Faculty Governance Council

October 26, 2009
2:00PM to 4:00PM
Dean's Conference Room (4307, HPNP)

Members: Dr. Richard Segal (Chair and Senator, POP), Dr. Michael Meldrum (Senator, PD), Dr. Michael Katovich (Senator, PD), Dr. Ken Sloan (MC), Dr. Veronika Butterweck (PC), Dr. Earlene Lipowski (POP), Mr. Tom Munyer (PTR), Dr. Dorette Ellis (PD), Dr. Renee Rose (DCEE), Dr. William Millard (Dean's Office)

Guest(s):

AGENDA TOPICS

1. Ongoing Projects

   a. Approve minutes from September 26, 2009

   b. Electronic exams (Guests: Lane, Andy and Scott)

   c. Status report on the Procedure and Policy Manual (Segal)

   d. Status report on the Assoc/Asst deans and Chair evaluations (Katovich)

   e. Status report on peer review of teaching: Keep or change the current policy and develop strategy to ensure compliance (Segal)

   f. Implementation steps for evaluating committee chairs and committee members: work with Ned in creating online forms along with reporting functions, set up timeline, and designate a person who will be responsible to ensure that each step in the process occurs when it should

2. HSC/Shands Integration – College Plan: Adhoc Task Force formed (Segal)

3. Discussion about future projects which should/could be undertaken by the FGC. Ask Council members to add to the list below and rank order projects based on priority.

    a. Strategic planning

    b. Participation in financial decision-making within the College

    c. Retreat planning (Nov/Dec)

    d. Review assessment data

4. Discuss the policy/procedure change (by the dean) about the window for submitting exams to the distance campuses. Consider forming a subcommittee to examine the relevant facts related to the problem and recommend an alternate solution to the dean's solution if there is a better idea.   Subcommittee could include representative from at least one distance campus and at least two GNV-based faculty coordinators. Report back to council by e-mail with a recommendation within a week so we can resolve issue ASAP.

Next meeting is scheduled for November 9th from 2-4pm.

Faculty Governance Council

Minutes from October 26, 2009

Members: Dr. Richard Segal (Chair and Senator, POP), Dr. Michael Meldrum (Senator, PD), Dr. Michael Katovich (Senator, PD), Dr. Ken Sloan (MC), Dr. Veronika Butterweck (PC), Dr. Earlene Lipowski (POP), Mr. Tom Munyer (PTR), Dr. Dorette Ellis (PD), Dr. Renee Rose (DCEE), Dr. William Millard (Dean's Office)

Absent: Mr. Tom Munyer (PTR), Dr. Dorette Ellis (PD), Dr. Renee Rose (DCEE)

Guest(s):   Lane Blanchard, Andy Kellenberger, Scott Blades

🔸 **Accept Minutes:**   Meeting was opened at 2:00pm in room 4307 with the minutes from the September 28, 2009 FGC meeting being approved as recorded.

🔸 **Electronic Exams:**   Several groups within the College have discussed an electronic administration of examinations over the past several years. Scott Blades, Andy Kellenberger and Lane Blanchard attended the meeting, with a presentation by Scott about three possible options that have been considered for administering exams electronically. To view the full report, see attached. Some of the more important points of interest in the report discussed by the Council concerned exam security, cost and availability of resources. Several council members also acknowledged that electronic administration for every course is not necessarily desirable. Of note, testing centers are currently available In Gainesville and Jacksonville, although the number of seats in JAX can only accommodate about half of the students. Eventually, a testing center will be available in Orlando at the Lake Nona facility. Dr. Segal will ask Dr. Meldrum to check with the GNV testing center to see if their facility can accommodate all or most of the examinations given in pharmacy courses for GNV based students. The Council will discuss further at an upcoming meeting.

🔸 **Policy and Procedures Manual:** The next step for the P&P will be for it to be reviewed and approved by the Executive Council Committee at their next meeting.

🔸 **Assoc/Asst Deans and Chair Evaluations:** Dr. Katovich will provide an update on this at the next FGC meeting.

🔸 **Peer Review of Teaching:** Dr. Segal was not able to meet with all the chairs to discuss. Will provide an update on this at the next FGC meeting.

🔸 **Implementation of Evaluating Committee Chairs and Committee Members:** Dr. Segal will work with Ned in creating online forms along with reporting functions.

- **HSC/Shands Integration:** The HSC and Shands are working together to form an integrated system, with a common mission, vision and goals. An Adhoc Task Force (Segal, Lopez, Gums, and Winterstein) has been formed by the Dean to coordinate the College's input to this process. Segal asked members of the FGC to review a document distributed at the meeting which identified the draft statements of vision, values and goals developed by the deans and center directors and Shands representatives. Over the coming months, each academic unit will be expected to participate in a strategic planning process, which will eventually result in a mission and vision statement for each unit, along with a statement of values, and one- and five-year goals. It will be expected that the broader vision, values, and goals of the integrated system will inform each unit's strategic planning process.

- **Policy/Procedure Change Regarding Submitting Exams to Distance Campuses:** Dr. Segal asked the Council whether there are any major concerns at this time regarding the recent change in the policy/procedure when submitting exams to the distance campuses. Previously, the "window" in which an exam had to be received at the distance campuses was 48 hours before the exam was to be given. The new policy/procedure shortens the window to 24 hours. At this time, the Council will monitor whether the new procedure creates any unintended consequences by waiting until the end of the semester to give it time to see how it will work out.

- **FGC Projects:** Dr. Segal asked the committee to think about what types of issues and/or projects they would like to see the FGC committee address in the coming year. Some possible projects could include strategic planning, participation in financial decision-making in the College, retreat planning, review assessment data. Each member was asked to submit at least one item to Dr. Segal by Monday, November 2. The list will be compiled and discussed at the next meeting and the committee will vote to see which, if any, of the items will be taken on by the committee and the prioritize appropriately.

- **Next meeting is scheduled for November 9th from 2-4pm.**

Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm.

Options for Electronic Assessments at the College of Pharmacy
A Research Summary
Scott Blades

Needs Assessment
In recent years, some professors have expressed an interested in using an electronic platform to deliver proctored assessments to Pharmacy students. The concern has been that administering paper and pencil assessments to all four of our campus is time consuming and costly to manage. With this in mind, Andy Kellenberger and I researched what options might be available for our unique situation.

Summary of Research
On June 25, 2008, Andy and I met with the distant campus directors to gain insights into the challenges of distributing paper and pencil exams and to brainstorm electronic assessment options. The directors determined that the current system of delivering assessments costs the college approximately $57,000 a year (or $500 an exam) when considering the price of proctors, shipping, and secretary time. The directors also echoed professors' concerns that the current process is time consuming (especially considering that exams have to be shipped to and from the distant campuses, scantrons have to be reviewed, and grades need to be entered into the E-Learning System). Ultimately, our group considered three options for using electronic assessments within the college.

1. **UF College of Pharmacy Testing Centers**
    Each campus could have its own testing center with its own hardware and enough space to accommodate full classes. Gainesville students could use the College of Medicine Testing Center here in Gainesville, and the distant campuses would have access to similar facilities at each of their locations.

    ### Advantages
    - Our college would have total control over the testing environment and a standard way of delivering assessments.
    - Our system would be an extension of the College of Medicine Testing Center, which has been offering and perfecting their service for the past 8 years.
    - Our college could rent out one or more of these spaces at the distant campuses to other programs needing space to facilitate electronic assessments.
    - The College of Medicine has offered to add 16 Mac computers to their testing center at Shands JAX. This would create a two-room, testing center of 46 computers (several computers short of our need at JAX, but a step in the right direction nonetheless).

    ### Disadvantages
    - This option would be very costly as it would require a large purchase of computers, construction or renovation, improved wireless capacity, power at each seat, and staff time to maintain/update computers.

2. **External Testing Centers**

   Our college could utilize commercial testing centers (Sylvan or Kaplan) and facilities affiliated with the National College Testing Association (NCTA). Under this model, professors would distribute their exams to the appropriate network of testing centers, and students would travel to the testing center in their area to complete their assessments electronically.

   ### Advantages
   - Creighton University's College of Pharmacy has used this approach with success for their distance program. However, their program is small compared to our traditional program (only about 50 students per class)
   - Our college would not have to construct, renovate, or maintain facilities.
   - Students could choose the testing centers most convenient for them.
   - Jacksonville students may find that testing center locations are in safer neighborhoods than Shands JAX.

   ### Disadvantages
   - Most testing centers (both commercial and those affiliated with NCTA) can only accommodate an average of 15 students at a time. Therefore, students would need to be spread across multiple centers in each city.
   - Managing multiple start and ends times across multiple facilities would be very challenging.
   - The going rate for this type of arrangement is $25 per student per exam on average. With approximately 150 distant students per class, this would cost $3750 per exam.
   - College staff would not be on-hand to field student questions about exams.

3. **Laptop-based Testing Center**

   In this scenario, students would arrive at a proctored location at each of the campuses and take their assessments on their own personal laptop computers. Exams would be distributed via the E-Learning System and the Respondus Lockdown Browser, which is a web browser that prevents users from opening other pieces of software and navigating to other places on their computers.

   ### Advantages
   - Our college would not need to purchase computer hardware.
   - We would use software that is already available and supported at UF.
   - Exams would be graded and added to the E-Learning System grade book automatically.
   - Questions and answer choices can be presented in random order.
   - Exams can include a proctor password to prevent remote access.

   ### Disadvantages
   - Our college would need to renovate current testing locations at each distant campus to provide power at each seat. (Campus directors were not comfortable having students use battery-powered laptops for fear that several students would lose power during an exam.)

- We cannot control how well students maintain their own computers (virus protection, Windows Updates, etc.). Professors would need to prepare for the likelihood of some students' computers failing during an exam. A small number of paper exams would need to be available to serve as a backup.
- Space may be an issue. Students would need to be spread out to prevent cheating. Students would not be able to sit right next to one another since this would make it easy for eyes to wander to other computer screens.

Conclusions

During our June meeting with the campus directors, they communicated that to move to an electronic assessments model, it would need to be easier to manage than the current paper-based method. They indicated that perhaps an ideal scenario would be to have computer-based testing centers at each campus (option 1). Our research supports this inclination. However, with the current budget crisis at UF, it is likely not feasible that our college could construct such facilities in the near future. Option 2 would be very difficult to manage and very expensive to implement. Option 3 shows promise, but the success of this model would depend on the college's ability to provide space and outlets for every student in a class and on the ability of the students to properly maintain their own machines (installing the Lockdown Browser, maintaining virus protection, etc.).

Addendum (September 2009)

Main Point:

We now have evidence that the wireless capacity for at least two of the distant campuses is not robust enough to allow for electronic assessments (via laptops or iDevices).

Details:

During the first week of class (Fall 2009), Andy Kellenberger and I met with all incoming 1PD students at each campus. We conducted what we call "The Technology Tour," which is a way for us to provide a final review of the technology skills we cover during the Computer & Technology Orientation course in the summer. This is also a time to gather feedback on our college's technology platforms and troubleshoot individual student issues.

This year, I decided that during these events at each campus I would also have students complete an online version of the VARK Survey (time permitting). In years past, Doug Ried has had students complete this survey as part of the technology orientation course. However, results have not been shared with students and faculty. In taking over responsibility for this survey, I decided that I would do the following:

1. Create a version of the VARK survey that could be administered through the ELS.
2. Have students score their own VARK survey to gain insights into their learning styles.
3. Provide students with web-based resources dealing with study tips specific to each learning style: Visual, Auditory, Read/Write, Kinesthetic, and Multimodal.
4. Share a report with faculty that outlines the learning styles for these students and makes recommendations for pedagogical approaches.

5. Use the survey as a low stakes means for testing out each campus's ability to host a live online assessment.

I was able to attempt a live electronic assessment during two of our four events: Orlando and Jacksonville. Unfortunately, both attempts failed.

At the Orlando campus (in the large auditorium area), I had students use their laptops to log in to the E-Learning System. I explained to the students that they would be completing a survey available in the ELS. I also explained that I had several paper-based versions of the survey in case anyone had technical difficulties. Within minutes, nearly all of the students were requesting paper surveys. The wireless was not strong enough to allow the students to connect to the Internet. Therefore, I had to cancel this activity and ask that the students complete the survey at home. Andy also had to cancel his polling activity for the iDevices based on poor wireless.

The experience at the Jacksonville campus was similar. We held our event in the "Theater" and there was not sufficient wireless for anyone to get online. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time during our St. Pete and Gainesville events to test out the wireless capacity at these locations.

Conclusions:
The wireless networks at Orlando and Jacksonville are not robust enough to handle full classes of students getting online. The students at these campuses will not be able to get full use out of their laptops and iDevices while on these campuses. Professors/facilitators wanting to have students (for example) access online materials with their laptops or participate in classroom polling with their iDevices will not be able to do so.

Given our laptop and iDevice requirements, wireless capacity at each campus should be robust enough to handle full classes getting online simultaneously. This will allow professors and students to get the most out the educational opportunities afforded by laptops and iDevices. I think it would be appropriate for the college to test the wireless capacity at each campus more thoroughly and devote resources to improve the wireless capacity where it is necessary.