M E M O R A N D U M

Date: October 11, 2012

TO: All Faculty Senate Members

FROM: Ida Cook
                      Chair, Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: **Faculty Senate Meeting on October 18, 2012**

Meeting Date: Thursday, October 18, 2012

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** *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**

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.

Personnel – *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.

Undergraduate Council – *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.

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:

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: