Faculty Senate
Steering Committee Meeting
Millican Hall, room 395E
Minutes of **February 7, 2019**

William Self, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of January 17, 2019 was made and seconded. Motion to correct a name spelling error. The minutes were approved as amended.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Joe Adams, Communications Director, Office of the Provost
Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director, Faculty Excellence
Jana Jasinski, Vice Provost for Faculty Excellence
Melody Bowdon, Interim Vice Provost for the Division of Teaching and Learning and Dean of the College of Undergraduate College
Christine Dellert, Deputy Chief of Staff for Communications and Operations, Office of the President
Dale Whittaker, President
Ann Miller, Interim Director, Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Dr. Self yielded the floor to President Dale Whittaker for an update.

Trevor Colbourn Hall
President Whittaker indicated that his goal from the beginning of the misuse of funds for Trevor Colbourn Hall was to be as transparent as possible. Recapped what has transpired to date and the findings of the independent investigation by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner. Discussed the actions taken from the beginning to date including hiring Accenture and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) for board governance. The Florida House of Representatives Public Integrity and Ethics Committee is expanding the investigation and approved subpoenas for fourteen previous and current employees. The university has removed all legislative budget requests for the year. Dr. Self added that chairman Marchena stepped down as the chair of the Board of Trustees, but is still serving as a board member. Robert Garvy is currently serving as the interim chairman. President Whittaker indicated that the university has already been punished with four senior administers losing their jobs, the President Emeritus ending his contract, and the Board of Trustees Chairman stepping down. Since President Whittaker was part of the leadership team as provost and had a heightened expectation of asking questions in his role as executive vice president, he forfeited his performance bonuses for the two years he served as provost and executive vice president.

Question: Are you looking at other systems or processes in place with the previous administration that might have similar risks?
Answer: After 22 years, President Hitt and Vice President Merck had tremendous trust. As provost, I believed in the trust John Hitt had in Merck. It's too easy to stop asking hard questions. It's the culture of "don't bring me problems, bring me solutions" which is very different than my way of discussing the rationale, risk, and push the envelope with a clear eye and head. The culture occurred mainly in facilities, up to finance and accounting. We are changing the organizational structure, the operational model, and the culture.

Comment: As a member of the Budget and Administrative Committee in the past, we asked Facilities why service was so slow. They would tell us of millions of dollars in life safety issues and renovations were needed without funding. Hopefully, the serious safety issues have been taken care of by now.
Response: President Whittaker indicated that UCF has a lot to look at. The question is, how did UCF find $10 million dollars every year, followed by $18 million dollars to put toward UCF Global or Trevor Colbourn Hall? As the provost, that is what is frustrating. Where did the money come from when UCF couldn't do the basic maintenance? We will be budgeting in a very different way going forward with transparency and involvement of the deans.

Question: What is your thought on the Board of Governors comment that UCF is growing too fast for its resources?
Answer: For construction, Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO) funds are currently under $50 million for the State University System which would be less than $5 million for each university to erect a new building. In the past, PECO funds were about $300 million and bonded. This is a serious problem for universities. The bigger challenge is when you take a careful look at our budget and you attribute costs, the best way we can right now, across the lower division, upper division, masters, and doctoral hours. The upper division (junior, senior) on a per credit basis breaks even for about a million credit hours. About a half million credits at the lower division level generate about $40 million dollars which offsets the doctoral 35,000 credit hours which costs more. When we grew from 2008 to 2014, with no growth funding or preeminence, we were quickly lowering the dollar per student spent. It wasn't being invested in faculty and the student to faculty ratio raised to over 30/1. Why do we have a million upper level and only a half million lower-level credits? This is due to Direct Connect. Direct Connect has been an excellent program to save the State, students, and their family's money and for UCF in providing diversity and access. The State colleges are underfunded as well. We are at the point where we need to take a careful look at the budget model and seriously consider not admitting any more students in the next couple of years. This year we admitted about 19,200 students. If we maintain 19,200 admitted students every year and gain performance and emerging preeminence funding, we can spend a couple of years investing that in infrastructure, quality, and excellence. We may want to collectively think and talk about pausing growth for a couple of years and continue to increase revenue in order to spend more dollars per student.

Question: If the Educational & General (E&G) funds were not moved, what could have been done with the $85 million, and what can they be used for now? Let's do something positive.
Answer: The $85 million was replaced by auxiliary and interest earnings. Even though the funds were replaced, they are less flexible now since they were given back E&G funds. We should probably budget next year so we have no carryforward, less the reserve requirement.

Question: Where did the funds for the $40 million Constellation Fund come from and why?
Answer: First, it was an acknowledgment that we needed to reset carryforward. It had accumulated too high which resulted in UCF being out of alignment with other universities. Being sensitive to how the funds were paid from student tuition and State appropriated funds, we decided to set the funds aside for scholarships. Scholarship funds come back to the university in the form of tuition, the cost of education flows into the normal university budget model. At first, it was $20 million, however, I encouraged the group to go as far as possible. We decided on the $40 million to gain one more point in the performance funding metric for the cost to the student. We were one of the institutions that provided the least amount of institutional funds and scholarships to our students. Since the university didn't want to provide one-year scholarships, the Board of Governors indicated that the scholarship fund can carryforward annually. It's really about $10 million a year if used for a 4-year scholarship, or $20 million a year if used for 2-year scholarships, and if used for graduate fellowships, it's much less. The provost and the deans have been working on plans to prioritize the types of scholarships that would increase 4-year graduation rates, reduce student debt, and help low-income students stay in school. The committee is still working on the use of the funds. The Governors also asked if the university was careful in planning priorities such as considering faculty, information technology, library, and other priorities. The university considered these priorities and will go back and review the priorities again. For example, the university prepaid the Oracle software contracts for six-years, and all of the new faculty hired on start-up contracts were placed in a separate commitment line. We should make sure that the buildings we currently have are well maintained and do the most with what we have, which means budgeting for maintenance.

Question: How long will the moratorium on new construction be in effect, and how will the moratorium impact the ongoing renovations of the library?
Answer: The moratorium will continue until the President feels comfortable knowing where UCF stands and will work with the Board of Trustees on the moratorium. We have no idea if UCF will have a financial penalty for the misused funds, and UCF can't plan without knowing. I'm hoping the moratorium can be lifted by May. The library renovation is being completed with CITF funds, and we should probably at least consider an exception. Right now everything is a no unless a really good argument is presented and we will ensure that the Board of Trustees have that rationale and arguments and support the decision.

Comment: Dr. Self indicated that he has a meeting with Dean Piñeres and Gordon Chavis regarding the Constellation fund on February 14. Asked the group for ideas with the rationale on how to spend fellowship or scholarship funds. The Senate office will send an email to Steering to solicit ideas. Dr. Self gave the example of a program for students to complete an Engineering and Biomedical Sciences degree which requires 147 credits to complete.
Response: President Whittaker indicated that although they are looking at $40 million this year, he hopes that another $10 million will be budgeted next year.

Comment: Delaying the construction of buildings will affect the students. Suggested a plan be devised based on the university needs – not individual colleges.
Response: President Whittaker indicated that the prioritization and planning of buildings were primarily done by Facilities. Two years ago as provost we started the Facilities Budget Committee with academic input into the prioritization. We can't save money and invest in capital. Each year, the university goes into the political process of competing for PECO money. This year, PECO funds are under $50 million dollars which could result in one or maybe two facilities being built for the State University System. UCF has been able to solve part of the problem with P3 type buildings in which someone else builds the building with private funding and UCF leases the space. That is what is happening with the downtown dormitory facility in which the bottom five floors will be academic. UCF has a plan and has money that can be used to repair and renovate. We can't proceed with any project over $2 million. This means we don't have the authority to replace the mathematics and biology buildings air handlers that cost $5 to $8 million each.

Comment: As a psychologist, I get a sense that this challenge has impacted faculty, staff, and students adversely. It's had a dampening effect of the momentum of the university. Is there a time where we can have a plan in place to redirect or make changes in respect to momentum to be more positive about what is going on?
Response: We will be having an inauguration on February 26 for the UCF family. President Whittaker is excited and hopeful for the future. We have tried to message the positive, but people need the truth and the impact. What you are saying is extremely important, but we have too many mixed messages right now that people don't know what to believe.
Comment: It's incumbent on faculty and staff in a leadership position to manifest that hopeful and optimistic outlook.
Comment: Everyone at UCF has been affected adversely, individually. Fixing the problem is paramount, but how do you reach each and every individual for meaning.
Response: President Whittaker welcomes any thoughts, but does not want it to come across as artificial. I don't think UCF knows the end of the impact yet. The President isn't sure what can be said until we know the impact. Once we know, we can be clear about the impact and have a strong collective plan to achieve excellence.
Comment: Since your hiring as provost, we have been hoping that you would be able to fix many of the structural issues within the University which includes UCF being underfunded in order to do our jobs. But then we see big initiatives like downtown, the medical school, and other big things instead of investing in the main campus. The provost

forums seemed to be more about putting things on display then listening. Maybe you can go back out to the colleges and do listening sessions and ask how they want money spent and what are their priorities? You meet with the deans regularly, but I have more access to you than my own dean. I would like to see more openness, the flow of ideas, accountability, and to invest in what is already here.

Response: President Whittaker indicated that 85% of UCF's new recurring funds went into faculty growth with the other 15% for staff to support the positions. This has been the case for the past four years. Many of the big initiatives were one-time funds. The cancer center building resulted in the occupants paying and UCF gets free space. For the hospital, Hospital Corporation of America (HCA) is paying $175 million dollars and will cost UCF nothing. For Downtown, we raised $20 million, the State allocated $20 million, and the remaining $20 million came from non-recurring funds. Before UCF builds another building, we need to budget the funds that can be used for renovation and fix and utilize what we have first. Noted the Morgridge building as an example, but would like to see it used more often. Noted that finding forums for listening sessions was an excellent recommendation.

Comment: A member noted that faculty must pay to use the Morgridge Center, otherwise they would use it more often.

Response: President Whittaker wondered why we charge internal departments and what the business model is for Morgridge. This is the time to dig into everything.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST
Hispanic Serving Institution
The Federal Government now recognizes UCF as a Hispanic serving institution. UCF is 6th in the nation in awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanic students.

Rankings
The American Research Universities Annual Report ranked UCF in the top 26 public research universities. This is one of the two metrics for preeminence.

Faculty and Student Success
We decided to put in place a model to use carryforward funds to continue to hire faculty for the colleges that don't have the 35% for the cluster hire faculty start-up. Once we reach preeminence we will have more funds to continue to hire faculty. We are making sure we meet the need now.

UCF continues to not have enough lab space for students. This results in the first time in college students not taking the right courses because they aren't being offered. The Provost has been working with Dean Johnson and Dr. Jasinski regarding the high need courses in physics, math, and chemistry and will provide temporary funding. Dean Johnson is proposing a sustainable model for the future.

Timely Completion
Interim Dean Bowdon and the team are sponsoring the timely completion initiative. This initiative makes sure a student starts in the right courses, stays on track, and to provide funds to ensure courses needed to graduate on time are available.

Constellation Fund
The university identified $40 million dollars for student scholarships. This initiative has to go before the Board of Trustees for approval. The committee is still working on recommendations and soliciting feedback. There may be other needs the trustees want to review, and the Board of Governors made it clear last week that the Board of Trustees must have input in how carryforward funds are spent.

Question: Politically, it seems like the goal post keeps moving for preeminence and performance funding. Is the Board of Governors committed? Will it be around long enough to make it, or is this a shell game?
Answer: It is a shell game. They did change the 6-year graduate rate to 4-year graduate rate which resulted in UCF getting $15 million less. The goals do move, but UCF should stay the course.

Comment: If the university pauses on growth, maybe the university can pause on some of the larger university goals to meet some of the smaller ones to focus on the faculty and staff.
Response: When you hear preeminence and performance funding it doesn't mean much. It's more about what the funding helps each individual.
Comment: It's more about the faculty hearing the administration say that we have all of these big ideas and how hard everyone is working. It would be better if the administration acknowledged what has happened and that we might put some plans on hold for you to recover from this instead of the business as usual. Maybe the constellation fund could address some of this.

OLD BUSINESS
Ad Hoc Committee Report on Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility
We talked about the Ad Hoc Committee report at the last meeting but did not accept the report.

Motion and second to accept the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility. Dr. Self reviewed and discussed the recommendations of the committee.

Comment: The third recommendation is really two different issues and may be overwhelming. In addition, the survey is technically already optional. It was determined that the task force to be formed can separate the issues in the third recommendation.

Comment: The SPoI survey does evaluate an important aspect of teaching, do students trust you, and are you being fair. If the questions were limited to the pertinent questions and the students could see the results by an instructor, it would be taken more seriously.
Question: What are the details and deadlines of the task force?
Answer: Dr. Self noted that the Ad Hoc committee is making the recommendation that a task force is formed to the Steering Committee. Dr. Self distributed a draft resolution to the members to determine if the recommendations in the report should be formalized in a resolution. Discussed how the University of Florida re-wrote the core questions and

allows the colleges/departments to add area specific questions to the list. The university also provides for faculty feedback on the evaluations.

Comment: Students in a large 400+ online course have no idea how many students are in the course, resulting in assumptions and negatively react to a low number of written assignments.

Motion and second to accept the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Student Perception of Instruction Accessibility. Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to add Resolution 2018-2019-12 Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility and Improvements to the February 21 Senate agenda. Open for discussion.

Motion and second to amend line 26:
>   Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate ~~Steering Ad Hoc Committee on SPoI Accessibility~~ recommends the ~~following~~ administration carry-out the following:

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to amend line 37:
>   Form a Task Force to include the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, students from SGA, administration, Center for Distributed Learning, faculty senators, and faculty to review

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to add the amended Resolution 2018-2019-12 Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility and Improvements to the February 21 Senate Agenda.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Teaching Workload
Teaching workload is still a high issue as noted at the November Senate meeting and the COACHE, Nature of Work – Teaching results distributed with the agenda. We have received requests regarding data analysis of the size of course sections growing. The university made decisions to spend money in ways that have impacted teaching workload in a negative way. Dr. Self explained that instead of adding a new section as enrollment grows, the same faculty member teaches a larger section in a bigger room.

Question: Is it true that the College of Business has a course of 2,000 students but only 500 are in the class while the others have to watch from the monitor?
Response: The College of Business has some active learning courses where they can watch the lectures later.

Dr. Self noted that it all comes down to the budget and faculty need more oversight of the budget. The deans haven't been privy to the budget decisions and they need to be involved. We now have two faculty members on the University Budget and the University Facilities Budget committee that should probably be doubled to bring more faculty voice. There has been very little faculty involvement in the enrollment management team and as the chair of the Senate, I will keep advocating for this change.

Comment: Teaching support, particularly graduate teaching assistants and undergraduate graders are needed.
Response: Dr. Self indicated that teaching support is not budgeted and is often paid for by OPS money to support critical courses. The university needs to find a better way to support teaching assistants.
Comment: Heard that the Chemistry department was approved to use a materials and supply fee to support teaching assistants.
Response: It was attempted, but not approved. The Audit Department indicated it was not allowed.

Question: Teaching load does not seem fair. For example, a department may have a faculty member teaching 500 students in a class and they are on a 40% teaching, 50% research, and 10% service contract. Yet another faculty member with 5 students in a class has the same 40% teaching, 50% research, and 10% service contract.
Comment: It's not addressed in our department, it's an inequitable division of labor and nobody wants to discuss the issue.
Comment: Our school has a differentiated effort.
Comment: This is done differently by each department.
Dr. Self encouraged faculty to attend the bargaining sessions. The union has introduced new language regarding workloads. Dr. Self believes the percentages are determined by the chair of the department.

NEW BUSINESS
Resolution 2018-2019-11 Statement of Civil and Inclusive Discourse in the Campus Environment
In 2017-2018, the Senate passed a resolution endorsing the University of Chicago Statement on Freedom of Expression. After the passage, some faculty were concerned about the language contained in the resolution. A broad Ad Hoc Committee was formed including faculty, Faculty Senate chair, Office of Institutional Equity, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Student Involvement, Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, Student Development and Enrollment Services, General Counsel's Office, and the Student Government Association to discuss both the role of faculty in freedom of expression and how to deal with the recently passed legislation that impacts UCF. The Ad Hoc Committee did not recommend that the original resolution is rescinded, but instead has brought forward Resolution 2018-2019-11 Statement of Civil and Inclusive Discourse in the Campus Environment to supplement the original resolution.

Motion and second the place Resolution 2018-2019-11 Statement of Civil and Inclusive Discourse in the Campus Environment on the February 21 Senate agenda. Open for discussion.

Comment: The concern wasn't so much over the language in the previous resolution as the incomplete language. The previous resolution didn't account for our institutional values that may go beyond freedom of expression. The intent was not to replace the resolution or to re-prioritize the language but to add a supplement that is an expression of values. We are not calling for a policy or regulation and received good guidance from General Counsel to ensure we weren't violating a legal responsibility including new laws passed.   The other concern was over the previous support of the Chicago Statement that was accompanied by other efforts that were troublesome.

Comment: Concern over the new resolution is that it does contradict language in the previous resolution. If the new resolution is the values we want to expresses, then it might be more appropriate to rescind the original version.   There is a difference in prioritization. The original resolutions states concerns about civility cannot hinder freedom of expression, where the supplemental resolution suggests that concerns about freedom of expression cannot undermine civility. Similarly, the original statement allows for restrictions of free speech solely on the grounds that are firmly established and legal precedent. The supplemental statement provides for some additional limitations and does restrict freedom of speech. The supplemental resolution also states that the Senate rejects certain types of speech and that can have a chilling effect on speech. It implies there are certain types of speech the Senate would want to discourage. The original resolution indicates it's not the role of an institution to make judgments about whether speech is offensive or not. The point is, the speech is legally protected.
Response: If we agree that it's not legally restricting, it really comes down to if you support these values and think these are the Senate's values. We should move this to the Senate floor for a healthy debate.
Comment: Debate will never end on this topic. This resolution versus the last resolution won't really change anything on campus.
Response: Other faculty members on campus feel this should be addressed.
Comment: Also concerned about the practical point of the resolution. Concerned this will be confusing if passed as to what are the faculties' obligations. As written, there is no way UCF could implement the statement as a policy.

Question called.

Vote: too close to call. Hand vote: 6 in favor, 7 opposed, remaining abstained; motion fails.

New Lockheed Martin-Sand Lake Educational Site
This update is postponed until the March meeting.

2019-2020 Academic Calendar and Religious Holidays
This item is postponed until the March meeting.

Senate Service and Accountability
This item is postponed until the March meeting.

LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORTS
Postponed until the March meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS
None

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Ad Hoc Committee Report -
Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility

The Ad Hoc Committee met September 28, 2018 with the following members in attendance: William Self, chair; Kevin Coffey, CECS; Reshawna Chapple, CHPS; Zhongzhou Chen, COS; Eric Main, FCTL; Silvana Sidhom, SGA Graduate Studies senator; Jesse Slomowitz, SGA CAH senator.

OVERVIEW

The new SPOI questions were approved by the Faculty Senate in 2013. On November 20, 2013 the Faculty Senate approved the SPoI results to be posted online. In August 2017, the Student Government Association (SGA) approached the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to make the SPoI data more accessible to students by putting the data in myUCF, and in an easier format for students to review a particular faculty member. The Steering Committee assigned the issue to the Information Technology Committee for 2017-2018. The committee discussed the issue within the committee and with faculty within the colleges. See Minutes of 9-25-2017, 1-9-2018, 1-22-2018, and 2-13-2018. The committee determined that the SPoI data is currently available on the UCF IT website and no change was recommended.

In August 2018, the SGA presented Resolution 50-57 Increasing Transparency of Student Perception of Instruction Surveys requesting the Faculty Senate make the SPoI data more readily available for transparency. SGA discussed the University of Florida's system called GatorRater which is available to all faculty and staff. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee formed an Ad Hoc Committee to address the issue.

ISSUE

Dr. Self talked to Dr. Chris Hass, Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and Dr. John Jordi in the Office of Faculty Development and Teaching Excellence who oversees GatorRater at the University of Florida. Dr. Hass indicated that Rice University was one of the first universities to allow access to the results and linked to the schedule of courses. The University of Florida developed an in-house program available to the public and is searchable by instructor or course. The university deployed GatorRater, a customized program offered by Explorance Blue that allows faculty and staff to log-in for more details funded by a Technology Fee grant. Florida State University has a similar system. Due to faculty concerns regarding bad questions, questions leading to bias, questions geared more to evaluating the instructor instead of the course, the University of Florida developed a long list of standard optional questions in addition to the core questions. The colleges and potentially the departments can choose to add five additional questions to the evaluation in addition to the core questions based on the college/department need. It took the university two years to review the questions. The university will be adding a mid-term evaluation option. The university is now piloting the improved and customized evaluation university-wide. To encourage participation, the university allows students to receive their grades a week early for those students that completed the evaluations. Those students that didn't complete the evaluation have to

wait to access grades. Once the surveys are past due, Canvas is shut down to not allow access to grades until the survey is complete.

DISCUSSION
Below is a summary of the issues raised during discussion:
- The Collegiate Cyber Defense Club (also known as Hack@UCF) is willing to take SPoI on as a small project.
- The university needs to own the information versus students placing the information on the website. The students, faculty, and administration need the SPoI data.
- SPoI results are already available to the public online at [UCF IT](#). The data is hard to find and contained in a 15,000-page Adobe pdf and an Excel .cvs format. Sometimes the web site goes down.
- SPoI doesn't relate to learning, subjected to bias, and if provided to students without context, the data can skew a student's impression of a course.
- Concerned that the completion of the SPoI for students is forced under the wrong conditions and time. Because of the timing, students Christmas tree the responses in order to continue.
- Faculty value the feedback, but the current system contains SPoI data errors due to multiple instructors or teaching assistants.
- The Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning would like to form focus groups and provide surveys to identify improvement opportunities.
- SPoI can be emotional as it can impact faculty promotion and tenure. Need a long-term vision for the questions. In the short-term we need to show integrity and not hide the data.
- Some faculty will feel threatened if the results are in the course search for scheduling.
- The issue is to make the information more readily accessible for students which is already public and being used by students and the faculty; can improve it later.
- Concerned that SPoI results will get pushed to be easily accessible with no plan to improve the questions.
- Students already use Rate my professor and ask other friends about courses and professors.
- Want a continuous effort to improve the process, make the information useful to students and faculty in order to interpret the data correctly.
- Outside of grade distributions, the SPoI data is the only readily available data to chairs and an over reliance on the data can have negative consequences.
- The weakness of SPoI is the low response rate. We need to add a "carrot" to encourage completion.
- In the next year faculty will be required to enter all grades in gradebook. This eliminates a potential "carrot" of accessing grades.

- Don't want punitive punishment to students for non-completion. The SPoI has to be meaningful to students. If the results are available at course scheduling, more students will respond. Better to pop-up as a reminder to allow the students to complete later under less stressful circumstances with only x times to bypass.
- Many students take the evaluation seriously and want their voice heard.
- Currently students are not given information as to why and what is done with SPoI results. They are only sent an email requesting completion. With access and information, SPoI will be more meaningful to students and will have a purpose to complete the evaluations.
- Flaws in data when a faculty member teaches a course designed by a different faculty member.
- What is the University of Florida's response rate?

RECOMMENDATIONS
The Ad Hoc Committee made the following recommendations:
1. In response to student concerns, immediately make the Student Perception of Instruction Results easily accessible to students and faculty.
2. Make the evaluations optional to complete, even if for a pilot period with active reminders.
3. Create a Task Force to include the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, students from SGA, administration, and faculty to review questions, validity, and better way to evaluate teaching and define the role of SPoI in the evaluation.
4. Provide students with information to interpret the data and a disclaimer regarding bias.
5. Add a link to the email sent to students to the SPoI results so students have a purpose to complete.

Accepted by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on February 7, 2019.

Draft Resolution 2018-2019-X Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility and Improvements

Whereas, The Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) survey is primarily used to provide feedback to faculty in order to continually improve courses and teaching methods and is the primary data used by administrators to evaluate faculty teaching; and

Whereas, the revised online SPoI survey was approved by the Faculty Senate and Provost Waldrop in 2012. In 2013, the Faculty Senate approved publishing the average responses for all nine questions on the university website; and

Whereas, in 2017 and 2018, the Student Government Association made several requests to make the SPoI data available in a transparent manner and in a format easier to locate course and instructor information with information to make the data understandable; and to allow students the possibility to affect, reflect upon, and take responsibility for their own learning while providing important information for course enhancements; and

Whereas, many faculty believe the SPoI data does not relate to learning, is subjected to bias, and is provided to students without context which can skew a student's impression of a course; and

Whereas, many faculty believe the SPoI data contains data errors due to multiple instructors or teaching assistants, and due to other faculty members teaching a course designed by a different faculty member; therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate Steering Ad Hoc Committee on SPoI Accessibility recommends the following:
1. Short-Term
   a. Make the SPoI results easily accessible to students and faculty on myUCF.
   b. Provide students with information to interpret the data and a disclaimer regarding bias.
   c. Pilot making the evaluations optional to complete with active reminders.
   d. Add a link to the email sent to students to the SPoI results so students have a purpose to complete the survey.
2. Long-Term
   a. Form a Task Force to include the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, students from SGA, administration, faculty senators, and faculty to review questions, validity, recommend better methods to evaluate teaching, and define the role of SPoI in the evaluation.
   b. Submit a Technology Fee grant to purchase a software package to easily capture and report SPoI data.

Provost Update

February 2019

Dr. Elizabeth A. Dooley
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Path to 21ˢᵗ Century Preeminent Research University

- **HSI Designation**
  - 27.5% Hispanic-student enrollment (16,000 students)
  - 6ᵗʰ in the nation for awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanic students
  - Compete for federal funding to improve the educational programs for Hispanic and low-income students

- **Strong Public Research University Ranking**

- **Commitment to Faculty and Student Success**

- **Student Waitlists**

- **Timely Completion**

- **UCF Constellation Fund**

- **What's Next?**

UCF

THANK YOU

Resolution 2018-2019-12 Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Accessibility and Improvements

Whereas, The Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) survey is primarily used to provide feedback to faculty in order to continually improve courses and teaching methods and is the primary data used by administrators to evaluate faculty teaching; and

Whereas, the revised online SPoI survey was approved by the Faculty Senate and Provost Waldrop in 2012. In 2013, the Faculty Senate approved publishing the average responses for all nine questions on the university website; and

Whereas, in 2017 and 2018, the Student Government Association made several requests to make the SPoI data available in a transparent manner and in a format easier to locate course and instructor information with information to make the data understandable; and to allow students the possibility to affect, reflect upon, and take responsibility for their own learning while providing important information for course enhancements; and

Whereas, many faculty believe the SPoI data does not relate to learning, is subjected to bias, and is provided to students without context which can skew a student's impression of a course; and

Whereas, many faculty believe the SPoI data contains data errors due to multiple instructors or teaching assistants, and due to other faculty members teaching a course designed by a different faculty member; therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the administration carry out the following:
1. Short-Term
   a. Make the SPoI results easily accessible to students and faculty on myUCF.
   b. Provide students with information to interpret the data and a disclaimer regarding bias.
   c. Pilot making the evaluations optional to complete with active reminders.
   d. Add a link to the email sent to students to the SPoI results so students have a purpose to complete the survey.
2. Long-Term
   a. Form a Task Force to include the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, students from SGA, administration, Center for Distributed Learning, faculty senators, and faculty to review questions, validity, recommend better methods to evaluate teaching, and define the role of SPoI in the evaluation.
   b. Submit a Technology Fee grant to purchase a software package to easily capture and report SPoI data.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on February 7, 2019.