

**Council of Associate Deans (CAD) Minutes
December 3, 2013
226 Tigert Hall**

Present: Tammy Aagard, Peggy Carr, Tom Dana, Stephanie Hanson, Chris Janelle, Angela Lindner, Bernard Mair, Ed Schaefer, Jen Day Shaw, Joe Spillane, Horace Tucker, Elaine Turner, Theresa Vernetson, Andrew Wehle, Michael Weigold, and M. Dee Williams

Absent: David Pharies

The meeting was called to order by Bernard Mair at 1:34 p.m.

1. Minutes of the November Council of Associate Deans' Meeting

The minutes from the November meeting were approved with corrections and clarification:

- Page 2, item 4, bullet 3 – Hanson clarified that the system does not crash in the HPNP building. The system cannot handle the capacity of the students trying to get onto the internet. When the system exceeds the capacity, the students cannot access the system. Students are unable to access the internet in class when they need to. Delete the word “crashes” from the end of both sentences.
- Page 3, item 6 – For the statewide core, UF recommended that the communication requirement could be satisfied with ENC 1101 or ENC 1102. Delete the second sentence.

2. Online Faculty Evaluations – Angela Lindner

Lindner is seeking advice and feedback on improving response rates because those in Engineering continue to decline despite their efforts. Faculty and administrators are very concerned and department chairs are suggesting an opt in or opt out option for students.

Discussion:

- Dana indicated that Education's rate used to be about 50-60% and is down to 28%. Students are ignoring their requests. Education is also finding that response rates for elective courses are lower compared to the courses required for the major courses. He is in favor of allowing a student to opt out of participating in an evaluation. He also pointed out that on the evaluation administrative page, there is an opt out column. It is programmed in, but cannot be used.
- Schaefer has a different perspective. He believes that the difference with the online system is that faculty need to be proactive to get students to respond. He does not think it is fair for faculty to complain about low response rates when they have not been proactive in getting response rates.
- It was suggested that UF could mount a campus-wide campaign to get students to realize that evaluations could be completed anywhere such as on the bus or during class.
- The group discussed the possibility of punitive methods but was reminded that this was already ruled out as not being appropriate. The university did not want class evaluations to have any negative connotations. There should not be any punitive element associated with evaluating courses such as holding students' grades or transcripts.
- Hanson pointed out that the system was supposed to be evaluated after three years. We had agreed that if current methods were not working, we would change the process to improve the response rates. The online system was piloted Spring 2011 and adopted Fall 2011 so we are approaching the three-year time to re-evaluate the system.
- Some colleges reported significant increases in response rates when instructors had students complete the evaluations in class. The students completed the evaluations on their mobile devices (phones, tablets, laptops), so there was no need to provide any additional equipment. Some in the group felt that faculty should be encouraged to adopt this procedure in their individual classes and others felt that there should be some centrally administered campus-wide system, not relying on

each faculty to do it for their class. An administrator would go to the instructor's classroom to administer the evaluation, explain the purpose, and ensure the students complete it. It would be done consistently for all faculty members so the evaluation experience itself is consistent. Hanson feels it is possible to set up a system in which a basic template of what students are told is given in every class. The method could be a talking head over the internet or a script so faculty variance is eliminated from what students are told the purpose of the evaluation is and how it will be used. It addresses the consistency concerns.

- The following changes were suggested:
 - Can the system be changed so a student can see all courses at one time and complete the process only once?
 - Can each instructor be evaluated only once each year instead of in every class?
- Weigold would like the evaluation to include a question as to why students are not completing the evaluations. Shaw indicated that students do not think the survey is used for anything or that it directly affects them. Weigold is willing to create a survey to get perception of students. If students are completing the evaluations, what is their motivation to complete it? If students are not completing evaluations, why not?

Recommendations:

- Dana, Lindner, Turner and Carr will meet with TJ Summerford to explore if there are different ways to present the evaluation which would enhance the process and to discuss what format other universities are using. They will look into whether a multi-column full semester view is possible.
- Invite Summerford to a council meeting after the subgroup has had an opportunity to meet with him.
- The council would like data broken down by undergraduate, graduate and professional students for February's meeting or earlier. The council would like to see the trend over time before going online, by course level and by departments.

3. Statewide Gen Ed Core: ENC 1101 – Bernard Mair

UF recommended that the statewide core communication list be expanded to include ENC 1102. Some majors will be affected by it because ENC 1101 or 1102 are not required for the major. Mair also added another request to BOG to have the prerequisite language for math and science valid for the communication area. UF is the only state institution that has made a request for changes.

4. Other Items

- Shaw informed the council that the Career Showcase is on January 21 and 22. She invited the associate deans to attend.
- Aagard thanked everyone for participating in the open house. Any feedback can be sent to Chandra Mitchell. She indicated Admissions may hold another open house in the spring.
- Aagard reported that the deadline for the Self-reported Academic Record (SAR) was Sunday, December 1. There was a 90% on-time submission completion rate. Admissions is contacting those who have not completed the SAR and those students will have until the end of the week to complete the SAR. Aagard believes the SAR made a difference in processing time. The total application number is the same as last year. So SAR did not affect the number of students that applied to UF.
- Aagard indicated that 70 new transfer students have been admitted to UF Online for the spring. About 40 students completed the online orientation. So these students will most likely enroll as online students. Admissions is currently working with about 500 Business and other 2+2 program students to roll them into UF online. She also indicated that there are 55 FTIC applications for next fall.

Meeting adjourned at 2:49 p.m.