Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
September 17, 2009

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of August 27, 2009 were unanimously approved with no revisions.

A suggestion was made to append the roll to a meeting's minutes. Dr. Cook noted that this had been done in the past and the practice had been terminated, but the issue can be taken up again by the Steering Committee.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Provost Hickey, Diane Chase, Richard Harrison, Charlene Stinard, Rick Schell, Bernadette Jungblut, Lynn Hepner, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Sherry Andrews.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Provost's Update
Today the provost attended the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting at Brevard Community College campus. The BOT is enthusiastic about the formation of a School of Visual Arts and Design, which would bring together the departments of Art and Digital Media. This is a revenue-neutral change. An Arts Management track has been reviewed at the college level and will be coming forward for review. There is no new budget news. Colleges and units are working on plans to eliminate one-time funds from recurring budgets, and these plans are due to the provost by mid-October. These plans will be reviewed and ultimately presented to the BOT.

OLD BUSINESS
College Budget Updates
Steering Committee members offered updates on their colleges' plans to reduce the budget to eliminate one-time funds.
- The College of Arts and Humanities has plans for a $2.6 million reduction by 2010-2012, assuming the budget is not subject to further cuts. The reduction will be made through the attrition of departing faculty and staff and by not rehiring those on visiting lines when their contracts are up. A restructuring plan is also proposed to reduce expenditures in the case of further budget cuts. There is a meeting of the Advisory Board on September 29, rescheduled from last Friday.
- The Rosen College of Hospitality Management had a retreat on August 21 at which the financial situation was discussed. Due to past savings and the loss of six positions through attrition, no additional cuts are necessary. They are considering terminating some under-enrolled tracks, but that will not affect faculty or staff positions.
- The College of Health and Public Affairs has formed a committee of faculty that will meet regularly. There is a college-wide meeting on Monday.
- The College of Nursing faculty delegated this job to Leadership Council, which is composed of the dean, the associate deans, and the chairs of all of the college's committee. A full budget report was discussed to determine how to cover the deficits.

- The College of Education is considering restructuring to achieve the budget reduction goal and changing the Master's programs to effect greater enrollment. The Faculty Council is discussing the process. Faculty are identifying which proposed unit they would like to join.
- The College of Engineering and Computer Science formed a committee. A representative from that committee was not able to attend today to report.
- The College of Business Administration formed a committee of department chairs and sub-deans. The committee determined that the PhD in Economics will be eliminated.
- The College of Optics and Photonics cut is small enough that the college is able to cover the reduction.
- The College of Science established a committee that has met and is currently developing a report.
- The College of Medicine did not report, as they are under different budget strictures.

The provost explained that the reason why the College of Optics and Photonics' deficit is so small is because the budget itself is small. He also noted that we are working under a moving target, as total funds from new tuition money has not yet been finalized. It is expected that the colleges will receive an additional $1-$2 million this year from additional enrollment. This is recurring money.

<u>Conflict of Interest Online Implementation</u> - *Lin Huff-Corzine and Doug Backman*
A handout was distributed containing a copy of an email to the faculty from the provost regarding implementation and a printout of the newest version of the online form. Dr. Huff-Corzine provided an overview of the process to migrate the Potential Conflict of Interest and Commitment online.   The form had been revised in preparation for on-line implementation. Forms AA21 (Potential Conflict of Interest and Commitment) and AA22 (Permission to Use UCF Personnel, Equipment, Facilities, Students, or Services) were combined into a list of ten questions that branch into more detailed sub-questions. The forms had been reviewed by the provost, the vice president for Research & Commercialization, and the college deans and department chairs. Changes had been made based on their feedback. Federal guidelines are provided in the form. The online form will be available on Monday, September 21 and completed forms are due to chairs and supervisors by October 6. The submitted forms are reviewed by chairs, deans' offices, the provost's office, and Research and Commercialization, when appropriate. An email about the online system is going out on Monday morning. Faculty who do not get the email should contact pca@mail.ucf.edu. Dr. Huff-Corzine opened the floor to questions.
- A question was raised regarding how nine month faculty should handle reporting their summer activities, given that the reporting period begins August 8. For nine month faculty, conflicts of commitment would not apply during the summer, but potential conflicts of interest must still be reported.
- Faculty who have already submitted papers forms during this reporting period are not required to submit online, but can if they wish.
- Issues were raised with regards to content changes and the review process for the changes, including whether the document should have gone through the Personnel Committee and whether senators should have had the opportunity to review the form before plans were made to go live with the online form. Dr. Huff-Corzine replied that the form had been made available for review to the Faculty Senate and the colleges. She asked Sherry Andrews, Associate General Counsel, to respond to the questions raised about the legal language in the form. Ms. Andrews noted that the document has been reviewed by several of the university's attorneys, and that the wording of questions is still being changed based on concerns raised. She is comfortable that the

current version complies with Florida statutes. As a followup, Dr. Cook noted that the approval of Conflict of Interest form has never gone through the Personnel Committee before.

- A question was raised about whether the document should have gone through the union and whether it is subject to collective bargaining. Dr. Cook noted that the Senate is not involved in collective bargaining issues.
- Dr. Cook noted that the Senate never received a working link to the form and so had been unable to distribute it for review. She suggested that the Office of Faculty Affairs shift the deadline for going live with the new form until after faculty have had a chance to review it and provide feedback.
- It was suggested that faculty be permitted to fill out the paper form until the questions are resolved and until faculty have had a chance to provide feedback. Dr. Huff-Corzine replied that the questions in the online form are not significantly different from those on the paper form. It is possible that they might delay the go-live date. To comply with the law, faculty must fill out a form each academic year. At this time, the links to the old form have been removed.

Report on TIP, RIA, and SOTL document approval
The TIP, RIA, and SOTL documents were approved by all colleges except for COM, which is still reviewing the forms. There is no schedule set yet for these programs. The TIP data will be out near the end of Fall semester, by December 4th at the latest.

Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) content revisions – *Diane Wink*
Dr. Wink provided an overview of the history of the ad hoc Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Committee. They have developed a new SPoI form as a result of three years of ongoing development. Dr. Wink discussed the details of the proposed form. Many of the questions were introduced in response to faculty requests to update the form to include context, e.g. whether the course is required or an elective, whether delivery format is face to face, web-based, etc…. A Faculty Perception of Instruction form was also added to allow faculty to record their perceptions of the class. The proposed form is a result of faculty input and previous pilot studies in a variety of courses. The form has three sections: 1) student information, 2) delivery mode, and 3) course/faculty evaluation. Modes of analysis of collected data were suggested. Motion made to receive the report from the committee. Motion seconded and unanimously approved. Motion made to discharge the ad hoc Student Perception of Instruction Committee. Motion seconded. Dr. Cook thanked the committee for their long and dedicated service. Motion to discharge the committee unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS
None.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
Dr. Cook noted that the standing committees are being organized and will begin their business.

Budget and Administrative
The committee met. Annette Khaled was elected Chair and Michelle Kelley was elected Vice Chair.

Graduate Council – *Stephen Goodman reports (for Jim Moharam)*
The leadership of the Graduate Council and its four subcommittees has been established, and is as follows:

Graduate Council Chair: Dr. Jim Moharam
Graduate Council Vice Chair: Dr. Ram Mohapatra
Graduate Policy Committee Chair: Dr. Jim Moharam
Graduate Curriculum Committee Chair: Dr. Ram Mohapatra
Graduate Program Review Committee Chair: Dr. Paul Dombrowski
Graduate Appeals and Awards Committee Chair: Dr. Kevin Coffey

Over the summer the Graduate Appeals and Awards Committee considered 25 petitions on a variety of topics (ranging from waiving time limit rules, transferring excess credits into programs, course substitutions, reversion to earlier catalogs, and waiving the minimum 6XXX hour requirements). 17 of these petitions were approved and 8 were denied. The first Fall 2009 meeting of the committee is scheduled for September 22, 2009.

The Graduate Curriculum Committee had its first meeting of the semester on September 16, 2009. At that meeting the committee reviewed six Course Action Requests (2 for course additions and 4 for course revisions). In addition the committee reviewed proposals for the following:

- Addition of portfolio as an option in the College of Education K-8 Math and Science Ed MEd program for fall 2009.
- Temporary suspension of admissions to the College of Education MA in Curriculum and Instruction while the department makes revisions to the program.
- Program revision for College of Sciences Physics PhD program.
- Temporary suspension of admissions to the College of Arts and Humanities MFA in Film and Digital Media, Visual Languages track due to budget issues.

The Graduate Policy Committee has its first Fall 2009 meeting scheduled for September 23, 2009.

The Graduate Program Review Committee has not yet had any business come forth that necessitates the scheduling of a meeting.

Personnel
The Personnel Committee met and elected a chair. However, the person elected is not a senator and so a new election will need to be held, as the Constitution requires that the committee chair be a senator.

Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum
The B.A. in Architecture was voted down. Hospitality Management track deletions have been tabled. A name change was approved. Health Information Management has changed its name to Health Information and Informatics.

OTHER BUSINESS
Dr. Wink, Chair of the Committee on Committees, is staffing vacancies. Colleges are urged to cooperate in staffing committees.

The constitutional revision is ongoing. College of Medicine will be included where possible in the constitutional revision to account for eligibility issues of its faculty.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to adjourn approved unanimously 5:30 P.M.

Student Perception of Instruction Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee Report

September 17, 2009

Mason Cash

Tace Crouse

Richard Harrison II

Bernadette M.E. Jungblut

Charles Negy

Charlene A. Stinard

Dawn Trouard

Diane Wink

Ad hoc Committee

- Set up by Faculty Senate 2006
- In response to faculty requests for a new form which better reflects current practice and considers characteristics of classes

Committee Charge

- Revise Student Perception of Instruction form to put responses in context and to reflect current teaching practices of faculty

- Committee NOT charged with development of plan for on-line administration of SPoI

- Committee NOT charged with determining if SPoI data should or should not be collected

Committee Charge

Put the responses in Context

Ad hoc Committee Goals

Develop a tool which:

1. Helps faculty improve teaching
2. Empowers students to provide thoughtful, relevant, and useful feedback.
3. Provides information which contributes to the faculty evaluation process
4. Minimizes the impact of bias in the evaluation process
5. Provides context sensitive feedback (e.g. site, modality, level of student, required vs elective course vs GEP, student ability)
6. Clearly separates curricular from instructor based evaluation items

Ad hoc Committee Goals

Develop a tool which:

7. Clearly separates mandated components of the course (e.g. course text) from instructor based components

8. Allows students to comment on environmental and university factors (e.g. parking, room temp, function of WebCT, library, bookstore) in a section separate from evaluation of faculty

9. Ties evaluation to course objectives

10. Reflects delivery format of course (e.g. face-to-face, or web or ITV) or evaluates those courses separately

11. Allows meaningful data analysis for a variety of queries

12. Design response options specific to each item set

Ad hoc Committee

- Reviewed existing commercial and forms developed by other schools
- Developed drafts
  - Face to face and ITV
  - M mode
  - W mode
  - Faculty Perception of Instruction
- Feedback from faculty and students via the senate and student government and by open calls for feedback
- Student focus group - # students and feedback one by one on items
- Pilots with faculty and students

Form Development

- Faculty input on needed changes Fall 2006
- Requested feedback about
  - Length of form
  - Overall content
  - Specific items

University of Central Florida
Faculty Senate Student Perception of Instruction ad hoc Committee
Feedback on Goals and Additional Goals

For each of the following, rate the importance of each of the following objectives on a 1 – 5 scale
with 5 being very important and 1 being unimportant.

Develop a tool which:	5	4	3	2	1	Comments
Helps faculty improve teaching	*					
Empowers students to provide thoughtful, relevant, and useful feedback.	**					
Provides information which contributes to the faculty evaluation process	*					
Minimizes the impact of bias in the evaluation process	*****					
Provides context sensitive feedback (e.g. site, modality, level of student, required vs elective course vs GEP, student ability)	**					
Clearly separates curricular from instructor-based evaluation items	*					
Clearly separates mandated components of the course (e.g. course text) from instructor-based components	*					
Allows students to comment on environmental and university factors (e.g. parking, room temp, function of WebCT, library, bookstore) in a section separate from evaluation of faculty	***					
Ties evaluation to course objectives	*					
Reflects delivery format of course (e.g. face-to-face, or web or ITV) or evaluates those courses separately	*					
Allows meaningful data analysis for a variety of queries	*					
Contains response options specific to each item set	*					

Additional Comments and suggestions (use back or go to a second page if needed):

Please return to a member of the committee or send to Latrecia Rice (Faculty Senate Office).
Please distribute in your department, school, or College to allow all faculty to offer comments and input.

Form Development Fall 2007

- Suggested items, format presented
- To all faculty
- Feedback summarized, reviewed, items altered.

Sample Feedback Fall 2007

1	Face to Face and ITV Classes		
2	**Item Number**	**Total Votes**	**Comments**
3	Item 1	11	1) Response options "c" and "d" are similar; may be hard to understand. 2) Move to middle or end -- why begin with a "preference"? Does that invoke an attitude? 3) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor -- it is the job of faculty (the experts on teaching) to be concerned with learning and developing web components as they see fit. It is superfluous to ask students who are not trained in teaching "what they like". Faculty should make these decisions.)
4	Item 2	12	1) Differentiate between response option b and e. 2) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor
5	Item 3	11	1) True/False vs. Agree/Disagree. 2) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor
6	Item 4	7	1) Include option "e. no choice of instructor offered" 2) Not needed because item 3 would include this factor. 3) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor. Most students take what they need for their programs and don't know about the professor, or it is a new professor, or the professor is changed in drop/add, etc. Again superfluous, (unless, perhaps a box is added that says, "N/A")
7	Item 5	9	1) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor. 2) Either change #5 to professor assigned most of texts or ask about how much of text student used as follow-up to assignments. 3) Would it be helpful to have feedback on the course materials, not just that they were used?
8	Item 6	11	1) Too vague, and unfair to instructor who doesn't choose course content; curriculum and degree program "choose " course content. 2) Curricular question; does not belong to Part I; place in Part II. 3) Dees this belong in instructor section?
9	Item 7	11	If the question is meant to give a context for the student's attitude toward the instructor, what happens when the student doesn't accurately predict his/her grade? Students frequently miscalculate their final grade, so what does this question accomplish?
10	Item 8	12	1) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor. 2) Spread cover insufficient range. Include 3-6 and 6-9. 3) Change response option to "c. more than 3 to 6 hours" and include option "d. more than 6 hours".

Additional Feedback 2007

- Student Government given form
- Feedback during focus session

Form Development

- Pilots with faculty and students Spring 08
  - Invited faculty who had won teaching awards to participate in pilot
  - 21 faculty participated
  - Students complete new form in addition to current SPoI in one or more classes
    - Several hundred students completed form
    - Students completed the revised SPoI as well as comments on questions
  - Used feedback to revise items.

Form Development

- Requested feedback from Senate on revised items
  - April 2009
  - End of Summer 2009
  - August 2009
  - Item by item changes made as needed

Response to Feedback Spring and Summer 2009

- Item response revision

- Revised item

- Additional item

Item Response Options SPoI

- **Old**

  3. I had a strong desire to take this course.

      a. absolutely true

      b. mostly true

      c. I had no preference.

      d. mostly false

      e. absolutely false

- **New**

  3. I had a strong desire to take this course.

      a. Strongly Agree

      b. Agree

      c. Neither Agree nor Disagree

      d. Disagreee.

      e. Strongly Disagree

Item Response Options FPoI

Old

4. In general, the students showed interest in what was being taught in the course(s).

a) absolutely true

b) mostly true

c) mostly false

d) absolutely false

New

4. In general, the students showed interest in what was being taught in the course(s).

a)   Strongly Agree

b)   Agree

c)   Neither Agree nor Disagree

d)   Disagreee.

e)   Strongly Disagree

Item Changes

Old

20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express their ideas.

New

20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express thoughtful or well-reasoned ideas.

Additional Question

21. The instructor provided opportunities for students to be intellectually or educationally challenged by this course.

(Rest of form renumbered accordingly)

Proposed SPoI Forms

Three sections:

- Section I: Student Information Items (6)
  - *Desire to take class, take by this mode, expected grade*

- Section II: Face-to-Face and ITV Course Items OR Web items (varies)
  - Student behaviors (number of classes missed, study time, participation)
  - Logistics (parking, room)
  - Logistic for course delivery e.g. ITV site of origin

- *Sections I and II*
  - *Not used to evaluate instruction*
  - *Help put responses to other items in context.*

Proposed form

- Section III: Evaluation of Instruction Items 14/15 items plus two short answers
  - About actual course (syllabus, schedule) and faculty effectiveness (well organized, available, delivery of content, feedback, development of critical thinking)
  - Final item "Overall, this faculty member was an effective instructor."
- Short answers
  - What did you like best about the way this faculty member taught this course?
  - What suggestions do you have for this faculty member to improve this course?

Data Analysis

NO averages suggested

Not valid for most ways they may be calculated

Output and Analyses: Overview

- **Seven sections (all available online and securely)**
  - Course/class context
  - Teaching modality, student effort expended, problems students experienced *outside* instructor's control
  - Instructor's ratings
  - Instructor's ratings compared to department and college
  - Instructor's ratings controlling for class context
  - Instructor's ratings controlling for teaching modality
  - Students' comments

- **Raw data also available to instructor (in machine-readable format)**

Output Section 1: Course/Class Context

1. In general, I prefer taking courses that are:
2. Which of the following is the most important reason you took this course?
3. I had a strong desire to take this course.
4. I had a strong desire to take a course with this instructor.
5. I used most of the required course materials (for example texts, articles, online resources, art supplies, computer programs, etc.).
6. The final grade I anticipate for this class is:

- **Bar graphs showing:**
    - Total number of students in course/section (possible response rate)
    - Total number of students responding to each question (actual response rate per item)
    - Total number of missing responses for each question (missing responses per item)
    - Headcounts for each response option
    - Percentages for each response option

Output Section 2: Teaching Modality, Student Effort Expended, Problems Outside Instructor's Control

F1. I spent ___ hours per week outside of class on this course.
F2. I missed class ___ times this semester.
F3. I was late to class or left early ___ times this semester.
F4. Did this class have online assignments (for example, web readings, web modules, online discussions, etc.)?
F5. I completed the online assignments.
F6. Webcourses technical problems were minimal and did NOT impact my ability to complete assignments.
F7. Parking on campus made it difficult for me to get to class on time.
F8. The classroom was comfortable for learning: the temperature, sound, desks/chairs, and lighting were fine.

- **Bar graphs showing:**
  - Total number of students in course/section (possible response rate)
  - Total number of students responding to each question (actual response rate per item)
  - Total number of missing responses for each question (missing responses per item)
  - Headcounts for each response option
  - Percentages for each response option

Output Section 3: Instructor's Ratings

7. The instructor provided a syllabus.
8. The instructor provided information about how grades are determined.
9. The instructor provided a course schedule.
10. The required course materials (for example, texts, articles, online resources, art
     supplies, computer programs, etc.) helped me learn the course content.
11. The assignments helped me learn the course content.
12. The instructor was available to assist me at prearranged times outside of class either
     online or in person.
13. The instructor was well organized.
14. The instructor displayed enthusiasm for teaching this class.
15. The instructor communicated the importance and significance of the subject matter.
16. The instructor communicated ideas and/or information clearly.
17. On average, I received feedback on the class assignments from the instructor.
18. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to ask questions.
19. The instructor answered student questions.
20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express thoughtful or well-reasoned ideas.
21. The instructor provided opportunities for students to be intellectually or educationally
     challenged by this course.
22. Overall, this faculty member was an effective instructor.

- **Bar graphs showing:**
  - Total number of students in course (possible response rate)
  - Total number of students responding to each question (actual response rate per item)
  - Total number of missing responses for each question (missing responses per item)
  - Headcounts for each response option
  - Percentages for each response option

Output Section 4:
Instructor's Ratings Compared to Department and College

Bar Graphs for Questions 7, 8, & 9:
- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "Yes" and "No" responses
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of "Yes" and "No" responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of "Yes" and "No" responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Bar Graphs for Question 10:
- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree", "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" responses
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Bar Graph for Question 17 (time until feedback received):
- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "within one week," "within two weeks," "within three weeks," "by the end of the semester" responses
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16, 18-22:
- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" (shown separately or combined)
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Output Section 5:
Instructor's Ratings Controlling for Class Context

- **Students' Most Preferred Teaching Modality**
  - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
    - Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses (shown separately or combined)
    - For students for whom the teaching modality of this course/section was their most preferred (e.g., F@F, Web-based, Web-mediated, etc.)

- **Students' Most Important Reason for Taking This Course**
  - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
    - Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses (shown separately or combined)
    - For students whose most important reason for taking this course included because they "wanted to"

- **Students Who Had a Strong Desire to Take This Course**
  - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
    - Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses (shown separately or combined)
    - For students who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" they had a strong desire to take this course

- **Students Who Had a Strong Desire to Take a Course with This Instructor**
  - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
    - Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses (shown separately or combined)
    - For students who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" they had a strong desire to take a course with this instructor

- **Students Who Used the Required Course Materials**
  - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
    - Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses (shown separately or combined)
    - For students who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" they had used most of the required course materials

- **Students' Expected Grades**
  - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
    - Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses (shown separately or combined)
    - Broken down by all grade options (As, Bs, Cs, Ds, F, P, S, U, Other)

Output Section 6:
Instructor's Ratings Controlling for Teaching Modality

- **Face-To-Face/ITV Courses:**
  - For Questions 11-16 and 18-22

  - Correlations between students' responses on **effort expended-type questions** and "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" responses

  - Correlations between students' responses on **problems outside of instructor's control-type questions** and "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" responses

- **Web-Based Courses:**
  - Same as above

- **Web-Mediated Courses:**
  - Same as above

- **Instruments Specific to Other Teaching Modalities Could Be Added:**
  - As requested by faculty, departments, colleges
  - As determined by Faculty Relations and Faculty Senate

Output Section 7: Students' Comments

23. What did you like best about the way this faculty member taught this course?

24. What suggestions do you have for this faculty member to improve this course?

Questions??