

**Welfare Council Agenda
November 18, 2015
8:30 - 10:30 a.m.
Tigert 202**

1. Call to order and welcome
2. Approval of the October minutes
3. Old Business
 - a. Update Faculty club
 - b. Working conditions in music building (resolution)
 - c. Campus Climate Survey (reminder to complete)
 - d. Faculty Ombuds
4. New Business
5. Adjourn

Welfare Council Minutes (DRAFT)
October 13, 2015
8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. 202 Tigert

Attendees:	Silvio dos Santos	Sue Alvers
Angel Kwolek-Folland	Ray Thomas	Jasmeet Judge
Daniella Saetta	Mei-Fang Lan	Jodi Gentry
Chris Hass	Karen Whalen	
Ray Issa	Amanda House	

Amanda House, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. for Karen Whalen who had laryngitis. After introductions, September minutes were approved.

Working Conditions in Music Building – Silvio dos Santos

- Silvio dos Santos asked the council to submit a resolution to the Faculty Senate asking the University to meet the standard environmental conditions for faculty, students and staff. Conditions in the Music Building have been in decline.
 - Severe roof leakage
 - Humidity, frost and freeze inside the building with no control over the temperature and humidity. Students and faculty suffer along with damage to instruments.
 - Noisy classrooms and rehearsal spaces.
 - Insufficient practice room space
 - Ongoing plumbing problems
- Some have suggested demolishing the building and use donations to build a new one.
- Ray Issa motioned with Ray Thomas second for the council to support a resolution that will go before the Senate asking the university to address the environmental conditions in the Music Building. This motion was approved by the Welfare Council unanimously.

OPT System – Angel Kwolek-Folland

- Angel Kwolek-Folland explained that changes are in progress with the OPT System. Currently the college/department teaching evaluation means have graduate and undergraduates included. After the revision, graduate and undergraduate means will be separated out.

Climate Survey – Angel Kwolek-Folland

- Dr. Kwolek-Folland mentioned that the university will do a climate survey that will open October 27 and close around November 17. Results of the survey will be available in spring 2016. Participants in the survey are faculty, staff and post docs.
- There are no plans for a climate survey for students because they are given the SERU survey every two years.

Faculty Ombudsman

- Karen Whalen stated that at Ken Gerhardt, Faculty Ombuds, will speak at the November Faculty Senate Meeting. She said that Dr. Gerhardt mentioned at the last Steering Committee meeting that the College of Medicine plans to have its own ombuds. Paul Davenport, Faculty Senate Chair, has asked Welfare Council to give an opinion if the university should have several ombuds or one. Sue will contact Drs. Gerhardt and Davenport to invite them to the next Welfare Council meeting to discuss.

Faculty Club

- Karen distributed the Faculty Club Amenities document that was written by Bradley Walters, Infrastructure Chair. She reminded the members that the Faculty Club will be located in University House.
- Concern was raised that the planned location was not in the center of campus.
- Chris Hass noted that there are not too many barriers for the club except that faculty need to use it to make it work.
- After some discussion, the council suggested that there should be a second story with breakout rooms added to the conference center/faculty club.

Teaching Assessment

- Chris Hass explained that last year, Welfare Council worked a little bit with APC, Jennifer Smith and the Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars on peer evaluations. The Academy had a peer assessment workshop/seminar that a several of the council members attended. He noted that CALS seems to have the best policy for peer evaluations. Chris wrote a white paper on the subject and will send to Karen who will then distribute to the council to review and discuss at the next meeting. He pointed out that the document that was distributed was written by Michael Kane (he thinks).
- Ray Thomas questioned whether anyone found out if holding grades until course evaluations were complete was a state policy? Chris explained that the policy is a university regulation.
- Daniella Saetta, student representative, pointed out that students want mid-term evaluations instead of end-of-course evaluations. They feel that if there is a mid-term evaluation then it can effect change in how the course is taught.
- Jasmeet Judge mentioned that she has mid-term evaluation and also final evaluations. She stated that she has had a good response rate by doing this.

Other items of Discussion

- Chris Hass asked the council to review the issue of students having four final exams on the same day. Even though it states this should not be done in the regulations, instructors are still doing this. Karen mentioned that this item is really for the APC. She will mention it to the APC chair at Steering Committee.
- Ray Thomas asked that HR add more information on retirement to its website. At the moment there is retirement planning information which is different than the “process on how to retire”. For faculty who plan to retire, it would be helpful to have something online about the process. Jodi Gentry will check into this. Jodi also asked the council to review the website and asked for suggestions to make it more user friendly.
- Ray mentioned that he has heard concern about “shared services”. He asked Jodi if she has any feedback on how it is working. Jodi is a member of a task force looking at shared service and she mentioned that she would bring up Ray’s concern.

The Welfare Council meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Resolution in Favor of the Construction of a New Music Center

WHEREAS, the School of Music has a vibrant music program, offering undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees in music; as well as joint degrees with several other programs at the University of Florida and large-enrollment general education courses in the humanities; and

WHEREAS, resulting from overall outdated design and years of deferred maintenance, the Music Building, built in the late 1960s, does not meet basic working and studying conditions and poses in many instances a health hazard for faculty and students; and

WHEREAS these problems have been well-documented by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), an accreditation institution, and by a report commissioned by the University of Florida's Physical Plant Division in 2011; and

WHEREAS, the renovation costs to bring the Music Building to 21st-century standards, which even if completed would still not provide adequate teaching and learning spaces (by design, only about half of the building's square footage is usable); and

WHEREAS, the cost of renovation and the addition of a required Recital Hall would be nearly as expensive as a new building; and

WHEREAS, state funds for maintenance have not been available and it is unlikely that additional funds will be forthcoming, and as it has been observed, individual donors rarely donate funds toward the renovation of old structures, preferring instead new, named constructions;

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED THAT:

The Faculty Senate of the University of Florida, on behalf of the faculty of the University of Florida, supports the construction of a new [to be named] Music Center, compatible with the demands of the music program at the University of Florida, and the expected standards of NASM and similar AAU universities.

An exceptional educational environment which promotes, recognizes and rewards teaching excellence is fundamental to achieving the mission of the University of Florida. ~~An~~ This exceptional educational environment requires a long-standing commitment to the pursuit and ~~the transfer~~ sharing of new ideas both ~~inside~~ and ~~outside~~ of the classroom through effective instructional techniques. The Welfare Council of the Faculty Senate, the Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars, and the Office of Faculty Development and Teaching Excellence support the assessment of instructional quality and effectiveness to ensure the University of Florida is providing an effective learning environment and to promote and recognize teaching excellence. We believe in a holistic/comprehensive assessment of teaching effectiveness incorporating information from the instructor in the form of teaching statements/portfolios, student evaluations and peer assessments.

Peer Assessments: The primary intent of peer assessment is to provide a process for improving teaching effectiveness (formulative evaluation). Our joint position is that peer assessments should be conducted a minimum of two times for each course taught by the instructor during the tenure probationary period. If after after appropriate feedback and the second review the peer assessment committee has deemed the instructor to have achieved satisfactory or distinction in teaching, then additional assessments of teaching may not be warranted during the pretenure period. The individual reports of the assessment committee should not be part of the tenure and promotion or annual assessment of the faculty member. At the end of the pretenure period, a summary report of the committee could be included in section xxx of the T&P packet. Thereafter formulative evaluation through peer assessment should be conducted at least once per class every 3-5 years or when triggered by performance that dips below 1SD of departmental and college means from the online student evaluations.

Online Student Evaluations: Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness are important components of the overall assessment of instructional quality. Faculty are encouraged to follow best practice guidelines for enhancing participation in the online student evaluation process. Faculty and units that do not feel the standardized questions provide adequate information to be useful in enhancing instructional effectiveness are encouraged to create additional student assessments in a manner consistent with UF student evaluation policies (ie. anonymity protection). Our joint position is that Online instructor evaluations that fall $\geq 2SD$ from the departmental or college mean, whichever is lower require peer assessment in the following term – $1SD$ of the departmental and college mean, whichever is lower on two consecutive terms require a peer assessment.

Teaching statements/portfolios:

Commented [MEK1]: Might add this: Currently there is very significant variation in the extent and manner in which peer assessment of teaching is conducted in the various colleges at the University of Florida. It is believe that more uniform and effective procedures are needed.. These procedures should be developed with comprehensive from faculty and administrators from all colleges.

Commented [MEK2]:
Chris,
Not sure if the ADTS will support these very specific recommendations at the moment until the they complete the peer assessment workshop. How were these thresholds decided upon, The CALS student evaluations are often 1SD. We need to discuss this.

Mike