M E M O R A N D U M

Date: February 12, 2009

TO: All Faculty Senate Members

FROM: Manoj Chopra
                    Chair, Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting on February 19, 2009

Meeting Date: Thursday, February 19, 2009
Meeting Time: 4:00-6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Student Union Key West, Room 218AB

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Roll Call**

3. **Approval of Minutes of** *January 22, 2009*

4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**

     ♦ Provost's Update

5. **Old Business**

     ♦   Textbook Affordability committee report

6. **New Business**

     ♦ Student Perception of Instruction form revisions

     ♦ Bookstore Update – Denise Berrios

     ♦ University Athletics Update – Keith Tribble

7. **Standing Committee Reports**

     • Budget and Administrative Committee – Dr. Belfield

     • Personnel Committee – Dr. Chakrabarti

     • Graduate Council – Dr. Moharam

- Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – Dr. Pennington

8. **Adjournment**

Budget and Administrative Procedures Subcommittee Report on Textbook Affordability[1]

February 2009

1) State law regulates that textbook information (title, author[s], year/edition, publisher, and ISBN number) be made available to students at least 30 days (Note: actual deadline to be established to insure compliance) prior to commencement of the semester in which the book(s) will be used. Instructors of courses must provide such information to the bookstore, which, in turn, will make the information available to students so they may shop for books to obtain the best price.

2) When practical, in Departments where multiple sections of the same course are routinely taught, the bookstore should be advised of this with the idea that the same book could be used across course sections and semesters. It is acknowledged that not all disciplines are amenable to using the same textbook for multiple sections because in some disciplines, the breadth of the course content is too extensive (which means, instructors have discretionary power to emphasize [i.e., teach] some topics while ignoring other topics). Also, in some disciplines, the subject matter for a course can be approached and studied from diverse orientations or perspectives. Instructors would retain the freedom to select books approached from an orientation consistent with their own preference.

3) Instructors should be cognizant of book costs when adopting books by proactively doing the following:

   a. Inquiring from book publishers (prior to adopting a book) the expected retail cost of the book(s) to students (retail price includes bookstore add-on costs).

   b. Considering ways to reduce the cost of the book(s) under consideration (e.g., ordering paperback instead of hardbound, de-bundling materials, using "loose-leaf" editions, black and white books, etc.).

   c. Only adopting books or materials that will be used or needed by the students.

   d. Considering the feasibility of assigning previous editions of books. It is acknowledged that the issue of adopting a new edition can be complicated by various pedagogical and market factors (e.g., some instructors may want books that contain the latest information for their course. Also, the bookstore must be able to obtain enough previous-edition books for all students if the instructor wishes to continue using an "out-dated" edition of the book).

   e. Consider using "customized" textbooks, if feasible, to lower costs of books. It is noted that customized textbooks often are "consumable"

---

[1] Some of these practices are based on recommendations from other sources, such as the Minnesota Office of Higher Education, the Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability Report (OPPAGA; Florida Legislature), and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC).

products and often will not be bought back by the bookstore due to a lack of a national market for custom books.

4) If permitted by law or publishing company policies, instructors may consider placing one or more copies (e.g., their "complimentary" copies) of the assigned book on reserve in the university library.

5) Students should be informed by instructors that books may be less expensive from private bookstores and from on-line bookstores compared to the university-affiliated bookstore. It is noted that a consequence of less books sold at the university-affiliated bookstore is less revenue to the university.

6) Establish a university-wide textbook advisory committee whose function will be to monitor the implementation of textbook affordability best practices and recommend modifications to the university's collective efforts at lowering textbook costs. The committee should meet at least once per academic year or semester to address on-going concerns.

Faculty Senate Meeting
January 22, 2009

Dr. Manoj Chopra, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of October 23, 2008 were unanimously approved with no revisions.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Drs. D. Chase and Morrison-Shetlar; Drs. Huff-Corzine and Kuhn (Faculty Relations); Dr. Dennis Dulniak, Steven Sesit, Brian Boyd (Registrar's Office); Dr. Barbara Fritzsche (UFF).

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Gordon Chavis is seeking faculty to give mini lectures for Scholars Day. Faculty should contact him if interested.

Provost's update
A Provost's Update will be going out later today. In a special session, the legislature ratified the 4% cut that the Governor had ordered held back at the beginning of the year. UCF had held back 6% in July proactively, so the 4% will not have an affect this year. UCF has lost 127 faculty and 71 staff member positions ince July 1, 2007. The provost is asking deans and vice presidents to remove another 4% from 2009-2010 budgets to be safe. Estimates are that UCF will be cut by 6-8% for the 2009-2010 budget. A clearer picture of the 2009-2010 budget situation will develop in March or early April. UCF currently has reserves that may cover another 2%.

UCF is one of five SUS schools currently able to charge differential tuition. A bill may extend this to all SUS schools. The new bill would allow a 15% increase each year until the tuition reaches the national average of state universities. At 15%/year, it will take seven years to reach the national average. Differential tuition will generate $25 million/year when fully implemented. UCF received $900,000 this year and is expecting $6 million in 2009-2010. Thirty percent of differential tuition is set aside for need-based aid. The balance must be spent on activities that directly impact undergraduate success, primarily faculty and advisors. The funds could also be spent on some faculty service co-curricular activities.

National studies have determined that there are two areas where class size impacts student learning, English composition and Math instruction, particularly General Algebra. The provost is allocating $400,000 of differential tuition funds, recurring, to improving these areas. Approximately $200,000 is going to expanding the activities of the University Writing Center and hiring additional instructors for English Composition. The maximum class size in English Composition will drop from 27 to 25. There will also be an experiment conducted with eight sections with a class limit of 19 to see if and how that impacts learning. The remaining $200,000 will be going to support math instruction, to reduce class size in general algebra and allow faculty to teach the sections using computer labs. The university will be doing assessment to determine the value of decreasing class size in these areas.

For disbursing the remainder of the differential tuition, the Pegasus funding model will be reactivated and differential tuition will be distributed on that basis. Under-funded units will receive funding first. This will affect at least three units – RCHM, the undergraduate component of COM, and COS, and possibly CAH if there are enough funds. This process will be repeated and expanded in 2010-2011, when there will be over $10 million in differential tuition. It is crucial to reward units that show increases in credit hour production. The only positive revenue we have is through differential tuition.

The provost has been stressing to the media that it is the efforts of the faculty and staff that have allowed UCF to do what it has. Students have not suffered because of the budget cutbacks, and this is due to the hard work of faculty. The provost offered thanks to the faculty on behalf of himself, the president, and the UCF Board of Trustees (BoT).

At the most recent BoT meeting, the president spoke about the priorities in the event that program cuts become necessary. Programs will be reviewed on the following criteria: 1) interest of students; 2) most talented faculty and staff; 3) programs of critical importance; 4) programs that allow UCF to recruit and retain the best and brightest students; 5) programs that generate significant revenue. The provost noted that it would be irresponsible for the university not to look at contingencies. If there is a 10-12% cut it will be very difficult to avoid layoffs.

UCF has lost 16% of the budget. On July 1, with the additional 4% cut, the university will be down 20%. Eighty to eighty-five percent of the budget is tied up in personnel. For this year, the state has patched the budget hole with some one-time money and some trust fund money that will have to be repaid. The federal stimulus package of $800 billion may offer assistance, but it is currently unknown what that impact will be.

The funds for TIP, RIA, SOTL, excellence awards, and promotional increases have been set aside and will not be affected by the cuts. The provost noted that these programs will stay in place unless some other forces cause them to be dropped.

Dr. Barbara Fritzsche, vice president of the UFF, offered the UFF's position on TIP, RIA, and SOTL. She noted that the UFF supports them, and that they have been in every proposal that has been brought to table. However, the UFF is concerned that UCF is not proceeding in a lawful fashion since they are supposed to be bargained as part of the total salary package.

A question was raised for the provost regarding how the budget crisis is impacting the College of Medicine. COM has had all of the same reductions as the other units. Because COM made budget commitments to the LCME, institution auxiliary funds are being used to fulfill those commitments. The COM's accreditation could be impacted if they are not met. The provost is working to get the COM state budget restored and the Cortellis matching funds reinstated.

A question was raised for the provost regarding the news that Seminole Community College will be offering BA in Interior Design. The provost replied that UCF is supporting SCC in this effort, as UCF declined the opportunity to offer such a degree. UCF is in discussions with Valencia Community college about the possibility of a joint venture in an art-based Architecture program. No commitments have been made.

General Announcements
UCF is 34th in the nation in numbers of National Merit Scholars.

State-wide, Centers of Excellence have taken a 25% budget cut, as has the Florida Solar Energy Center.

OLD BUSINESS
Resolution from Personnel Committee – Resolution 2007-2008-5 Appointment and Evaluation of School Directors and Department Chairs (Revised)

Motion made not to read the resolution aloud. Motion seconded and approved.

Discussion of the resolution follows. The following friendly amendments are proposed:
- change "nominate" to "select"
- in the last sentence of the Appointment section, add "vote and a" prior to "record of the vote"
- move the last sentence of the Appointment section to before the second to last sentence

The College of Nursing currently has two Associate Deans who are also department chairs. They are not acting or interim for either position. A friendly amendment is proposed to remove "(e.g., as interim or acting)" and replace with a comma.

Motion to call the question carries. Motion made to approve as amended. Motion seconded and passes unanimously. The revised resolution will read:

Resolution 2007-08-05 Appointment and Evaluation of School Directors and Department Chairs (Revised)

Whereas, the University of Central Florida seeks to sustain growth, productivity and excellence in education and research,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate endorses the following guidelines for appointment and evaluation of directors and department chairs.

All schools/departments must have a full-time director/department chair.

Service Eligibility

A school/department's director/chair serves a term of five years although the appointment is renewable annually. Normally, a director/department chair will not serve more than two successive five-year terms. Except under special circumstances. ~~(e.g., as interim or acting)~~no one with another administrative appointment should serve concurrently as a director/department chair, and no director/department chair should serve concurrently in any other administrative position.

Where an outside faculty member is considered for director/department chair appointment, customary academic search procedures should be followed.

Appointment

Each college dean, upon consultation with that college's faculty, will establish a procedure for the appointment and reappointment of directors/department chairs. After due consideration, as hiring agent, the dean will ~~nominate~~select a candidate for director/department chair, whose appointment is subject to approval by the provost and the president. College procedures require a vote and a record of the vote for appointment and reappointment. Eligible voters on appointments include all tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty and full-time clinical faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above but eligibility may be extended at the college level by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. ~~College procedures require a record of the vote for appointment and reappointment.~~

Review & Reappointment

The faculty of the school/department will evaluate directors/department chairs annually. Department/school faculty and others whom the dean deems appropriate will conduct the review. A full review for reappointment will take place during the fifth year. The dean at his or her own initiative or as a consequence of a request by the school/department faculty can institute an interim review.

NEW BUSINESS
Faculty Mentoring Program – *Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine*
Dr. Huff-Corzine presented information on the new Faculty Mentoring Program. Mentoring can help faculty performance in all areas of their jobs and leads to increased job satisfaction and reduced turnover. Colleges and departments are in the best position to provide this mentoring, and the UCF initiative is designed to work in concert with the already existing programs. UCF held a new faculty focus group on mentoring and looked at best practices from across the country. The best practices include several things already occurring at UCF, including promotion and tenure workshops, orientation to the college and for promotion and tenure, an annual meeting between junior faculty and the dean and/or chair including an annual performance evaluation (some units do this, but not all.) A mentoring program does not have to be one-on-one; individuals can have multiple mentors and mentees. Faculty Relations has started a small grants program for colleges. Three $5000 grants will be awarded for implementing new mentoring programs. The intention is to offer three grants each year. A committee will evaluate proposals. Dr. Huff-Corzine is seeking three additional faculty volunteers for the committee. Tammie Kaufman, Michelle Kelley, and Jeff Kaplan volunteered to serve. Dr. David Kuhn noted that good mentoring programs can also help attract job candidates.

Online Grading Update - *Registrar Dennis Dulniak*

Dr. Dulniak offered an update on the participation rates for online grading for fall 2008 and plans for spring 2009 online grading. In fall, 71% of faculty participated in online grading. The remaining 28% used paper grading, and the Registrar's Office needs help to get the word out to them, as paper grading will no longer be available starting in spring 2009. Survey results were overall very positive. Of faculty surveyed, 96% said that the online grade roster was easy to access, and 86% did not require assistance to complete the roster.

A question was raised about whether paper records are needed at college level. The Registrar's Office does not require them, and they are working to enable colleges to see the information online so they won't need paper records either.

A senator spoke about facing issues with uploading grades on the final day. The registrar noted that although the process is fairly smooth, a significant number of simultaneous users can cause challenges. They are working on correcting that.

Potential Changes to Add/Drop Policy – *Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar*
The add/drop policy may change from five days of add/drop to four days of add/drop and the fifth day will only be for adding classes. A benefit to this is that it will reduce class shopping on last day and allow classes to be fuller. The proposal has been discussed with all affected parties, including faculty, students, advisors, and financial aid, and the response has been overwhelmingly in favor of the change. This change will be piloted in the summer.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
Budget and Administrative – *Dr. LiKamWa reporting*
The committee is working on a draft of best practices for textbook affordability. The draft will be submitted to the steering committee for discussion at the next steering meeting.

Personnel – *Dr. Chakrabarti reporting*
The committee is working on revised promotion and tenure guidelines. These will hopefully be completed at the next committee meeting so the guidelines can be presented to the senate.

Graduate Council – *Dr. Mohapatra reporting*
- Appeals and Awards Committee – The committee met three times and reviewed 10+ student petitions per meeting
- Curriculum Committee - The committee met four times and reviewed 25+ course action and special topics requests per meeting. New tracks were approved for MS in Engineering and EdD Educational Leadership program. Revisions were approved for the MFA in Film and Digital Media, Visual Language and Interactive Media track; PhD Conservation Biology tracks; MS in Accounting; MS in Taxation; MA Instructional Technology/Media e-Learning track; e-Learning Professional Development Certificate. The committee approved the renaming of the MA in Early Childhood Development to the MS degree and the suspension of the MEd in Early Childhood Education.
- Policy Committee – The committee met five times. It approved course category definitions for: Formal (class room/distant learning), Directed Research, Independent

Study, Doctoral Research, .Internship, etc. The committee approved revisions to the MS and PhD Programs Policies/Requirements and to the Transfer Credit Policy

- <u>Program Review Committee</u> – The committee met four times. It approved an MS program in Health Care Informatics. Program Review Procedures are under discussion.

<u>Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee</u> – *Dr. Pennington reporting*
The committee approved 41 program changes. Dr. Pennington noted that meeting attendance has been excellent this year, and thanked the members of the UPCC and UCRC for their efforts.

OTHER BUSINESS
Dr. Chopra relayed three points of information:

The archive of senate minutes is now available on the senate website.

The Board of Governor's lawsuit against the legislature regarding setting tuition will move forward. The judge has ruled that there is standing for the suit.

Two of the colleges have new deans. Dr. Bahaa Saleh is the new dean for the College of Optics and Photonics and Dr. Marwan Simaan is the new dean for the College of Engineering and Computer Science.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to adjourn made at 5:47. Motion seconded and approved.

Faculty Perception of Instruction

Purpose: This form provides an opportunity to document and contextualize your instructional experiences this semester before receiving your Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) results. Your responses can be compared with student responses to assist with interpretation of SPoI results. You have the option to share your Faculty Perception of Instruction (FPoI) with your chair or others. Your participation is completely voluntary.

Instructions: Please answer each question based on your current semester experiences. You can provide additional information in the Comments boxes. Within the Comments boxes, you can specify the course(s) to which you are referring.

1. In general, I <u>prefer</u> teaching courses that are

   a. Face-to-face

   b. Interactive TV (ITV)

   c. Web-mediated [partly online; partly face-to-face (M)]

   d. Fully online (W)

   e. Video streaming

   f. FEEDS

   g. Labs

   h. Clinical

   i. I have no preference.

Comments

2. In general, the students had adequate background knowledge and preparation for the course(s) I taught.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

Comments

3. Overall, the students showed great effort to learn.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

Comments

4. In general, the students showed interest in what was being taught in the course(s).

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

Comments

5. The physical facilities and/or equipment, used for teaching, worked well throughout the semester.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

Comments

6. Please describe the degree of control you had over course management decisions such as objectives, text(s), exams, etc.

Comments

7. If an ITV class, my classroom was (choose ONE of the following):

a. the site from which the course was broadcast some weeks and the site to which the

course was transmitted other weeks

b. the site from which the course was broadcast most every class

c. the site to which the course was transmitted most every class

Comments

8. Please describe any characteristics or circumstance(s) during the semester, including the way the courses were presented, that impacted the effectiveness of your instruction.

Comments

9. What do you think went particularly well with your course(s)?

Comments

10. What aspects of the instruction could have been improved?

Comments

Student Perception of Instruction (W)

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

All responses are anonymous. The results will be shared with the instructor after the semester is over.

Section I. Student Items

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

1. In general, I <u>prefer</u> 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

Comments

2. Which of the following is the <u>most</u> important reason you took this course?

    a. I had to

    b. I wanted to

    c. I had to <u>and </u>I wanted to

Comments

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

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. I had no preference

    d. mostly false

    e. absolutely false

Comments

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

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. I had no preference

    d. mostly false

    e. absolutely false

Comments

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

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

e. not applicable

```
Comments



```

6. The grade I expect to receive in 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

```
Comments



```

Section II: W Course Items

W1. I completed the online requirements including discussions as assigned.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

> Comments

W2. I spent a total of ___ hours per week on this class.

    a. 3 or less

    b. 4-6

    c. 7-9

    d. more than 9

> Comments

W3. The WebCourses site was easy to navigate.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

> Comments

W4. Access problems (server down or very slow) with WebCourses were minimal and did not impact my ability to complete assignments.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely false

Comments

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

7. The instructor provided a syllabus.

    a. Yes

    b. No

> Comments

8. The instructor provided information about how grades are determined.

    a. Yes

    b. No

> Comments

9. The instructor provided a course schedule.

    a. Yes

    b. No

> Comments

10. The required course materials (for example texts, articles, online resources, art supplies, computer programs) helped me learn the course content.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

d. absolutely false

e. not applicable

Comments

11. The assignments helped me learn the course content.

a. absolutely true

b. mostly true

c. mostly false

d. absolutely false

Comments

12. The instructor was available to assist me at prearranged times outside of class either online or in person.

a. absolutely true

b. mostly true

c. mostly false

d. absolutely true

Comments

13. The instructor was well organized.

a. absolutely true

b. mostly true

c. mostly false

d. absolutely true

```
 Comments




```

14. The instructor displayed enthusiasm for teaching this class.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely true

```
 Comments




```

15. The instructor communicated the importance and significance of the subject matter.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely true

```
 Comments




```

16. The instructor communicated ideas and/or information clearly.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely true

Comments

17. On average, I received feedback on the class assignments from the instructor

     a. within one week

     b. within two weeks

     c. within three weeks

     d. by the end of the semester

Comments

18. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to ask questions.

     a. absolutely true

     b. mostly true

     c. mostly false

     d. absolutely true

Comments

19. The instructor answered student questions.

     a. absolutely true

     b. mostly true

     c. mostly false

     d. absolutely true

> Comments
>
>

20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express their ideas.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely true

> Comments
>
>

21. Overall, this faculty member was an effective instructor.

    a. absolutely true

    b. mostly true

    c. mostly false

    d. absolutely true

> Comments
>
>

22. What did you like best about the way this faculty member taught this course?

> Comments
>
>

23. What suggestions do you have for this faculty member to improve this course?

Comments

February 9, 2009

Fellow Faculty Senators:

Two and a half years ago, a Faculty Senate ad hoc committee was tasked with the development of a revised Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI). This was an outgrowth of a study by a faculty committee examining academic rigor. This study identified the important role the SPoI played in faculty evaluation as well as the deficiencies of the current form and process.

The ad hoc committee solicited input from members of the Faculty Senate about how the SPoI form and process needed to be modified. Multiple tools used at other universities were also reviewed.

As the committee's work progressed, it received feedback via the Faculty Senate from both senators and faculty in the colleges and units. In addition**,** draft versions of the SPoI questions were reviewed by members of the Student Government Association. Students also participated in a focus group in which every item was reviewed for clarity and validity after students completed draft versions of the revised SPoI question sets.

The SPoI question sets (presented in an electronic delivery format for convenience) were piloted by faculty in four colleges (CAH, CON, CoE, COS). The twelve faculty who participated in this pilot had one or more sections of their classes complete the draft SPoI. The resulting data were from graduate and undergraduate programs, upper and lower division courses and web, web mediated**,** and face-to face delivery modalities. In addition, students in this SPoI pilot provided feedback about the clarity of the items and ease of use of the new format.

Further revisions were made to the SPoI drafts based on this extensive input. Three proposed versions are presented for your review and, we hope, approval**:**

- SPoI for face to face or ITV classes**; and**

- SPoI for web mediated classes (M classes)**;** and

- SPoI for fully web**-**based classes (W classes).

SPoIs for newly developed course delivery modalities such as those used by CBA and CECS (e.g. video on demand) are in their final edits. Sections 1 and 3 will be the same with modifications in Section 2 to reflect the specific course delivery modality.

Please note that students would complete only the SPoI version which reflects the mode of delivery of their particular class section.

The committee is also proposing an analysis process which will go beyond raw student response data. This analysis would correlate the student information in Section One with the course delivery and faculty evaluation responses in Sections Two and Three. This is expected to put student responses in context. For example, responses from students who prefer web-based teaching but were in a face-to face class could be analyzed separately from responses of those who prefer face-to-face classes. And responses of students who choose a particular faculty member could be examined separately from those who did not or could not make such a choice.

The fourth document attached is a proposed optional Faculty Perception of Instruction (FPoI) form. The FPoI is designed for faculty to use at the end of each semester to document characteristics of particular course offerings. This form is intended for the personal use of the faculty who would have the option of providing it to their chair during the evaluation process.

The SPoI ad hoc committee looks forward to receiving your feedback so needed revisions of the SPoI can be completed?

SPoI Ad Hoc Committee

Diane Wink, Chair
Tace Crouse
Richard Harrison
Bernadette Jungblut
Charlene Stinard

Budget and Administrative Procedures Subcommittee Report on Textbook Affordability[1]

February 2009

1) State law regulates that textbook information (title, author[s], year/edition, publisher, and ISBN number) be made available to students at least 30 days (Note: actual deadline to be established to insure compliance) prior to commencement of the semester in which the book(s) will be used. Instructors of courses must provide such information to the bookstore, which, in turn, will make the information available to students so they may shop for books to obtain the best price.

2) When practical, in Departments where multiple sections of the same course are routinely taught, the bookstore should be advised of this with the idea that the same book could be used across course sections and semesters. It is acknowledged that not all disciplines are amenable to using the same textbook for multiple sections because in some disciplines, the breadth of the course content is too extensive (which means, instructors have discretionary power to emphasize [i.e., teach] some topics while ignoring other topics). Also, in some disciplines, the subject matter for a course can be approached and studied from diverse orientations or perspectives. Instructors would retain the freedom to select books approached from an orientation consistent with their own preference.

3) Instructors should be cognizant of book costs when adopting books by proactively doing the following:

   a. Inquiring from book publishers (prior to adopting a book) the expected retail cost of the book(s) to students (retail price includes bookstore add-on costs).

   b. Considering ways to reduce the cost of the book(s) under consideration (e.g., ordering paperback instead of hardbound, de-bundling materials, using "loose-leaf" editions, black and white books, etc.).

   c. Only adopting books or materials that will be used or needed by the students.

   d. Considering the feasibility of assigning previous editions of books. It is acknowledged that the issue of adopting a new edition can be complicated by various pedagogical and market factors (e.g., some instructors may want books that contain the latest information for their course. Also, the bookstore must be able to obtain enough previous-edition books for all students if the instructor wishes to continue using an "out-dated" edition of the book).

   e. Consider using "customized" textbooks, if feasible, to lower costs of books. It is noted that customized textbooks often are "consumable"

---

[1] Some of these practices are based on recommendations from other sources, such as the Minnesota Office of Higher Education, the Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability Report (OPPAGA; Florida Legislature), and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC).

products and often will not be bought back by the bookstore due to a lack of a national market for custom books.

4) If permitted by law or publishing company policies, instructors may consider placing one or more copies (e.g., their "complimentary" copies) of the assigned book on reserve in the university library.

5) Students should be informed by instructors that books may be less expensive from private bookstores and from on-line bookstores compared to the university-affiliated bookstore. It is noted that a consequence of less books sold at the university-affiliated bookstore is less revenue to the university.

6) Establish a university-wide textbook advisory committee whose function will be to monitor the implementation of textbook affordability best practices and recommend modifications to the university's collective efforts at lowering textbook costs. The committee should meet at least once per academic year or semester to address on-going concerns.