M E M O R A N D U M

Date: September 27, 2013

TO: Members of the Steering Committee

FROM: Reid Oetjen
                 Chair, Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING on October 3, 2013

Meeting Date: Thursday, October 3, 2013

Meeting Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: College of Arts and Humanities, Room 192

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Minutes of** *September 5, 2013*
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Report of the Provost**
6. **Old Business**

   - Publication of SPOI items
   - Steering liaison for Personnel Committee

7. **New Business**

   - Student attendance records and financial aid

8. **Committee Reports**

   - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Tom Wu*
   - Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
   - Parking Advisory Committee – *Bernardo Ramirez*
   - Personnel Committee – TBD
   - Undergraduate Council – *Robert Wood*

9. **Other Business**

10. **Adjournment**

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of
September 5, 2013

Reid Oetjen, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of August 8, 2013 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Kerry Welch, Associate Vice President, Student Development and Enrollment Services
Max Poole, Senior Associate Dean, Graduate Studies
Rick Schell, Vice President and Chief of Staff, Office of the President

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Oetjen announced that the Board of Governors was prepared to approve Jan Ignash as Interim Chancellor.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST
In the absence of the provost, Diane Chase gave his report.
1. There is a proposal for a program in Industrial Engineering jointly sponsored with a campus in Peru. This will soon go to the BOT for approval.
2. The Provost is looking to establish an "international pathway program" involving the Center for Multilingual and Multicultural Studies. This would function as a bridge program for foreign students, using a partnership school, to prepare them to enter certain undergraduate programs.
3. A vote is being conducted at this time by the UFF, to approve recent contract negotiations. Approval from this vote is needed to authorize the state-funded raises of $1000 or $1400. For the upcoming contract, the administration is offering 1% raises.

OLD BUSINESS
Senate Committees
Oetjen reported that all Senate reporting committees are staffed. He asked for volunteers to serve as liaisons with committees. The following liaisons were named:

> Budget and Administrative – Thomas Wu
> Personnel – Manoj Chopra (nominated but not present to accept)
> Graduate Council – Jim Moharam
> Undergraduate Council – Robert Wood
> Parking Advisory – Bernardo Ramirez

NEW BUSINESS
Graduate Student Council – Kerry Welch

Kerry Welch reported that last year a group was working on issues of friction between SGA and graduate students. They identified nine areas to work on. A new group is being developed, consisting of graduate students from every college, some undergraduate students, and some faculty. He asked for faculty volunteers to serve. After a suggestion from Ida Cook, the committee agreed to send this request to the Graduate Council.

Update on Office of Diversity Initiatives – Rick Schell
Rick Schell gave an update on the Office of Diversity Initiatives. This office reports to him as chief of staff, in order to ensure easy access to the president. Valarie King, who has led this office for almost 20 years, is retiring at the end of September. This seemed to be a good time to review the office and its function. For the last six months, a small committee has been looking at the office and comparing it to similar offices at other universities and private companies. The consensus of the committee was that the office should continue to function at the university level. The mission and goals would be updated but be essentially the same. No changes were needed in the operation of the office and the staffing would be maintained, with a national search conducted for King's replacement. Schell distributed a copy of the proposed mission and goals statement and asked that faculty circulate it and send him feedback. In response to a question, Schell said that UCF will continue to use the federal definition of diversity. This update will be added to the agenda of the next Senate meeting as an item of information.

Publication of SPOI Data
Oetjen brought up the idea of publishing information from SPOI data. Diane Chase said that previously, data for questions 9-16 from all responses were made public on the UCF website. With the revised question format, which questions, if any, should be made public? Various opinions were expressed: number 9 only, do the minimum required by statute, questions 3, 4, 5 and 9 since they are similar to the previously published questions. Diane Chase said that the administration would take direction from the Faculty Senate about the solution. Koons moved to table this item so that additional information can be gathered; it was seconded and carried.

OTHER BUSINESS
Oetjen reported that there is a new director of Student Disability Services. Oetjen is planning to meet with him and invite him to address the Senate.

Wood asked why UCF is not on a published list of the best universities to work for. Oetjen will send this question to the Personnel Committee.

Diane Chase reported that an effort was made in the summer to talk to non-faculty units to improve student success and graduation. Cook will be on a committee related to this; she asks for suggestions about how to help students.

In the light of several recent news items, Cook expressed a concern about alcohol and behavior on campus.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:40.

Current SPoI

1. Effectiveness organizing the course
2. **Effectiveness explaining course requirements, grading criteria, and expectations (Similar to Item #11)**
3. **Effectiveness communicating ideas and/or information. (Similar to Item #10)**
4. **Effectiveness showing respect and concern for students (Similar to Item #13)**
5. **Effectiveness stimulating interest in the course (Similar to Item #14)**
6. **Effectiveness creating an environment that helps students learn (Similar to Item #15)**
7. Effectiveness giving useful feedback on course performance
8. **Effectiveness helping students achieve course objectives (Similar to Item #12)**
9. **Overall effectiveness of the instructor (Similar to Item #16)**

Previous SPoI

1. Feedback concerning your performance in this course was
2. The instructor's interest in your learning was
3. Use of class time was
4. The instructor's overall organization of the course was
5. Continuity from one class meeting to the next was
6. The pace of the course was
7. The instructor's assessment of your progress in the course was
8. The texts and supplemental learning materials used in the course were
9. **Description of course objectives and assignments**
10. **Communication of ideas and information**
11. **Expression of expectations for performance**
12. **Availability to assist students in or outside of class**
13. **Respect and concern for students**
14. **Stimulation of interest in the course**
15. **Facilitation of learning**
16. **Overall assessment of instructor**

*** Bolded Items were posted on the UCF Test Scoring Services Website

About   News   Maintenance Calendar   Service Catalog   Organizational Units and Resources   Projects   Contact Us

Computer Services & Telecommunications

Enterprise Application Development
  About EAD
  Enterprise Imaging Systems
  Services
Enterprise Systems and Operations
  About ESO
  Resources
  Services
Information Security Office
  About ISO
  Incident Response
  Resources
  Security Coordinators
  Services
Project and Performance Management Office
  About PPMO
Technology Sales, Service and Support
  About TSSS
  Services
  Technology Commons
  Technology Service Center
  UCF Computer Store
Telecommunications
  About Telecommunications
  Network Services
  Resources
  Service Desk
  Services

Test Scoring Services

Student Perception of Instruction (SPI)

ALL requests for SPI data and error corrections should now be directed to the Faculty Affairs office. The Test Scoring office is not permitted to make changes to the SPI data or distribute additional copies without their authorization.

The Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) is administered near the end of each term to give students the opportunity to assess their instructor's performance. The raw data is withheld until after grades have been turned in. Once the data is delivered to the Test Scoring office, we usually complete the processing within a week and deliver the results on CDs to the Faculty Affairs office for review and distribution to their respective colleges.

Spring 2013 and later

The number of questions was reduced beginning in Spring 2013, and a new report format was developed. There are now only 9 multiple choice questions, and 2 free response "comment" questions.

The Multiple Choice Questions
(possible responses are Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor)

1. Effectiveness organizing the course
2. Effectiveness explaining course requirements, grading criteria, and expectations
3. Effectiveness communicating ideas and/or informations
4. Effectiveness showing respect and concern for students
5. Effectiveness stimulating interest in the course
6. Effectiveness creating an environment that helps students learn
7. Effectiveness giving useful feedback on course performance
8. Effectiveness helping students achieve course objectives
9. Overall effectiveness of the instructor

The Free Response Questions

- What did you like best about the course and/or how the instructor taught it?
- What suggestions do you have for improving the course and/or how the instructor taught it?

The results from Spring and Summer 2013 have not yet been authorized for publication on this site. (as of 9/3/2013)

Prior to Spring 2013

Prior to Spring 2013, it consisted of 16 multiple choice questions, plus 4 free response "comment" questions (since 1996):

The Multiple Choice Questions
(possible responses are Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor)

1. Feedback concerning your performance in this course was
2. The instructor's interest in your learning was
3. Use of class time was
4. The instructor's overall organization of the course was
5. Continuity from one class meeting to the next was
6. The pace of the course was
7. The instructor's assessment of your progress in the course was
8. The texts and supplemental learning materials used in the course were
9. Description of course objectives and assignments
10. Communication of ideas and information
11. Expression of expectations for performance
12. Availability to assist students in or outside of class

13. Respect and concern for students
14. Stimulation of interest in the course
15. Facilitation of learning
16. Overall assessment of instructor

The Free Response Questions

17. The thing(s) I like the MOST about this course
18. The thing(s) I like the LEAST about this course
19. What is your reaction to the method of evaluating your mastery of the course (i.e., testing, grading, out of class assignments (term papers), instructor feedback, etc.)
20. Additional comments and suggestions for improvement

Multiple choice questions 1 through 8, and the comments, are considered confidential and used only for instructor evaluation. However, the responses to questions 9 through 16 are public information published by the University.

Below is a list of semesters for which the public information is available with links to download the raw data, frequency counts of responses, and the PDF reports that summarize the data.

Academic Year	Semester	Semester Number	Data	Response Counts	Reports
1996	Fall	0980	data	counts	report
1997	Spring	0990	data	counts	report
1997	Summer	1000	data	counts	report
1997	Fall	1010	data	counts	report
1998	Spring	1020	data	counts	report
1998	Summer	1030	data	counts	report
1998	Fall	1040	data	counts	report
1999	Spring	1050	data	counts	report
1999	Summer	1060	data	counts	report
1999	Fall	1070	data	counts	report
2000	Spring	1080	data	counts	report
2000	Summer	1090	data	counts	report
2000	Fall	1100	data	counts	report
2001	Spring	1110	data	counts	report
2001	Summer	1120	data	counts	report
2001	Fall	1130	data	counts	report
2002	Spring	1140	data	counts	report
2002	Summer	1150	data	counts	report
2002	Fall	1160	data	counts	report
2003	Spring	1170	data	counts	report
2003	Summer	1180	data	counts	report
2003	Fall	1190	data	counts	report
2004	Spring	1200	data	counts	report
2004	Summer	1210	data	counts	report
2004	Fall	1220	data	counts	report
2005	Spring	1230	data	counts	report
2005	Summer	1240	data	counts	report
2005	Fall	1250	data	counts	report

SAMPLE RESULTS

Instructor Name: ▓▓▓▓▓

▓▓▓▓▓ing	▓▓▓▓▓	
Department/School	**Course-Section Number**	**Course Name**
Unknown	1	0.00
Number of Students Enrolled	**Number Responding**	**% of Response**

Question	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Number Responding
1. Description of course objectives	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
2. Communication of ideas and info	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
3. Expression of expectations of performance	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
4. Availability to assist students	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
5. Respect and concern for students	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
6. Stimulation of interest in the course	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	1
7. Facilitation of learning	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
8. Overall assessment of instructor	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1

Statistics over all questions

N	8
Mean	4.125
Std Dev	0.599478940414
Min	3
Max	5

Response Coding: Excellent = 5   Very Good = 4   Good = 3   Fair = 2   Poor = 1