Faculty Senate
Information Technology Committee

<u>MEETING MINUTES</u>

Meeting Date: Monday, January 22, 2018

Meeting Time: 2:00 – 3:00 pm

Meeting Location: HPA1, Room 335

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. Jee Yeon (Jeannie) Hahm volunteered to take the minutes.

2. Roll Call

- Guests from UCF IT & R: Joel Hartman and Michael Sink

- Members in attendance: Reid Oetjen, Jee Yeon (Jeannie) Hahm, Pieter Kik, John Schultz, Matt Marino, Bert Scott, Athena Hoeppner, Lee Dotson, Joseph Harrington, Sumanta Pattanaik, John Malala, Stephanie Vie, Deedra Walton

3. Approval of Minutes of January 9, 2018

Minutes from January 9, 2018 were approved.

4. Announcements and Recognition of Guests

No announcements. Guests listed above were introduced.

5. Old Business

A question was asked regarding which meeting day and time would be better for the members. Monday from 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm was preferred over Tuesday from 3:30 pm to 4:30 pm.

6. New Business

a. Faculty Feedback Regarding Releasing SPoI Data

Based on the General Counsel's statement that was sent in an email from Reid, the committee understands that comments will not be part of public sharing. According to the Office of the

General Counsel, "we are free to share the summary data by course for the "common core" items, i.e, the numerical data, but the comments are considered "limited access" records under F.S. 1012.91 and cannot be shared publically". The comments can be shared with other faculty. Some faculty want the comments to be shared publicly because specific comments are more useful than the numbers.

The driver of this discussion about releasing SPoI data is two fold: Faculty and students. Faculty want more complete evaluations. We are not looking into changing the current SPoI questions. We need students to complete SPoIs. We need to find a mechanism that students can embrace (e.g. star ratings on Amazon). However, there is a concern with faculty with bad ratings that might not want SPoIs to be released. They can feel exposed. It can serve as an embarrassment. Or, it can encourage them to improve their teaching.

There are faculty that feel that it should remain the way it currently is. They feel that SPoIs are for individual faculty to get feedback on their teaching. If we make the data more easily available, it becomes a satisfaction survey, which turns students into customers.

Most of the faculty seem to fall in the middle range in terms of SPoI scores. What is considered a low score? What does the numerical rating mean? What does a rating of 1 or 2 mean? A high rating doesn't necessarily mean good teaching.

How do chairs/administrators use SPoI data? There are high stakes decisions being made based on SPoIs. The usage of information is not going to change. The current file of SPoI results that administrators get is not very useful. There needs to be a better way administrators can have access to the data. There should be a data pool where we can tease things out to get a better understanding of the data. For example, a faculty that taught a course for the first time might have a lower rating than others that have experience with the same course. There needs to be a database where we can look at the data more intelligently and more useful.

From the students' perspective, they do not think that the SPoIs are used for anything that makes an impact. According to Chuck Dziuban, students don't value SPoIs. It could be because they do not see the results. If comments can be shared among students, they might feel more willing to complete the SPoI.

Currently, students do not receive the comments but numerical data is available. SPoIs are available online. Library does not have it in print.

A dashboard with a student view that is available whenever students want to see the data could be a method of sharing.

Response rate is an issue that we need to discuss. Current overall response rate is 60%. How can we encourage students to complete SPoIs? We need to look at the mechanism of how students complete SPoIs. With the current system, the response rate is not great. Some faculty want a more representative data in order to share it publicly. Some say that students that tend

to fill out the SPoIs are either very happy or disgruntled. UCF will not go back to the scantrons because of the high cost associated with it. Some think that the results of SPoIs tend to be fair. Some faculty want transparency.

Chuck Dziuban and others have analyzed the questions over the years. There are three questions that faculty can score high and receive an overall high score. The three questions are:

1) Effectiveness communicating ideas and/or information
2) Effectiveness showing respect and concern for students
3) Effectiveness creating an environment that helps students learn

If you score highly on these three questions, the probability of the faculty member receiving an overall rating of "Excellent" is 97%. But, we do not have the context of the data. Should we delve into what students' comments are about those three specific questions?

b. Outside Vendor Update – Explorance Blue

Do members of the committee want to participate in discussions with Explorance Blue? Is it worth our time? Committee members are fine with Explorance Blue coming in to present.

Explorance Blue is student facing. It has the capability to do the things we are looking for. Creating a new system will cost too much for UCF. So, tweaking what is out there is easier. The university doesn't have the funds to create. UCF already collects a Technology Fee from students. Can we propose the redirecting of projects that the funds are allocated to?

USF is currently using it but they are looking into removing Explorance Blue. We need to find out why. Explorance Blue plugs it in Canvas and pushes it out to students.

c. Develop Strategy to Move Forward

We, as a committee, can decide what we want to do. The committee can make recommendations. The committee collects feedback from their respective colleges and brings it back to the committee. Faculty Senate makes the decision.

We already have a lot of data available. If we are able to see it in other forms such as graphs, it will help us make a decision on what to recommend. Perhaps looking at a portal will help us see what questions we want answered.

If we are trying to make a decision on behalf of other faculty members, there needs to be a formal way of collecting opinions from them. Otherwise, we are not making decisions representative of the faculty. The committee can come up with options and share with faculty. We can ask Faculty Excellence to send out a survey.

What specific questions do we want answered from the data?

What data would faculty want to see?
If faculty are not against sharing, what levels of detail do they want to see?
Students want to see data, how do we push it out to students?
Do we want only the overall rating to be shared?
Do we want ratings of all items to be shared by instructor by course?
What are other universities doing? There are models out there. For example, a book published with all ratings and summary of comments.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:57 pm

Meeting minutes submitted by Jee Yeon (Jeannie) Hahm