Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
March 17, 2011
(including the reconvened meeting, March 31, 2011)

As Faculty Senate Chair Ida Cook was unable to be present, the meeting was chaired by Vice Chair Robert Pennington. Dr. Pennington called the meeting to order at 406: p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Tony Waldrop, Provost
Pat Bishop, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
Dan Holsenbeck, Associate Vice President for University Relations
Lin Huff-Corzine, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Elliot Vittes, Interim Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of February 17, 2011 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Dr. Pennington offered a reminder that this was the last scheduled meeting of the 2010-2011 Senate. The first meeting of the 2011-2012 Senate will be on April 21.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST
Founder's Day
This year's Founder's Day Convocation will be help on Wednesday, April 6 at 10:00 a.m. in the SU Pegasus Ballroom. The provost encouraged faculty to attend.

US News and World Report Rankings
The U.S. News and World Report rankings were just released and UCF had many programs that were highly ranked.

Orlando Sentinel Article
A recent Orlando Sentinel article discussed programs being targeted for closure. Provost Waldrop said that this is not the case. The provosts of the state universities have begun to look at the programs that have a low number of graduates each year. The provost assured senate members that this part of the regular process that has always been conducted to review programs. Programs that fall below the threshold for degrees will be asked to provide an explanation or a plan for change.

State Legislative Update
Provost Waldrop deferred the remainder of his time to Vice President Dan Holsenbeck to provide a state legislative update. Dr. Holsenbeck reported on recent legislative activities:

- Gun Bill: The gun bill which would have allowed citizens to carry firearms on campus has been amended so that universities are no longer included.

- Pension and Benefits: There are currently two bills, one in the House and the other in the Senate. The Senate bill seems to be more employee-friendly. Dr. Holsenbeck indicated it appears that the effort to keep the ORP (Optional Retirement Plan) alive will be successful. It is likely that state employees will be required to make contributions towards their retirement plans. There has been no discussion of health insurance yet.

- Tuition: There is a strong likelihood of additional tuition raises. It has been suggested that it may appear more palatable to discuss raising tuition a fixed amount, rather than a percentage, although the end result would be about the same.

- State Budget: The House developed its first real cuts to the budget recommendations in the appropriations committee for higher education. It recommends a 5% cut to our Educational and General (E&G) funds. The Senate's first recommendation is for a 2.6% reduction. The final cut will likely be in the 3-5% range, although there are still several steps before anything can be finalized. Dr. Holsenbeck's assessment regarding the state budget is optimistic, but it is still early in the process. He thanked the Senate for the opportunity to address them.

A motion was made to reorder the agenda in the interest of time so that the standing committee updates and resolutions five and six would be dealt with before resuming discussion of the old business regarding SPoI. Motion seconded and carried.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
Budget and Administrative Committee Update – *Carla Poindexter*
No new business.

Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
Council information and activities (membership, meeting schedule, agenda, minutes, actions, etc) are available at http://www.graduatecouncil.ucf.edu/.

Appeals Committee: Dr. Coffey
- Met one on 3/17.
- Reviewed student petitions – typically 10 petitions per meeting.
- Next meeting is scheduled for 3/31.

Curriculum Committee: Dr. Dupras
- Met twice on 3/2 and 3/16
- Review of CES 5144 split class syllabus, CECS.
- Theoretical and Applied Ethics Certificate, CAH .
- Program revisions to Teacher Leadership MEd, CED.
- Revisions to the MS Miniature Engineering System track, ME, CECS.
- Revisions to the Industrial Engineering PhD program, CECS.
- Review of revisions to the Industrial Engineering MSIE and MS programs, CECS.
- Addition of an Executive DNP track, Doctor of Nursing Practice, CON
- Reactivation of the Higher Ed track, Education PhD, CED

- Name change of Instructional Technology to Instructional Design & Technology, MA, CED
- Revisions to the Accelerated BA/BS to MA track, CS&D MA, COHPA
- Revisions to the Public Admin. track, Public Affairs PhD, COHPA
- Revisions to the Exec. Health Services Admin. track, Health Sciences MS, COHPA
- Revisions to the Medical Speech-Language Pathology certificate, COHPA
- Revisions to the Emergency Management & Homeland Security certificate, COHPA
- Review of courses and special topics additions and revisions.
- Next meeting is scheduled for 3/30.

Policy Committee: Dr. Moharam

- Met once on 2/23.
- Approved Resolution requiring Scholarly Integrity/Responsible Conduct of Research training for all entering doctoral students.
- Reviewing admission standard for non-degree seeking students
- Next meeting scheduled for 3/23.

Program Review and Awards Committee: Dr. Dombrowski

- Met once on 3/04.
- Reviewed of nominations for Graduate Student Awards:
- Reviewed nominations for the University Excellence in Graduate Teaching Award.
- Next meeting scheduled for 3/25.

Personnel Committee – *Kevin Haran*
The last meeting of the semester will be on March 24. Representatives from Computer Services and Faculty Affairs will be giving a presentation on how electronic Promotion and Tenure files will be handled.

Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – *Jill Fjelstul*
On March 15, the committee sent a proposal regarding tracks and specializations to the Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Among the recommendations in the proposal was that there be a minimum GPA identified for each of the tracks and specializations. In addition, the committee recommended that the catalog specify how the track or specialization would be reflected on the diploma and transcript.

NEW BUSINESS
Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors *(from Personnel Committee)*
Kevin Haran, Chair of the Personnel Committee, read the resolution. A brief discussion followed.

A friendly amendment was made to replace the words "has had" with the words "can have" in the third "Whereas" clause. Friendly amendment accepted. The motion to approve the resolution carried. The resolution as approved read:

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

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~~ can have 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 2010-2011-6 Graduate Training Requirement in Academic Integrity and the Responsible Conduct of Research *(from the Graduate Council)*

Jim Moharam, Chair of the Graduate Council, explained the rationale for this resolution, which is to make all new doctoral students aware of their ethical responsibility when they engage in teaching and research. This resolution requires all doctoral students to undergo training. A question was raised about why this only applied to doctoral students and not all graduate students. Dr. Moharam replied that it was due to limited resources.

Motion carried. The resolution as approved read:

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

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.

OLD BUSINESS

Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI)

Motion made to take the discussion of SPoI off of the table and bring the discussion back to the floor. Motion seconded and carried.

Dr. Pennington turned the discussion over to Dr. Chopra. Dr. Chopra reminded members that the new document reflects the change to the scale. Dr. Pennington announced that we received confirmation that modality-specific delivery will be possible, and section two has been annotated to reflect which questions might be affected.

The Senate proceeded to move through the document *ad seriatim*, reviewing each item in sequence. Questions were raised on the following items:

Item 7 – Suggested rewording had been submitted by email. Motion made to adopt that wording. Motion seconded and carried. The item will now read:

> *The instructor's incorporation of challenging questions, in discussion and in written materials, was:*

Item 9 – A motion was made to eliminate the word "effective" from item nine and all the other items following that have similar phrasing. The rationale for the motion was that with the revised scaled, the phrasing of the items no longer fit logically with the scale. Motion seconded. A friendly amendment was made to change the question into a statement, phrased as:

> *The instructor's ability to create an environment that encouraged students to ask questions or present their ideas was:*

Friendly amendment accepted.

A discussion about how students might interpret the question. As currently worded, the phrasing refers to the instructor's potential, not whether he or she actualized it. Further discussion ensued and members cautioned that the item should be kept sufficiently broad to be used in a variety of class modalities and sizes. Several suggestions were made for rewording the item. A friendly amendment was made to reword the item as follows:

> *The instructor's effectiveness in creating an environment that encouraged students to ask questions or present their ideas was:*

Amendment accepted. Motion carried.

<u>Item 10</u> – Motion was made to change the question into a statement, phrased as follows:

The instructor's effectiveness in facilitation of learning was:

Motion seconded and carried.

<u>Item 11</u> – A suggestion had been submitted by email for rewording the item as follows:

The clarity of information regarding grading for this class was:

A discussion ensued and members felt that this would change intent of the question to reflect only on the material, and not the instructor. Motion was made to change the wording of the item to:

The information given to students about how they would be graded was:

Motion seconded and carried.

<u>Item 12</u> – A suggestion had been submitted by email for rewording the item as follows:

How useful were the required course materials in helping you learn the course content?

Discussion ensued and several suggestions were made for rewording the item as a statement. A motion to accept the following wording carried:

The effectiveness of the required course materials in helping students learn the course content was:

<u>Item 13</u> – Motion was made to reword the item as follows:

The effectiveness of the assignments in helping student learn the course content was:

Motion carried.

<u>Item 14</u> – Motion was made to reword the item as follows:

The effectiveness of the exams in covering important aspects of the course was:

Discussion followed on whether the term "exams" should be used or whether terms such as "assessment" or "graded materials" would be better. The Senate also discussed what the word effective means in this context. The question was called. Motion to call the question carried. The motion to change the wording was approved. The wording as approved was:

The effectiveness of the exams in covering important aspects of the course was:

<u>Item 13 Revisited</u> – A motion was made to include an additional answer choice of "f. Not Applicable/Don't Know." Motion seconded. A friendly amendment was made to change the word "assignments" to "assessments". Friendly amendment was not accepted. Motion to add response option "f. Not Applicable/Don't Know" carried.

<u>Item 15</u> – A suggestion had been submitted by email to use the word "feedback" instead of "comments." Suggested wording for rephrasing the item was discussed. Motion made to change the wording as follows:

The effectiveness of the instructor's feedback on assignments and exams was:

A friendly amendment was offered to replace "effectiveness" with "usefulness". Amendment accepted. A discussion followed regarding the use of effectiveness versus usefulness ensued, as well as whether timeliness should be incorporated into this item. A friendly amendment was made to include an additional answer choice of "f. Not Applicable/Don't Know." Amendment accepted. Motion carried. The wording as approved was:

The usefulness of the instructor's feedback on assignments and exams was:

<u>Item 16</u> – A suggestion had been submitted by email for rewording the item as follows:
How effective was the Instructor in achieving/meeting the course objectives?
 Motion made to reword the item as:
The effectiveness of the instructor in achieving the course objectives was:
Motion carried.

<u>Item 17</u> – This item was added at the last meeting despite peer reviewed research that shows that there is no correlation to this question. A discussion followed on the purpose of the question. Motion was made to move the item to Section III. Seconded. A friendly amendment was made to replace the words "I anticipate" with the words "I expect to earn". Amendment accepted. Motion carried. The item will be moved to Section III. The wording as approved was:
The final grade I expect to earn for this class is:

<u>Item 18</u> – A suggestion had been submitted by email that the comment box be deleted. The Senate discussed alternate wording of the question, including
Overall, how would you rate the instruction of this course?
A motion was made to remove the comment box and change the wording to:
Overall, the effectiveness of the instruction in this course was:
 Motion carried.

<u>Item 19</u> – A motion was made to add the word "instruction" to the question. A discussion followed on whether this question should be about the teaching or all aspects of the class. A suggestion was made to add an item allowing students to discuss things other than the instruction. Suggested wording was:
What did you like most about this course?
Dr. Chopra asked that senators hold off on proposing new items until all of the current items have been review. A friendly amendment was made change the wording of the question to read:
What specific suggestions do you have for improving the instruction of this course?
Amendment accepted. Motion carried.

RECESS
Motion to recess made and seconded. Motion carried. The meeting will reconvene on March 31 at 4:00 in the Student Union Key West, room 218.

Meeting Reconvened March 31, 2011

At 4:03 p.m., Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, reconvened the meeting of March 17, 2011, which had been recessed. Dr. Manoj Chopra resumed the discussion of SPoI with Section II.

<u>Item 3</u> – The first item in Section II (previously item three in the first section) had been moved to Section II at the February 17 meeting. The Senate subsequently received confirmation that items could be delivered to specific modalities. Motion made to remove response option f, "Not applicable because the class did not meet face to face," with the rationale that the item would not

be delivered to students in web-only classes. Motion seconded and carried.

Item II-1 – Motion made to remove the words "outside of class" so that the item is no longer modality-specific. Seconded. A discussion ensued regarding how students quantify the time spent on a particular course, including counting seat time in class or just that time outside of class. Friendly amendment to add, "(including in-class time if applicable.)" to the end of the statement. Amendment accepted. Friendly amendment to change "in-class time" to "class time" to prevent confusion among students with set online hours. Amendment accepted. A question was raised regarding whether the scale should change since class time is being included.

Friendly amendment made to change the scale to:
a. 1 or less
b. 2-4
c. 5-7
d. 8-10
e. 11 or more

Amendment accepted. Motion carried. The scale was changed; the item was moved out of the modality-specific section; and the wording as approved read:
> *I spent ___ hours per week on this course (including class time if applicable):*

Item II-3 – A question was raised regarding the purpose of this item, and whether it was specifically focused on Webcourses. Senate members discussed the use of the word "assignments" and suggested that it was too specific for the way faculty members use online resources. Motion made to reword as follows:
> *Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web modules, assessments, online discussions)?*

Motion seconded and carried.

Item II-3a – A suggestion had been submitted by email to remove the word "online" and make the item no longer modality specific. A motion was made to adopt that suggestion. Seconded. A senator spoke against the motion, noting that making those changes would undermine the purpose of the question. Motion failed.

Motion made to change the word "assignment" to "activities". Motion seconded and carried. The wording as approved read:
> *What proportion of the online activities did you complete?*

Item II-3b – Motion made to remove the word "Webcourses" and change the word "assignments" to "activities." Seconded. Friendly amendment to change the word "percentage" to "proportion" accepted. Motion carried. The wording as approved read:
> *In general, what proportion of the time did access problems affect your ability to complete online activities?*

Item II-4 – Item approved without changes.

Item III-1 – A suggestion had been submitted by email to add a comment box to this item. Motion made to add the comment box. Seconded. Discussion followed. A senator spoke against the comment box, noting that with too many comment boxes, there is so much data it is hard to tell what data is meaningful. Comment boxes at the end of the survey are preferable. Motion failed.

Motion made to add a response option "e. No opinion". Motion seconded and carried.

Item 17 revisited – Motion made to add a response option "NC" after option "h" and move the remaining options down. Seconded. Motion carried.

Item 10 revisited – A suggestion had been submitted by email that the Senate reword Item 10 to improve clarity. The suggested wording was:
   The instructor's facilitation of learning was:
Motion made to adopt that language. Seconded. A senator spoke against the motion, noting that it made the meaning less clear. Motion failed.

Item 16 revisited – A suggestion had been submitted by email to reword Item 16 as follows:
   The instructor's progress in achieving the course objectives was:
Motion made to adopt that language. Seconded. Discussion followed. A senator noted that the suggested change puts the onus of achieving the course objective on the faculty member, rather than the student. A senator noted that one either makes progress toward an objective or achieves an objective, but making progress toward achieve something is contradictory. Motion failed.

Motion made to change the wording to:
   The effectiveness of the instructor in helping the student achieve course objectives was:
Seconded. Discussion followed on whether this wording changes the focus of the question from the instructor to the student. Motion carried.

New Items
Dr. Chopra invited motions to add new questions, as had been discussed earlier. A discussion ensued about whether there should be separate items for commenting on the instruction of the course and the course overall.

Motion made to add the following question with a comment box:
   What did you like best about the course?
Seconded. A friendly amendment was accepted to reword as:
   What did you like best about how the instructor taught the course?
Motion carried. This item will go immediately prior to the current number 19.

Item 19 revisited – It was suggested that the wording of Item 19 be revised so that it is parallel to the item just added. Motion to reword as:
   What suggestions do you have for improving how the instructor taught the course?
Seconded. Motion carried.

A question was raised about whether asking what the students liked best introduces bias. The

consensus of the Senate was that asking for suggestions for improvement was equivalent to asking what the students liked least. A senator noted that the benefit to asking for improvement is that it empowers the student, rather than simply offering a chance to complain.

A motion was made to add the two questions with comment boxes addressing the aspects of the course that didn't involve the instruction. The suggested wording was:
> *What did you like best about this course?*
> *What suggestions do you have for improving this course?*

Motion seconded. Discussion followed on whether such questions belonged in the Student Perception of Instruction form, or if they were better suited to course evaluations. Concerns were offered on how the information might be used. A senator noted that the information would otherwise be included in the comments about the instruction. There was a brief discussion on where the items should be located. A friendly amendment was made to add the words, "independent of how the instructor taught the course," to both items. Amendment accepted. Motion carried. The items as approved read:
> *What did you like best about this course, independent of how the instructor taught the course?*
> *What suggestions do you have for improving the course, independent of how the instructor taught the course?*

The items will be listed in that order, immediately following the other two items with comment boxes.

Resolution 2010-2011-3 Approval of the Proposed Student Perception of Instruction Form *(from Steering Committee)*
Dr. Cook asked for any additional comments on the resolution to approve the revised SPoI. None were raised. The motion to approve the resolution carried. The resolution as approved read:

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 *(from Steering Committee)*
A friendly amendment was made to replace the phrase "the evaluation of" with the phrase "pilot testing and evaluating" in the first "Whereas" clause. Amendment accepted. A question was

raised about how the data will be delivered to the faculty and departments. Dr. Cook discussed the handout on the SPTE Scale, which provides an example of how this is handled at another university. UCF will be doing something similar. Dr. Cook clarified that no "grand" average would be provided as this is not proper use of the data. However, uniform reports can be provided to faculty to allow for comparisons to other departments, colleges, and like sized classes. The purpose is to provide faculty feedback so they are empowered to make changes.

Testing Services is able to provide faculty results at the instructor, department, college, and university level. In addition, it was suggested that averages for similar type classes be provided (e.g., online, media enhanced, fully web-based, large, medium, and small classes). Lastly, it was suggested that student comments be separated into all positives and all negatives rather than interspersed. Dr. Cook said she would relay these comments to the administration.

The motion to approve the resolution as revised carried. The resolution as approved read:

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~~ pilot testing and evaluating the proposed version of the Student Perception of Instruction form using sound methodological techniques and sampling.

OTHER BUSINESS
Dr. Cook briefly updated upcoming changes to the retirement plan. It seems likely that all employees will be required to contribute to our retirement plans. The ORP is expected to continue. The DROP Program appears to be in danger of being discontinued as an option after June 30, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to adjourn made at 5:30 p.m. Motion seconded and carried.

Student Perception of Instruction (Face-to-Face) Common Template for other formats

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

1. The organization of the course was:

The scale has been changed throughout the document.

~~a. Ineffective~~ a. Excellent

~~b. Somewhat Effective~~ b. Good

~~c. Moderately Effective~~ c. Satisfactory

~~d. Effective~~ d. Fair

~~e. Very Effective~~ e. Poor

2. **The <u>verbal and/or written</u> 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.

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

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Fair

e. Poor

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

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

Due to the scale change, it may be necessary to rephrase these questions.

Feedback from faculty:

With questions including the word "effective", delete the word "effective" and leave the remainder of the question intact.

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

11. **How <mark>effective</mark> 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

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

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Fair

e. Poor

16. **How <mark>effective</mark> 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

~~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:

Feedback from faculty:
- Delete the comment box from this question.
- Suggested wording change: "Overall, how would you rate the instruction in this course?"

~~18.~~ 19. What specific suggestions do you have for improving this course?

Comment:

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

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:

Moved from core questions. Option F added 2/17 prior to the confirmation of modality-specific delivery.

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Fair

e. Poor

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

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 of more

Feedback from faculty:

Re-word question so it's not modality-specific: "I spent ___ hours per week on this course."

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

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

a. Yes

b. No

II-3a. 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

Feedback from faculty:

Re-word question so it's not modality-specific: "What proportion of the assignments did you complete?"

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

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

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   c. Disagree

b. Agree   d. Strongly Disagree

Feedback from faculty:

Add a comment box for this question. It would be useful to know if the students are interested in the topic, think it will be an easy A, take less time, looked up the instructor on Rate My Professor, etc.

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

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 can have 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.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 17, 2011.

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.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 31, 2011.

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 pilot testing and evaluating the proposed version of the Student Perception of Instruction form using sound methodological techniques and sampling.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 31, 2011.

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

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.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 17, 2011.