

Faculty Senate Meeting  
**Minutes of**  
**February 17, 2011**

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the Faculty Senate to order at 4:06 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

A motion to approve the minutes January 20, 2011 was made and seconded.  
Motion carried.

A motion was made to amend the agenda to have the committee reports before the new business. Motion seconded and carried.

**RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Tony Waldrop, Provost

Diane Chase, Executive Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs

Chuck Dziuban, Director of the Research Initiative for Teaching Effectiveness

Richard Harrison, Library

Michael Kilbride, Student Body President

Denise Young, Associate Vice President, Regional Campuses

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Dr. Cook announced that last week she attended a presentation that was made to the deans on issues surrounding academic integrity. This was part of the ongoing effort to further discussion on this issue.

**PROVOST'S UPDATE**

State Budget Update

Provost Waldrop spoke briefly about the state budget. Although the specifics of the state budget are unknown, he felt that the governor's budget looks favorable. The provost cautioned that the final budget will not be known until after the house and the senate each pass their own budgets. Regarding benefits, Provost Waldrop speculated that there will be several changes and the university is monitoring this.

Administrative Search Update

There are two administrative searches currently underway. The search committee for vice provost and dean of Undergraduate Studies is being chaired by Dean Alvin Wang, and the search for dean of the College of Sciences is being chaired by Dean Deborah German.

Policy Update

Provost Waldrop announced that Faculty Affairs is working on finalizing a document regarding policies and procedures for non-tenure track faculty in research and clinical tracks, as directed by the Faculty Senate Resolution 2010-2011-1 Promotion of Non Tenure-Earning Assistant and Associate Professors. The policy will need to go through

the required 30-day comment period. The provost also believes that similar policies are needed for instructors and lecturers.

### Promotion & Tenure

The provost announced that he is in the process of reviewing the Promotion and Tenure binders. He has now read 45 of the 57 files, and will soon be meeting with the president to give his recommendations.

Dr. Cook added that the provost approved Resolution 2010-2011-2 Revision of Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

### **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### Budget and Administrative Committee

As committee chair Carla Poindexter was not present, no report was made.

#### 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 on 2/03 and 2/17.
- Reviewed student petitions – typically 10 petitions per meeting.
- Next meeting is scheduled for 3/17.

Curriculum Committee: Dr. Dupras

- Met twice on 2/2 and 2/16.
- Review of CES 5144 split class syllabus, CECS.
- Reactivation of the Theoretical and Applied Ethics graduate certificate, CAH.
- Rename Art MFA in Studio Art and the Computer to MFA in Emerging Media, CAH.
- Addition of a Studio Art and the Computer track, CAH
- Rename Visual Language and Interactive Media track to Digital Media, CAH.
- Inactivation of Varying Exceptionalities track, Exceptional Student Education MED, CED.
- Curriculum revisions to the Early Childhood Development and Education MS program, CED.
- Revisions to the EdD in Education, CED.
- Review of courses and special topics additions and revisions.
- Next meeting scheduled for 3/2.

Policy Committee: Dr. Moharam

- Met once on 2/9.

- Approved a proposed resolution requiring Scholarly Integrity/Responsible Conduct of Research training for all entering doctoral students.
- Next meeting scheduled for 2/23.

Program Review and Awards Committee: Dr. Dombrowski

- Met once on 1/28.
- Reviewed the proposal for the Masters of Research Administration program.
- Next meeting scheduled for 3/04.

#### Personnel Committee

Jeffrey Kaplan reported on behalf of Kevin Haran, who was unable to attend. The committee is working on a resolution regarding the policies governing the evaluation of chairs and directors. The resolution will be going to the Steering Committee in March.

#### Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – Jill Fjelstul

The committee was very busy in December and January with catalog deadlines. The February meeting was calm. An ad hoc committee is looking at campus-wide specializations and concentrations.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI)

An email providing an overview of the history of the Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) revision process had been sent to the Senate along with a copy of the newly-proposed SPoI. Dr. Cook expressed the Senate's appreciation to all of the individuals who have spent their time and effort to work on this.

Dr. Charles Dziuban, director of UCF's Research Initiative for Teaching Effectiveness, was present to give a report on the recommendations of the external consultant, Dr. John Centra, who reviewed the proposed SPoI changes recommended by the ad hoc Senate committee.

Dr. Centra was recommended as a consultant by members of the Educational Testing Service (ETS). He is an expert in this area and has numerous peer-reviewed publications regarding the evaluation of instruction. He suggested that the questions be reorganized into four overarching categories to improve the assessment process for students and faculty:

1. Organization and planning of the course
2. Communication ability of the instructor
3. Relationship or interaction of the teacher with students
4. Grading and learning materials used in the course.

Additionally, Dr. Centra recommended that we use a symmetric scale rather than the current scale, which is weighted toward the positive. (The current scale has three positive options: Excellent, Very Good, Good; and only two negatives: Fair, Poor.) Specifically, he recommended that UCF consider an alternative scale that addresses instructional

effectiveness 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.

Dr. Centra recommended that we use a common set of questions, as there are currently five (5) modes of instruction and this is likely to change over time. Dr. Dziuban stressed that Dr. Centra strongly recommended that an overall score never be used.

Dr. Dziuban opened the floor to questions and comments:

- Question: What is the rationale to start with 'very ineffective' rather than 'very effective'? Why have the negative come first?  
Answer: There was no specific reason for doing so, and the scale can be inverted.
- Comment: UCF needs to get rid of standard average scores across all items due to the statistical inaccuracy of using them for rating faculty. Additionally, the SPoI results should be used for the development and improvement of teaching rather than in a punitive manner. Support was offered for the consultant's recommendation that deans and chairs receive help in understanding how to properly use and understand SPoI data.
- Comment: It is preferable to compare SPoI results based on each course rather than on total number of students as is done currently, thereby giving more weight to larger classes.
- Comment: It is difficult to get large numbers of responses with online delivery as compared to the old paper form.  
Response: Dr. Cook stated that she would defer that question for later in the meeting, after delivery of the consultant's report has concluded.

Dr. Cook provided an overview of the feedback from the faculty who reviewed the SPoI:

1. In place of scale shown on the handout use "Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Fair, Poor" instead of Ineffective,... Effective, etc.
2. Include the question asking for the student's expected grade.
3. Group together individual students' answers in SPoI report.
4. Make SPoI completion mandatory, e.g., require student completion pending release of grades before a given deadline.

Dr. Cook noted that in general, the response rate for online SPoI has been higher than with the paper version, except for in fall 2010 where computer errors resulted in students having only a one-week window to complete the survey, as compared to the normal two weeks.

A question was asked whether there were legal issues in making the completion of SPoI mandatory in order for students to get their grades. Dr. Diane Chase explained that we could delay students' access to final grades, but not forever. Several requests for past SPoI data were made:

- The specific numbers to back the assertion that online SPoI has a higher response.

- The numbers on how many students completed the SPoI versus those who just went in and checked one answer.
- SPoI numbers based upon each college and the university as a whole, as well as by undergraduate/graduate response rate.
- The response rate of written comments in the online SPoI versus the paper version, as the comments from online seemed very sparse.

Dr. Chase said that she would gather this data to report back to the Senate. She did not think it would be possible to meet the last request, as the data on written responses from paper SPoI may not exist.

Dr. Cook turned the discussion of the specific survey items to Dr. Manoj Chopra, stating that she would track the more procedural issues and assist in recognizing senators wanting to be recognized in discussions. Dr. Chopra presented the resolution for approving the SPoI:

**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.

As the resolution was from the Steering Committee, a second was not needed. Discussion on the SPoI form began with the items noted above as feedback from faculty. Dr. Chopra explained that any changes would need to be incorporated via friendly amendments.

A friendly amendment was made to change the scale from 'Very Ineffective...Very Effective', to 'Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Fair, Poor' where applicable, and for questions where it was not logical, to use a scale from positive to negative. Motion seconded. Discussion followed. The question was called. Motion to call the question made and seconded. The motion to change the scale carried.

The discussion proceeded to whether the SPoI should retain the question about students' expected grade. Motion to include this item was made and seconded. A discussion ensued on where this item would be included. One senator expressed that if there are a

number of studies showing no correlation between expected grade and a student's responses, there is no reason to include it. The motioner and seconder agreed to place the question immediately before the summary questions. Motion carried.

A question was raised about the structure of the SPoI, and whether Section II (questions specific to different course modes) and Section III (Student Information Items) should be optional, as the consultant had recommended. A suggestion was made that all of Section II include 'Not Applicable' as an answer choice to allow student to indicate that the question did not pertain to their mode of instruction. Discussion continued and it was suggested that different questions be presented in Section II depending on the type of course (F2F, W, M, etc). Dr. D. Chase was unsure if it was technically possible to deliver different questions depending on modality, and perhaps the inclusion of a 'Not Applicable' choice might be necessary. There was strong support for ensuring that students are only presented with questions that related to their modality. A concern was raised that making the section optional would make the data less useful due to the difference in numbers of respondents in the sections. It was suggested that the Faculty Senate delay making a decision about the formatting and structure until we find out the technical feasibility of matching questions with each student's mode of instruction.

A question was raised about the consultant's opinion of using separate forms. Dr. Dziuban stated that a problem with separate forms is that you have to show evidence that they are equated. A senator noted that the Educational Testing Service has a division of statisticians dedicated to determining whether forms are equivalent.

It was asked if there could be there one open-ended question to replace Section 2 in order to reduce the number of questions on the SPoI. Concerns were raised about the possible usefulness of the responses.

A senator suggested that the Senate periodically review the SPoI questions. Dr. Dziuban supported this suggestion. It was noted that further changes could be made to the survey following a review of the results of the pilot testing.

Dr. Cook distributed an example of how another university analyzes and delivers the results of the SPoI to faculty and their supervisors. The results allow for the faculty member to compare their scores by item with department, college and university classes.

Dr. Chopra initiated a discussion to consider the SPoI item by item starting with Section I.

Motion made to re-word question two to replace "explanation", as it might imply a verbal explanation. Seconded. Discussion followed on possible ways to re-word the question. Questions were raised about whether the question is intended to refer to the syllabus. The motioner and seconder accepted changing the wording of the question to, "The verbal and/or written explanation of the course requirements was:". Motion carried.

Members of the Senate felt that question three, "The use of class time was:" was only relevant for face-to-face classes. A motion was made to delete this question from the core questions and have it only given to face-to-face classes. No second was given. It was suggested that the wording be changed to, "The instructor's use of time was:". Dr. Cook recognized Student Body President Michael Kilbride, who offered a student perspective. Mr. Kilbride noted that he would interpret that question as only relevant to face-to-face classes. He suggested that "Not Applicable" be added as a possible answer. Motion was made to change the question to, "The instructor's use of in-class time was:". Seconded. The motioner and seconder accepted a suggested to add an additional response option, "F. Not applicable because the class did not meet face-to-face." The motion carried.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made to adjourn. Dr. Cook noted that the Senate couldn't adjourn while there was a resolution on the floor. A motion was made to table the resolution until the next meeting. Seconded. The motion to table carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:36 p.m.