## MEMORANDUM

Date:October 11, 2012TO:All Faculty Senate MembersFROM:Ida Cook<br/>Chair, Faculty SenateSUBJECT:Faculty Senate Meeting on October 18, 2012

Meeting Date:Thursday, October 18, 2012Meeting Time:4:00-6:00 p.m.Meeting Location:Student Union Key West, Room 218

# AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Approval of Minutes of September 20, 2012
- 4. Announcements and Recognition of Guests
- 5. Report of the Provost
- 6. Old Business
  - Student Perception of Instruction
- 7. New Business

None.

#### 8. Committee Reports

- Budget and Administrative Committee Robert Dipboye
- Personnel Committee Kathryn Seidel
- Parking Advisory Committee Alex Tamasan
- Undergraduate Council Kelly Allred
- Graduate Council Jim Moharam
- 9. Other Business
- 10. Adjournment

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of September 20, 2012

Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 1603. The roll was circulated for signatures.

## MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of August 23, 2012 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cook announced that brochures about the smoke-free campus policy were available at the back table.

## **GUESTS**

Joel Hartman, Information Technology and Resources LaShaunda Hayes, Student Government Association Cecyle Carson, Communication Sciences and Disorders Todd Stansbury, Athletics Torey Brewer, Athletics Chuck Dziuban, Center for Distributed Learning

## **REPORT OF THE PROVOST**

Tony Waldrop, Provost and Executive Vice President, stated that he would forgo his report due to the length of the agenda.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

## University Athletics - Todd Stansbury

Todd Stansbury, Vice President and Director of Athletics, spoke to the Faculty Senate about his vision for Athletics. He discussed the upcoming change to the Big East conference and other updates related to Athletics. He provided a detailed background of his experience in college athletics.

## Legislative Update – Dan Holsenbeck

Dan Holsenbeck, Vice President for University Relations, provided an overview of the legislature's budget cycle. The university is in the process of drafting the legislative budget request (LBR) for the next fiscal year and has received a request for the 2014-2015 LBR as well. The legislature will have an organizational session after the November election to meet with new members and begin discussing the budget for the state. Holsenbeck encouraged faculty to participate in the political process, but stressed that employees are prohibited from using any state resources to further their political support. The budget will hit the floor in March and it will be debated in April and eventually passed the first day of the last week of session. Economic projections are indicating funding has stabilized; this will leave about \$73 million in discretionary funding for all of state government. The Board of Governors will be requesting

\$134 million and it is possible the SUS will receive some of these funds if funds are shifted from other areas. If the \$134 million is appropriated, the state universities will not seek tuition increases. It is believed that any movement to increase tuition will be met with opposition from the governor and legislature. The \$300 million that was cut from the budget last year has been restored to the base budget in the request. No PECO funds are available.

The challenge to the legislation that mandates that state employees contribute three percent toward their retirements is still in the court system. Holsenbeck identified two sites that offer information about legislative and budgetary issues: Lobby Tools, a paid website, and On-Line Sunshine, a free alternative.

## Further Announcements

Cook announced that there are two open seats on the University Master Planning Committee that need to be filled by senators from any college. Senators interested in serving should contact her.

Cook announced that the Green Books SGA initiative discussed at the last meeting have been ordered and should arrive in 3-4 weeks.

## Library Storage - Rich Gause

Rich Gause, senator from the University Libraries, gave an overview of the new automated retrieval system the Libraries will be building. Most texts and historic documents will be moved off of the library shelves into the retrieval system. The building that will hold all of these documents/books will be built behind the library. The library will also undergo a three-phase update that will take place over the next 5-7 years. The estimated cost if this renovation is \$60 million.

Gause stated that faculty input is necessary in determining which books will left on the shelves to be browsed. Eventually, 200,000-500,000 volumes will be available for browsing. Browsability is more important for some disciplines, and faculty input is crucial in determining what areas will be most impacted.

## Student Perception of Instruction - Chuck Dziuban

Chuck Dziuban, Director of the Research Initiative for Teaching Effectiveness, provided an overview of the proposed Student Perception of Instruction form that was pilot tested in fall 2011. The proposed form has eight items that are the same as on the current form and eight items that have been completely retooled. In addition, the scale was changed to be symmetrical and some items were customized for different modes of instruction delivery. Items were added across all delivery modes, including asking students to provide their expected grades in the course.

Dziuban briefly discussed his SPOI research and presented data from the analysis of the proposed form. In the proposed form, if two items ('effectiveness in facilitation of learning' and 'communication of ideas') were marked as excellent, there was a 98% chance the overall rating would be excellent. This proved true across all teaching modalities. The items that were common to both the current and proposed form were highly correlated. The proposed scale also seems to have resulted in a slight elevation of scores, although means did not change. Across all modalities, the supplemental questions were not correlated to the overall rating of instruction.

Dziuban recommended keeping the symmetric scale and removing the supplemental items. A copy of the presentation will be put on line. Cook briefly spoke about the Faculty Perception of Instruction form and suggested that it be made more easily available to faculty.

## **COMMITTEE REPOTS**

## Budget and Administration - Robert Dipboye

The committee met last week and settled on five possible issues for future action:

- post-tenure review
- priorities in the event of budget cuts
- policies and procedures inhibiting or facilitating multi-disciplinary collaboration
- fees for use of facilities
- reaffirming the purpose of the university in light of the emphasis on STEM

The next meeting will be October 11 at 1630 in PSY 101.

## <u>Personnel</u> – *Kathryn Seidel*

The committee met and discussed several possible items for action. At the next meeting, they will be prioritizing the items. The next meeting will be October 8 at 1200-1330 in CAH 192.

## Parking – Alex Tamasan

Nothing new to report. The next meeting will be September 27 at 0900 in PH 406I.

## <u>Undergraduate Council</u> – Kelly Allred

The committee will be working with the Graduate Council looking at adding pass/fail and pass/fail/honors to the grading scheme. The next meeting will be October 9 at noon in COS 221.

## Graduate Council - Jim Moharam

Nothing new to report. The Graduate Curriculum committee will meet this week, and the Graduate Policy Committee will meet next meet.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Cook offered a reminder that the State of the University address will be next Tuesday, September 17 at 1500 in the Student Union Pegasus Ballroom. She encouraged the faculty to attend.

## ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn carried. The meeting adjourned at 1740.

Revisions proposed by the ad hoc SPOI committee October 16, 2012. Please note: The committee was undecided about whether to use the current or pilot tested	_	<b>Deleted:</b> Approved by the Faculty Senate March 31, 2011.¶ Pilot tested Fall 2011.¶
response scale. This issue will be decided at the Faculty Senate meeting.		
Student Perception of Instruction		
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.		
۲	_	Deleted: Core Questions for All Modalities
1. The organization of the course was:		
a. Excellent b. <u>Very Good</u>	_	Deleted: Good
c. <u>Good</u>		Deleted: Satisfactory
d. Fair		Dicted Substactory
e. Poor		
2. The instructor's explanation of course requirements and expectations was:		Deleted: verbal and/or written
a. Excellent		
b. <u>Very Good</u>		Deleted: Good
c. <u>Good</u> d. Fair		Deleted: Satisfactory
e. Poor		
<b>T</b>		Deleted: 3. The instructor's communication of the
<ul><li><b>3.</b> The instructor's communication of ideas and/or information was:</li><li>a. Excellent</li></ul>		importance of the subject matter was: ¶ a. Excellent¶
b. <u>Very Good</u>	$\backslash$	b. Good¶
c. <u>Good</u>	$\langle \rangle$	c. Satisfactory¶ d. Fair¶
d. Fair	$\langle \rangle \rangle$	e. Poor¶
e. Poor	$\langle \rangle \rangle$	Deleted: 4
		Deleted: Good
4. The instructor's respect and concern for students was:	$\langle \rangle$	Deleted: Satisfactory
a. Excellent		Deleted: 5. The instructor's enthusiasm for the
b. Very Good		course material was: ¶
<u>c. Good</u>		a. Excellent¶ b. Good¶
<u>d. Fair</u>		c. Satisfactory
<u>e. Poor</u>		d. Fair¶ e. Poor¶
5. The instructor's stimulation of interest in the course was:	<	Deleted: 6
a. Excellent		Deleted: incorporation of challenging questions, in discussion and in written materials, was:
b. <u>Very Good</u>		·
Page 1 of 3		Deleted: Good

1

c. <u>Good</u>		Deleted: Satisfactory
d. Fair e. Poor f. Not Applicable / Don't Know		Deleted: 7. 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¶
<b><u>6</u></b> . The instructor's effectiveness in creating an environment that helps students learn was:		e. Poor¶ f. Not Applicable / Don't Know¶
<ul> <li>a. Excellent</li> <li>b. <u>Very Good</u></li> <li>c. <u>Good</u></li> <li>d. Fair</li> <li>e. Poor</li> </ul> 7. <u>The instructor's explanation of grading criteria was:</u> <ul> <li>a. Excellent</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>1. Not Applicable / Don't Know¶</li> <li>Deleted: 8. The instructor's effectiveness in creating an environment that encouraged students to ask questions or present their ideas was:¶ <ul> <li>a. Excellent¶</li> <li>b. Good¶</li> <li>c. Satisfactory¶</li> <li>d. Fair¶</li> <li>e. Poor¶</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
b. <u>Very Good</u>		Deleted: 9
c. <u>Good</u>		Deleted: facilitation of learning was
d. Fair e. Poor		Deleted: Good
. 1001		Deleted: Satisfactory
<b>T</b>		Deleted: 10
۲ ۲	$\langle     \rangle$	Deleted: The information given to students about how they would be graded was
<b><u>8</u></b> . The usefulness of the instructor's feedback on <u>course performance was</u> :	$  \setminus  $	Deleted: Good
a. Excellent b. <u>Very Good</u>	$\parallel / $	Deleted: Satisfactory
c. <u>Good</u> d. Fair e. Poor f. Not Applicable / Don't Know		Deleted: 11. The effectiveness of the required course materials in helping students learn the course content was: ¶ a. Excellent¶ b. Good¶ c. Satisfactory¶
<b>2</b> . The effectiveness of the instructor in helping students achieve course objectives was:		d. Fair¶ e. Poor¶
a. Excellent b. <u>Very Good</u>		Deleted: 12. The effectiveness of the assignments in helping students learn the course content was:
c. <u>Good</u> d. Fair		Deleted: 13. The effectiveness of exams in coveri
e. Poor		Deleted: 14
		Deleted: assignments and exams was
10. Overall, the effectiveness of the instruction in this course was:		Deleted: Good
a. Excellent b. <u>Very Good</u>		Deleted: Satisfactory
c. Good		Deleted: 15
d. Fair	$\langle     \rangle$	Deleted: Good
e. Poor	$\langle     \rangle$	Deleted: Satisfactory
11. What did you like best shout how the instructor tought the source?		Deleted: 16
11. What did you like best about how the instructor taught the course?		Deleted: Good
Comment:	//	Deleted: Good
		Deleted: 17
Page 2 of 3		Diritiu. 17

I

I

I

1

Comment:         1         20. What suggestions do you have for improvint the course, independent of how the instructor tranght the course, independent of how the instructor tranght the course?         20. What suggestions do you have for improvint the course. Independent of how the instructor tranght the course?         20. What suggestions do you have for improvint the course. Independent of how the instructor tranght the course?         20. What suggestions do you have for improvint the course. Independent of how the instructor transpit the course?         20. The instructor's use of in-class time was:         1       5. Good!         2. The instructor's use of in-class time was:         1       6. Good!         2. The instructor's use of in-class time was:         1       6. Good!         2. How many times did you miss class?         1       1. or less!         2. How many times did you miss class?         1       1. or less!         2. How many times did you miss class?         2. All this class have online components (for course)         2. So more?         2. All this class have online activities of you course?         2. All the class to or of them?         2. All the full them?         2. All the time?         3. All the class to the of them?         3. All the tinset?         3. All the ti		Deleted: 18
20. What suggestions do you have for improvi 20. What suggestions do you have for improvi 20. What suggestions do you have for improving 20. What suggestions do you have for improving 20. What suggestions of the instructor 20. How many times did you miss class? ¶ 21. How many times did you miss class? ¶ 22. Boy many times did you miss class? ¶ 23. Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web module assessments, online discussions, etc.)? ¶ 23. What proportion of the online activities of you complete? ¶ 24. About half of them ¶ 25. About that of them ¶ 26. About a quarter of them ¶ 27. About half of them ¶ 28. Minet supportion of the time diacessions of them ¶ 29. About half of them ¶ 20. About a quarter of them ¶ 20. About half of them ¶ 20. About a quarter of them ¶ 21. About a quarter of them ¶ 23. About half of them ¶ 24. About a quarter of them ¶ 25. In general, what proportion of the time diacessions? ¶ 26. About a quarter of them ¶ 27. Almost all the time ¶ 28. About them § 29. About them § 20. About the quarters of them § 20. About them § 20.		course, independent of how the instructor taught the course?¶ <object>¶</object>
20. What suggestions do you have for improvi the course, independent of how the instructor taught the course? solijects]		$- \downarrow /   \P$
Modality-Specific Items ¶         21. The instructor's use of in-class time was:¶         a. Excellent¶         b. Good¶         c. Satisfactory¶         d. Fair¶         c. Poon¶         22. How many times did you miss class? ¶         a. 1 or less¶         b. 2-3¶         c. 4-5¶         d. 6-7¶         a. 8 or more¶         1         23. Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web module assessments, online discussions, etc.)? ¶         a. Yes ¶         b. No[]         1         23. What proportion of the online activities of you complete? ¶         a. Almost all of them¶         d. About aquarter of them]         1         2.3b. In general, what proportion of the time di access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your ability to complete online activities of access problems affect your abi		20. What suggestions do you have for improving the course, independent of how the instructor taught the course?¶
Modality-Specific Items         ¶         1. The instructor's use of in-class time was:¶         a. Excellent¶         b. Good¶         c. Satisfactory¶         d. Fair¶         e. Poor¶         ¶         1. The instructor's use of in-class time was:¶         a. Excellent¶         c. Satisfactory¶         d. Fair¶         e. Poor¶         ¶         2. How many times did you miss class? ¶         a. 1 or less¶         b. 2.31         c. 4.51         d. 6.71         e. 8 or more¶         ¶         3. Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web module assessments, online discussions, etc.)? ¶         a. Not¶         b. No¶         ¶         3. What proportion of the online activities of you complete? ¶         a. Almost all of them¶         d. About thequarter of them¶         e. Almost none of them¶         ¶         3. Most proportion of the time diaccess problems affect your ability to complete online activities ¶         a. Almost all the time¶         b. About thequarters of the time¶		Ч́ Ч
<ul> <li>22. How many times did you miss class? ¶</li> <li>a. 1 or less¶</li> <li>b. 2-3]</li> <li>c. 4-5]</li> <li>d. 6-7¶</li> <li>e. 8 or more¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>23. Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web module assessments, online discussions, etc.)? ¶</li> <li>a. Yes ¶</li> <li>b. No¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>a. Almost all of them¶</li> <li>b. About three-quarters of them. ¶</li> <li>c. About half of them¶</li> <li>d. About a quarter of them¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>B. About three quarter of them¶</li> <li>e. Almost none of them¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>a. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the m¶</li> <li>e. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the m¶</li> <li>e. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the time diaccess problems affect your ability to complete online activities? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the time¶</li> </ul>		Modality-Specific Items       ¶         ¶       ¶         21. The instructor's use of in-class time was:¶       a. Excellent¶         b. Good¶       c. Satisfactory¶         d. Fair¶       e. Poor¶
<ul> <li>23. Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web module: assessments, online discussions, etc.)? ¶</li> <li>a. Yes ¶</li> <li>b. No¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>23a. What proportion of the online activities of you complete? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all of them¶</li> <li>b. About hard of them¶</li> <li>c. About half of them¶</li> <li>d. About a quarter of them¶</li> <li>e. Almost none of them¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>23b. In general, what proportion of the time di access problems affect your ability to complete online activities? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the time¶</li> </ul>		22. How many times did you miss class? ¶ a. 1 or less¶ b. 2-3¶ c. 4-5¶ d. 6-7¶ e. 8 or more¶
<ul> <li>23a. What proportion of the online activities of you complete? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all of them¶</li> <li>b. About three-quarters of them. ¶</li> <li>c. About half of them¶</li> <li>d. About a quarter of them¶</li> <li>e. Almost none of them¶</li> <li>g. Almost none of them¶</li> <li>¶</li> <li>23b. In general, what proportion of the time dia access problems affect your ability to complete online activities? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the time¶</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>23. Did this class have online components (for example, activities, web readings, web modules, assessments, online discussions, etc.)? ¶</li> <li>a. Yes ¶</li> <li>b. No¶</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>¶</li> <li>23b. In general, what proportion of the time di access problems affect your ability to complete online activities? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all the time¶</li> <li>b. About three quarters of the time¶</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>23a. What proportion of the online activities did you complete? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all of them ¶</li> <li>b. About three-quarters of them. ¶</li> <li>c. About half of them ¶</li> <li>d. About a quarter of them ¶</li> </ul>
b. About three quarters of the time		<ul> <li>¶</li> <li>23b. In general, what proportion of the time did access problems affect your ability to complete online activities? ¶</li> <li>a. Almost all the time¶</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>d. About a quarter of the time¶</li> <li>e. Almost none of the time¶</li> <li>¶</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>c. About half the time¶</li> <li>d. About a quarter of the time¶</li> <li>e. Almost none of the time¶</li> <li>¶</li> </ul>
	Page 3 of	

I

l

Revisions proposed by the ad hoc SPOI committee October 16, 2012.

*Please note: The committee was undecided about whether to use the current or pilot tested response scale. This issue will be decided at the Faculty Senate meeting.* 

## **Student Perception of Instruction**

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.

- 1. The organization of the course was:
- a. Excellent
- b. Very Good
- c. Good
- d. Fair
- e. Poor

#### 2. The instructor's explanation of course requirements and expectations was:

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

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

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

## 4. The instructor's respect and concern for students was:

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

## 5. The instructor's stimulation of interest in the course was:

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

## 6. The instructor's effectiveness in creating an environment that helps students learn was:

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

## 7. The instructor's explanation of grading criteria was:

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

## 8. The usefulness of the instructor's feedback on course performance was:

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

## 9. The effectiveness of the instructor in helping students achieve course objectives was:

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

## **10.** Overall, the effectiveness of the instruction in this course was:

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

## 11. What did you like best about how the instructor taught the course?

Comment:

## 12. What suggestions do you have for improving how the instructor taught the course?

Comment: