendations to CDL. Among the many recommendations included suggestions to place more of the curriculum online, expand the role of the Web Veterans, allow more flexibility to accommodate varying levels of technical competence, increase the enrollment cap, and focus less on pure pedagogy and more on how instructional design can be applied specifically in an online environment.

The curriculum is currently being revised and the pilot for the revision is targeted for a Summer 2011 delivery. A preliminary outline includes a reduced number of face-to-face sessions, with the majority of the content being delivered online.

Online Faculty Readiness Assessment

Based upon conversations with deans and department chairs, CDL understands that more and more faculty are being hired with experience teaching online, thus prompting a question about whether or not they need to participate in IDL6543. However, because there are numerous models for teaching online, there is no clear definition of what "prior online teaching experience" means. In response, CDL developed an online form intended for selected faculty to determine if their experience, competence, familiarity with the Blackboard Vista platform, and

teaching philosophy meet CDL standards. It is expected that a final assessment will result in one of several possible results: IDL6543 equivalency, a requirement to complete specific elements from IDL6543 or other programs, a requirement to complete a different professional development program, or a requirement to complete IDL6543 in its entirety. It will take faculty members it expected to take several hours to prepare and submit the instrument.

Faculty Seminars in Online Teaching

CDL has created 30-minute seminars on advanced topics “beyond IDL6543.” Topics can be pedagogically-oriented or technology-oriented. They will be workshop-based, available live or online, and CDL is willing to bring these sessions directly to the colleges and departments. Seminars will be co-facilitated by an instructional faculty member and a CDL instructional designer. The first session will be January 27 (*Designing Effective Online Assessments*: Bobby Hoffman and Denise Lowe).

FUTURE INITIATIVES

New Online Student Orientation

The current orientation for online learning is exclusively technical. The new orientation will also include expectations for online students, success strategies, video tips from fellow students, etc. The new orientation will focus on the tools that are most often used and also include strategies for success and set expectations for online learning.

Learn 9.x Migration

A new course management system is coming within the next 18 months. Several faculty will pilot the system starting in the 2011/2012 Academic Year.

Webcourses for All

CDL hopes to make the new course management system available for all courses, regardless of modality, by providing a shell that the faculty may elect to use without undergoing special training. However, certain features/tools may be unavailable until Essentials training is completed. The expectation is that this will replace *myUCF Grades*.

Mobility

Mobile Central and Mobile Learn (Blackboard products) are in development and will be deployed in the near future.

Pedagogical Repository

This will be a collection of effective online instructional practices. CDL would faculty to contribute their best practices. The vision is to become like the Purdue OWL for online learning.

Dr. Cavanagh opened up his presentation to questions from the Faculty Senate:

Q: Is the new IDL 6543 going to be offered fully online? If not, why not?

A: Because the feedback was that faculty enjoyed getting together for camaraderie and to learn from one another, IDL 6543 will not be offered completely online in the near future. CDL will be pursuing a completely online system in the future.

Question: How will Learn 9 handle the Macintosh users?

Answer: CDL will be testing the news system with Macs.

Faculty should feel free to contact Tom Cavanagh via email or phone with any other questions.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative Committee Update

As committee chair Carla Poindexter could not be present, there was no report.

Graduate Council – Jim Moharam

The Council has been very active since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Council information and activities (membership, meeting schedule, agenda, minutes, actions, etc) are available at

<http://www.graduatecouncil.ucf.edu/>

Appeals Committee - Dr. Coffey

- Met twice (11/18 and 12/16).
- Reviewed student petitions – typically 10 petitions per meeting.
- Next meeting to be determined.

Curriculum Committee - Dr. Dupras

- Met twice (12/08 and 1/19).
- Review of M&S course fees.
- Name change to the Policy and Analysis track, MA Political Science, COS.
- Curriculum changes to Thermofluids track, Mechanical Engineering, MS, CECS.
- Suspend admissions to Higher Ed track, Education PhD, CED.
- Curriculum revisions and name change to the MA in Sport and Fitness, CED.
- Leadership and Coaching track.
- Curriculum revisions to the EdS in School Psychology, CED.
- Curriculum revisions to the Graduate Certificate in Reading, CED.
- Curriculum revisions to the Mathematics Education track, Education PhD, CED.
- Curriculum revisions to the Professional track, Criminal Justice MS, COHPA.
- Addition of a dual degree in MPA/PhD, COHPA.
- Courses and special topics.
- Next meeting scheduled for 2/02.

Policy Committee - Dr. Moharam

- Met three times (11/24, 12/08, and 1/19).
- Revised the language for the guide lines for split level (4000/5000) courses.
- Discussed the issue of scholarly Integrity/Responsible Conduct of Research.
- Next meeting scheduled for 2/09.

Program Review and Awards Committee - Dr. Dombrowski

- Met once (12/10).

- Reviewed graduate faculty credentials for reappointment in several department.
- Considered proposal for Ph.D. in Political Science.
- Next meeting scheduled for 1/28.

Personnel Committee – *Kevin Haran*

The Personnel Committee will meet in the next two weeks to consider the policies concerning the appointment of chairs and directors, and the level of faculty participation in the process. In addition, the committee will consider why these two appointments are listed together and whether they should be separated.

Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – *Jill Fjelstul*

The committee has been very busy for the last few meetings making changes to the curriculum and approving equipment fee increases. The full minutes are available on the UPCC website (<http://www.undergraduatestudies.ucf.edu/faculty/upccminutes.php>).

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

Student Perception of Instruction (Face-to-Face ~~and ITV~~) Common Template for other formats

Instructions: Please answer each question based on your current class experience. You can provide additional information ~~on each item in the Comments box~~ where indicated.

All responses are anonymous. Responses to these questions are important to help improve the course and how it is taught. Results may be used in personnel decisions. The results will be shared with the instructor after the semester is over.

Comment [i1]: Wording suggested by Centra.

Section III: Evaluation of Instruction Items (*question numbering continues from Section I*)

Organization and Planning

~~13. The instructor was well organized.~~ organization of the course was:

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Ineffective
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Ineffective
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Effective
- d. ~~Disagree~~ Effective
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Effective

Comment [i2]: New wording of original#4 allow comparison of new with old

The explanation of course requirements was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

The use of class time was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

Communication Ability of the Instructor

~~15. The instructor's communication of the importance and significance of the subject matter was:~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Ineffective
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Ineffective
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Effective

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

- d. ~~Disagree~~ Effective
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Effective

~~16. The instructor's communication of ideas and/or information clearly was:~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Ineffective
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Ineffective
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Effective
- d. ~~Disagree~~ Effective
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Effective

Comment [13]: Revision of original #10 comparison of new with old

~~14. The instructor's displayed enthusiasm for teaching this class the course material was:~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Ineffective
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Ineffective
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Effective
- d. ~~Disagree~~ Effective
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Effective

~~21. The instructor provided opportunities for students to be intellectually or educationally challenged by this course were:~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Ineffective
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Ineffective
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Effective
- d. ~~Disagree~~ Effective
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Effective

Comment [14]: Delete this item and keep "Alternative to 21 below."

~~Alternative to 21:~~

The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

Comment [15]: Keep this item and delete 21 above.

Relationship or Interaction of the Teacher with the Students

~~12. The instructor's availability was available to assist me students at prearranged times outside of class either online or in person was:~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Very Unacceptable
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Unacceptable
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Acceptable

Comment [16]: Keep this item, drop Alternate to Q12 below

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

- d. ~~Disagree~~ Acceptable
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Acceptable
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

~~Alternate for question 12:~~

~~How effective was the instructor in assisting students outside of class, either online or in person:~~

- ~~a. Ineffective~~
- ~~b. Somewhat Ineffective~~
- ~~c. Moderately Effective~~
- ~~d. Effective~~
- ~~e. Very Effective~~
- ~~f. Not Applicable / Don't Know~~

~~18. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to ask questions. (Handled by the question below.)~~

- ~~a. Strongly Agree~~
- ~~b. Agree~~
- ~~c. Neither Agree nor Disagree~~
- ~~d. Disagree~~
- ~~e. Strongly Disagree~~

~~19. The instructor answered student questions. (Handled by the question below.)~~

- ~~a. Strongly Agree~~
- ~~b. Agree~~
- ~~c. Neither Agree nor Disagree~~
- ~~d. Disagree~~
- ~~e. Strongly Disagree~~

~~20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express thoughtful or well-reasoned ideas. (Handled by the question below.)~~

- ~~a. Strongly Agree~~
- ~~b. Agree~~
- ~~c. Neither Agree nor Disagree~~
- ~~d. Agree~~
- ~~e. Strongly Disagree~~

How effective was the instructor in creating an environment that encouraged students to ask questions or present their ideas?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

[e. Very Effective](#)

How effective was the instructor's facilitation of learning [or in facilitating your learning]?

- [a. Ineffective](#)
- [b. Somewhat Ineffective](#)
- [c. Moderately Effective](#)
- [d. Effective](#)
- [e. Very Effective](#)

Comment [I7]: Added from original #15 to provide comparison of new and old

Comment [I8]: Cook's slight reversion in brackets

Grading and Learning Materials Used in the Course (ETS Student instructional report II)

~~7. The instructor provided a syllabus.~~

- ~~[a. Yes](#)~~
- ~~[b. No](#)~~

8. How effective was the information given to students about how they would be graded?;~~**The instructor provided information about how grades are determined.**~~

- ~~[a. Yes](#)~~
- ~~[b. No](#)~~
- [a. Ineffective](#)
- [b. Somewhat Ineffective](#)
- [c. Moderately Effective](#)
- [d. Effective](#)
- [e. Very Effective](#)

~~9. The instructor provided a course schedule.~~

- ~~[a. Yes](#)~~
- ~~[b. No](#)~~

10. How effective were the required course materials (for example, texts, articles, online resources, art supplies, computer programs, etc.) helped me in helping you learn the course content.

- ~~[a. Strongly Agree](#)~~ [Ineffective](#)
- ~~[b. Agree](#)~~ [Somewhat Ineffective](#)
- ~~[c. Neither Agree nor Disagree](#)~~ [Moderately Effective](#)
- ~~[d. Disagree](#)~~ [Effective](#)
- ~~[e. Strongly Disagree](#)~~ [Very Effective](#)

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

11. ~~The assignments helped me~~ How effective were the assignments in helping you (or students) learn the course content?

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Ineffective
- b. ~~Agree~~ Somewhat Ineffective
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ Moderately Effective
- d. ~~Disagree~~ Effective
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Very Effective

17. ~~On average, I received feedback on the class assignments from the instructor~~ How effective were the instructors comments on assignments and exams:

- a. ~~within one week~~
- b. ~~within two weeks~~
- c. ~~within three weeks~~
- d. ~~by the end of the semester~~
- a. ~~Ineffective~~
- b. ~~Somewhat Ineffective~~
- c. ~~Moderately Effective~~
- d. ~~Effective~~
- e. ~~Very Effective~~

Comment [I9]: Moved below next item from original draft

How effective were exams in covering important aspects of the course?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

Comment [I10]: Probably should read ...exams or assessments in... [add words 'or assessments']

How effective were the instructor's comments on assignments and exams:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

Comment [I11]: Moved from above (17)

How effective was the instructor in making progress toward course objectives?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

| [e. Very Effective](#)

Summary Questions

| **22. Overall, ~~this faculty member was an effective instructor~~ how would you rate the effectiveness of the instruction in this course?;**

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ [Ineffective](#)
- b. ~~Agree~~ [Somewhat Ineffective](#)
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ [Moderately Effective](#)
- d. ~~Disagree~~ [Effective](#)
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ [Very Effective](#)

Comment [I12]: Added from original #16 to provide comparison of new and old

Comment:

| **23. What did you like best about the way this faculty member taught this course? |**

Comment [I13]: Centra comment – Question could be misinterpreted.

| **24. What [specific](#) suggestions do you have for ~~this faculty member to improve~~ this course?**

Comment:

| ****End of Common Questions for All Types of Classes***

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

CENTRA RECOMMENDS DROPPING OR MAKING Sections II, III OPTIONAL
(possibly via a different link or survey)

Section II: Face-to-Face and ITV Course Items

The Section II items are not used to evaluate instruction but will help put responses for Section III items in context.

F1. I spent ___ hours per week outside of class on this course.

- a. ~~3~~ 1 or less
- b. ~~4~~ 2-3
- c. ~~7~~ 4-5
- d. ~~more than 9~~ 6-7
- e. 8 or more

F2. I missed class ___ times this semester on days the class met face to face. How many times did you miss class?

- a. ~~0~~ 1 or less
- b. ~~1~~ 2-3
- c. ~~3~~ 4-5
- d. ~~more than 5~~ 6-7
- e. 8 or more

F3. When the class met face to face, I was late to class or left early ___ times this semester.

- a. ~~0~~
- b. ~~1~~ 2
- c. ~~3~~ 5
- d. ~~more than 5~~

Comment [I14]: Centra comment - How often does this happen and will the students admit it?

F4. Did this class have online assignments (for example, web readings, web modules, online discussions, etc.)?

- a. Yes
- b. No

If the answer to F4 is yes, the following two items will appear:

Comment [I15]: This is a contingency question, where the next 2 questions would pop up

F5. What proportion of ~~I completed~~ the online assignments did you complete?

- a. ~~Always~~ Almost all of them
- b. ~~Often~~ About three-quarters of them
- c. ~~Sometimes~~ About half of them
- d. ~~Rarely~~ About a quarter of them
- e. ~~Never~~ Almost none of them

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

F6. ~~In general, what percentage of the time did~~ Webcourses access ~~problems~~ (for example, ~~the server being down or very slow – or other technical glitches~~) were minimal and did ~~NOT impact my~~ affect your ability to complete online assignments?;

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Almost all the time
- b. ~~Agree~~ About three quarters of the time
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~ About half the time
- d. ~~Agree~~ About a quarter of the time
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~ Almost none of the time

Comment [i16]: There aren't any questions about having problems with general ability to complete assignments, so why ask about online in F2F survey?

F7. ~~Parking on campus~~ Approximately how many times did parking problems ~~made~~ make it difficult for ~~me~~ you to get to class on time.?

- a. ~~Never~~ 0-1
- b. ~~Rarely~~ 2-3
- c. ~~Sometimes~~ 4-5
- d. ~~Often~~ 6-7
- e. ~~Always~~ 8 or more
- f. Not applicable

F8. ~~The classroom was comfortable for learning; the temperature, sound, desks/chairs, and lighting were fine.~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~
- b. ~~Agree~~
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~
- d. ~~Disagree~~
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~

Comment [i17]: Centra comment - This cannot lead to improvement to a specific type of problem unless students are able to leave comments.

~~If an ITV section, the following two items will appear~~

F9. My classroom was (choose one of the following):

- a. ~~the site FROM which the course was broadcast almost every class~~
- b. ~~the site from which the course was broadcast some weeks and a site to which the course was transmitted other weeks~~
- e. ~~a site TO which the course was broadcast almost every class~~

Comment [ic18]: Deleted because ITV is no longer used.

F10. ~~ITV problems (for example, audio and/or video quality) were minimal and did NOT impact my ability to participate in class.~~

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~
- b. ~~Agree~~
- c. ~~Neither Agree nor Disagree~~
- d. ~~Disagree~~
- e. ~~Strongly Disagree~~

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

Section III: Student Information Items

The Section III items are not used to evaluate instruction but will help put responses for Section III items in context.

1. In general, I prefer taking courses that are:

- a. Face to face
- b. Interactive TV
- c. Web-mediated [partly online; partly face to face (M)]
- d. Fully online (W)
- e. Video-streaming (V)
- f. FEEDS
- g. I have no preference

Comment [I19]: Centra comment - Students may not know what the choices mean.

2. Which of the following is the most important reason you took this course?

- a. I had to.
- b. I had to and I wanted to.
- c. I wanted to.
- d. It fit my schedule.

Comment [I20]: Centra comment - Choices are confusing and the item value is questionable.

3. I had a strong desire to take this course.

- a. ~~Strongly Agree~~ Strongly Disagree
- b. Agree ~~Disagree~~
- c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- d. Disagree Agree
- e. Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

Comment [I21]: Centra comment - Probably better than question 2.

4. I had a strong desire to take a course with this instructor.

- a. Strongly Agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Disagree

5. I used most of the required course materials (for example texts, articles, online resources, art supplies, computer programs, etc.):

- a. Strongly Agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neither Agree nor Disagree

Comment [I22]: Centra comment - Not sure how the reply would be interpreted.

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Disagree

~~6. The final grade I anticipate for this class is:~~

- a. ~~A/A-~~
- b. ~~B+/B/B-~~
- c. ~~C+/C/C-~~
- d. ~~D+/D/D-~~
- e. ~~F~~
- f. ~~P~~
- g. ~~S~~
- h. ~~U~~
- i. ~~Other~~

Comment [I23]: Centra comment - Research has not show that expected grade affects the ratings.

Comment [I24]: Centra comment - Deleted questions would influenced depending upon whether or not the student was a major /minor.

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

Student Perception of Instruction (Face-to-Face) **Common Template for other formats**

Instructions: Please answer each question based on your current class experience. You can provide additional information where indicated.

All responses are anonymous. Responses to these questions are important to help improve the course and how it is taught. Results may be used in personnel decisions. The results will be shared with the instructor after the semester is over.

Section I: Evaluation of Instruction Items

Organization and Planning

The organization of the course was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

The explanation of course requirements was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

The use of class time was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

Communication Ability of the Instructor

The instructor's communication of the importance of the subject matter was:.

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

e. Very Effective

The instructor's communication of ideas and/or information was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems was:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

Relationship or Interaction of the Teacher with the Students

The instructor's availability to assist students at prearranged times outside of class either online or in person was:

- a. Very Unacceptable
- b. Somewhat Unacceptable
- c. Moderately Acceptable
- d. Acceptable
- e. Very Acceptable
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

How effective was the instructor in creating an environment that encouraged students to ask questions or present their ideas?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

e. Very Effective

How effective was the instructor's facilitation of learning [or in facilitating your learning]?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

Grading and Learning Materials Used in the Course (ETS Student instructional report II)

How effective was the information given to students about how they would be graded?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

How effective were the required course materials in helping you learn the course content.

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

How effective were the assignments in helping you (or students) learn the course content?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

How effective were exams in covering important aspects of the course?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

How effective were the instructor's comments on assignments and exams:

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

How effective was the instructor in making progress toward course objectives?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

Summary Questions

Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of the instruction in this course?

- a. Ineffective
- b. Somewhat Ineffective
- c. Moderately Effective
- d. Effective
- e. Very Effective

Comment:

What specific suggestions do you have for improving this course?

Comment:

****End of Common Questions for All Types of Classes***

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

**CENTRA RECOMMENDS DROPPING OR MAKING Sections II, III OPTIONAL
(possibly via a different link or survey)**

Section II: Face-to-Face Course Items

The Section II items are not used to evaluate instruction but will help put responses for Section I items in context.

I spent ___ hours per week outside of class on this course.

- a. 1 or less
- b. 2-3
- c. 4-5
- d. 6-7
- e. 8 or more

How many times did you miss class?

- a. 1 or less
- b. 2-3
- c. 4-5
- d. 6-7
- e. 8 or more

F4. Did this class have online assignments (for example, web readings, web modules, online discussions, etc.)?

- a. Yes
- b. No

If the answer to F4 is yes, the following two items will appear:

F5. What proportion of the online assignments did you complete?.

- a. Almost all of them
- About three-quarters of them. About half of them
- d. About a quarter of them
- e. Almost none of them

In general, what percentage of the time did Webcourses access problems affect your ability to complete online assignments?

- a. Almost all the time
- b. About three quarters of the time
- c. About half the time
- d. About a quarter of the time

An alternate item response pattern might be: a) Poor b) Fair c) Satisfactory d) Good e) Excellent

e. Almost none of the time

Approximately how many times did parking problems make it difficult for you to get to class on time?

- a. 0-1
- b. 2-3
- c. 4-5
- d. 6-7
- e. 8 or more
- f. Not applicable

Section III: Student Information Items

The Section III items are not used to evaluate instruction but will help put responses for Section I items in context.

I had a strong desire to take this course.

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Agree

Background to the Proposed Revisions of Student Perception of Instruction Forms: Brief Summary

by Ida Cook, Chair, Faculty Senate

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of all of the faculty members who volunteered and contributed to the process of addressing faculty performance and evaluation over the past five years. Their names are provided at the end of this note.

Originally the effort to examine the evaluation of faculty teaching performance began with a group of faculty that worked together during the 2005 Summer Faculty Development Conference. Later the Academic Rigor Work Group (ARWG) was formed to further develop information about faculty evaluations. Around the same time, another committee was formed by Faculty Affairs to look at the possibility of online delivery of SPOI. In spring 2006, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee recommended that the two groups work together as an ad hoc committee of the Steering Committee.

In an August 2007 progress report, the ad hoc committee informed the Senate that they had created versions of the SPoI for the three types of course delivery: Face-to-face and ITV; web mediated; and fully web-based. The committee planned to obtain IRB approval to pilot test the forms in fall 2007 in classes taught by 200+ award winning faculty members. Twelve professors participated in the fall 2007 pilot, and the committee subsequently reported that they hoped to have a more random sample in spring term 2008.

In September 2009, the committee presented its recommended changes, including that the SPoI form have three sections dealing with 1) student information, 2) delivery mode, and 3) course/faculty evaluation. Different modes of analysis were also suggested. The Faculty Senate voted to receive the report and thanked the subcommittee for its long and dedicated service.

After the delivery of the proposed revisions, the Office of Academic Affairs agreed to provide funding for an outside consultant to review and comment on the proposed SPoI revisions. Upon recommendation by representatives of the Educational Testing Service, Academic Affairs contracted with Dr. John Centra, Professor, Syracuse University, whose professional career includes extensive study and professional publications in support of improving faculty performance, evaluation, and performance assessment. Dr. Centra completed his work in December 2010.

We will begin discussion of the proposed SPOI at the February 17 Faculty Senate meeting. The following items are attached for your review:

1. Summary of Consultant's Recommendations
2. Draft – Track Changes SPoI- that uses the F2F, ITV version (with additional questions for other modes) along with the consultant's suggestions for improvement.
3. Draft – Final version of the SPOI with all changes and comments hidden.

Faculty participants who worked with different groups, committees and subcommittees on Student Perception of Instruction:

2005 Summer Faculty Development Conference workshop:

Pat Anglely, Steve Berman, Barbara Fritzsche, Bill Gaudelli, Linda Goddard, Maria Gonzalez, Tony Grajeda, Anna Jones, Bernadette Jungblut, Frank Kujawa, Maria Lavooy, Barbara Moore; Bob Potter, Craig Saper, Meg Scharf, Charlene Stinard, Diane Wink.

2005 Academic Rigor Working Group (ARWG):

Tace Crouse, Richard Harrison, Bernadette Jungblut, Paula Krist, Pat Lancey, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, John Schell, Charlene Stinard, Diane Wink.

2006-2010 ad hoc Faculty Senate subcommittee on Revisions to the Student Perception of Instruction:

Diane Alvarez, Mason Cash, Tace Crouse, Richard Harrison, Lin Huff-Corzine, Bernadette Jungblut, Mark Kamrath, Jeff Kaplan, Charles Negy, Charlene Stinard, Dawn Trouard, Diane Wink.

Resolution 2010-2011-3 Approval of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form

Whereas, the UCF faculty have concerns about the quality and usage of the current Student Perception of Instruction form, and

Whereas, several faculty committees, administrators, and an outside consultant have developed constructive recommendations to revise the Student Perception of Instruction form, and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate has considered these reports and a final revision has been reviewed,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate hereby approves the proposed revisions to the Student Perception of Instruction form.

Resolution 2010-2011-4 Evaluation of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form

Whereas, several faculty committees have offered constructive recommendations to revise the Student Perception of Instruction form, and

Whereas, a draft of a proposed Student Perception of Instruction form has been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the administration assist in the evaluation of the proposed version of the Student Perception of Instruction form using sound methodological techniques and sampling.

Summary of Consultant's Recommendations

Dr. John Centra, the consultant, who reviewed the current and proposed versions of UCF Student Perception of Instruction documents, has delivered his report. Based on his analysis of the documents provided to him Dr. Centra has proposed the following points for consideration.

1. There appear to be four major areas of emphasis in the current and proposed student evaluation of instruction instruments. Therefore, in order to facilitate students' consideration of major aspects of instruction, Dr. Centra recommends that the items be reorganized into four categories and be labeled with the following designations:
 - a. Organization and planning of the course
 - b. Communication ability of the instructor
 - c. Relationship or interaction of the teacher with students
 - d. Grading and learning materials used in the course. (See compendium of Student Instructional Report II, an instrument available to institutions from ETS. It is not copyrighted, so can be adapted.)
2. The instrument should include one final question regarding the overall assessment of the instructor. This question is important, because according to Dr. Centra's research, it correlates best with student learning, and forms the bases for summative decisions for faculty members' teaching effectiveness.
3. Dr. Centra recommends that the instrument would be most effective if questions relate to instruction and students' learning outcomes, rather than instructors' characteristics.
4. If the current rating scale is to be continued, consider modified syntax with Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Fair, and Poor.
 - a. The current scale is non-symmetric and is heavily weighted in a positive direction (Excellent, Very good, Good – only 2 on the negative side – Fair, Poor.)
 - b. A scale that includes an ambivalent midpoint (e.g. neither) is problematic because students use that response as a way of not committing one way or the other.
5. Dr. Centra recommends that UCF consider an alternative scale that addresses instructional effectiveness is a five-point scale with the following syntax: Ineffective, Somewhat Ineffective, Moderately Effective, Effective, Very Effective. This pattern of response choices helps point to quality of instruction, organization, communication and interaction.
6. A summary or total score, calculated mean or standard deviation for any of the evaluation forms should not be used. Use of a summary score assumes that the separate items are weighted equivalently. This is not the case. Items with the larger variance have greater weight in composite scores those items with smaller variances.

7. Use a common set of questions (Part III of draft SPoI) for all modes of instruction. If additional items are desired (Part I and Part II), they should be appended or linked to the evaluation according to the delivery mode of the course. Questions for additional items should be consistent with the five-point scale that addresses instruction and how it relates to student learning.
8. Reports of evaluation results provided to instructors and/or supervisors should provide item scores, mean, standard deviation to allow instructors to compare their individual performance:
 - a. on items for their performance in different semesters/years;
 - b. on items for their performance with those of their department's item scores, means, standard deviations; and
 - c. on items for their performance with those of their college faculty item scores, means, standard deviations
9. All reports of evaluation results provided should include a link to the online compendium of resources developed by Dr. Centra for Educational Testing Service, which could be used to provide context for the results for both the instructor and supervisor using the results.