

MEMORANDUM

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

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

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2011**
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
 - Provost's Update
5. **Old Business**
 - Resolution 2010-2011-3 Approval of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form *(from Steering)*
6. **New Business**
 - Resolution 2010-2011-4 Evaluation of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form *(from Steering)*
 - Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors *(from Personnel)*
 - Resolution 2010-2011-6 Graduate Training Requirement in Academic Integrity and the Responsible Conduct of Research *(from Graduate Council)*
7. **Standing Committee Updates**
 - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Carla Poindexter*
 - Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
 - Personnel Committee – *Kevin Haran*
 - UPCC – *Jill Fjelstul*
8. **Adjournment**

If the discussion of the SPoI or other business is not completed, the Senate will recess instead of adjourn, and the meeting will be resumed Thursday, March 31 at 4:00 p.m. in the Student Union Key West, room 218.

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.

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

Student Perception of Instruction

CORE QUESTIONS FOR ALL MODALITIES

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

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

Section I: Evaluation of Instruction Items

Organization and Planning

1. The organization of the course was:

- ~~a. Ineffective~~ a. Excellent
- ~~b. Somewhat Effective~~ b. Good
- ~~c. Moderately Effective~~ c. Satisfactory
- ~~d. Effective~~ d. Fair
- ~~e. Very Effective~~ e. Poor

Comment [FS1]: The scale has been changed throughout the document.

2. The verbal and/or written explanation of course requirements was:

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

~~3. The instructor's use of in-class time was:~~

- ~~a. Excellent~~
- ~~b. Good~~
- ~~c. Satisfactory~~
- ~~d. Fair~~
- ~~e. Poor~~
- ~~f. Not applicable because the class did not meet face to face.~~

Comment [FS2]: Moved to Section II: Modality-Specific Items

Communication Ability of the Instructor

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

6. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material was:

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

Relationship or Interaction of the Teacher with the Students

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

Comment [FS3]: Due to the scale change, it may be necessary to rephrase these questions.

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

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

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor
- f. Not Applicable / Don't Know

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

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

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

17. The final grade I anticipate for this class is:

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

Summary Questions

~~17.~~18. Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of the instruction in this course?

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

Comment:

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

18.19. What specific suggestions do you have for improving this course?

Comment:

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

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

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

Section II: Modality-Specific Items

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

3. The instructor's use of in-class time was:

- a. Excellent
- b. Good
- c. Satisfactory
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

~~f. Not applicable because the class did not meet face-to-face.~~

Comment [FS4]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
F2F and M only

Comment [i5]: Moved from core questions.

II-1. I spent ___ hours per week outside of class on this course.

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

Comment [FS6]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
F2F and M only

II-2. How many times did you miss class?

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

Comment [FS7]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
F2F and M only

II-3. F4. Did this class have online assignments (for example, web readings, web modules, online discussions, etc.)?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Comment [FS8]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
F2F only

II-3a. F5. What proportion of the online assignments did you complete?.

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

Comment [FS9]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
Web, M, and F2F if the answer to II-3 (above) is Yes.

This draft incorporates the changes approved at the 2/17/2011 Senate meeting.

II-3b. In general, what percentage of the time did Webcourses access problems affect your ability to complete online assignments?

- a. Almost all the time
- b. About three quarters of the time
- c. About half the time
- d. About a quarter of the time
- e. Almost none of the time

Comment [FS10]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
Web, M, and F2F if the answer to II-3 (above) is Yes.

II-4. Approximately how many times did parking problems make it difficult for you to get to class on time?

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

Comment [FS11]: MODALITY-SPECIFIC
M and F2F only.

Section III: Student Information Items

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

III-1. I had a strong desire to take this course.

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

Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors

(From the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, faculty participation in the evaluation of their chairs and/or directors is crucial; and

Whereas, the role of faculty in this process in the Faculty Handbook is currently unclear; and

Whereas, this has had the effect of limiting the participation of the faculty from the departments/school conducting the review; therefore

Be it resolved, that chair/director review committees will consist of faculty from the department/school conducting the review and others whom the dean deems appropriate; and

Be it further resolved, that the language in the Faculty Handbook be clarified to make explicit the role of the faculty in the review process of their chairs/directors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution 2010-2011-6 Graduate Training Requirement in Academic Integrity and the Responsible Conduct of Research

(from the Graduate Council)

WHEREAS the central activities and missions of a university rest upon the fundamental assumption that all members of the university community conduct themselves in accordance with a strict adherence to academic and scholarly integrity; and

WHEREAS all UCF students are expected to adhere to the essential standards of academic integrity, as outlined in the Golden Rule and its associated UCF regulations (UCF-5.008); and

WHEREAS to maintain this atmosphere in the UCF graduate community, it is crucial that all students are made aware of the expectations of academic integrity, the responsibilities associated with research and scholarly work, and the consequences associated with the failure to abide by these expectations; and

WHEREAS the advanced nature of graduate education, the higher level of scholarly and research activity associated with graduate work, and the higher level of expected behavior of students who have been awarded a bachelor's degree make it essential that additional training in the areas of academic integrity and the responsible conduct of research (RCR) be provided to graduate students at UCF; and

WHEREAS this additional training will serve to guide their conduct as graduate students at UCF and provide the requisite ethical background for their future roles as leaders and educators,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT starting with the Fall 2011 term, all students newly admitted to doctoral programs will be required to complete training designed to inculcate an awareness and understanding of the fundamental issues of academic integrity and the responsible conduct of research (RCR) in a manner that is consistent with federal regulations.