

Minutes of the Meeting of the University Council on Teaching (Draft):
Wednesday March 24, 2010
12 noon

Recorded by: Paula Mathieu

Present: Chris Hepburn (Chair), Bob Murphy, Jackie Lerner, Colleen Griffith, Virginia Reinberg, Patricia DeLeeuw, Don Hafner, Suzanne Barrett, Akua Sarr, Rita Olivieri

Guests: Anna Rhodes UGBC Academic Affairs Co-Director
Brian Jacek, UGBC Academic Affairs Co-Director
Denise Der, Quality of Student Life Committee

Our undergraduate guests presented a draft of an evaluation of faculty members as student advisors, which they hope to implement in the future. Our meeting's discussion centered around responding to this draft.

Item #1 Discussion of a Proposal for an Evaluation of Advisors

Overall Goals of Committee to Improve Advising at BC:

1. To improve student resources, to help students become better advisees.
2. To institute training for major advisors (run by department) so there's a base level of commonality, and faculty are updated with tools.
3. Advisor evaluation. It's hard for university to 'measure' advising. Makes it hard for departments to decide what to emphasize in training, evaluation, etc. This draft is an effort to make some progress in this area.

Came to UCT meeting for feedback on draft of evaluation of advisors (see attached).

Question 1: to make sure the student is evaluating assigned advisee. (If no, can't answer questionnaire).

—One problem discussed is that to feed the student advisor name in the system, student anonymity might be jeopardized; also, fear that linking advisor evaluation to course evaluation might decrease overall student response.

Question 2: asks if a face-to-face meeting took place. If not, can't answer questionnaire. May develop an alternative question.

Question 3: this offers a basic expectation of advisors, to be available to communicate. —Committee members felt that readily available and willing to communicate might be separate issues. Students felt that both address the different styles of accessibility.

Question 4: In focus groups, students found that students with good advisors were encouraged to ask questions and discuss concerns, thus this question.

Question 5: Stems from concern that advisees aren't getting accurate information. Discussed that this question might be combined with 6.

Question 7: This is key for positive advising experiences, helping students think about a long-term plan. We should ask them about their goals and help with long-term planning.

Questions 8 and 9: might be moved up higher, under question 4.

Question 10: to see if students are comfortable with advisor or not. Open-ended question: whose responsibility and how to create comfort.

Question 11: Left it intentionally open to allow for many ways for advisor to show concern—personal, curricular, etc.

Question 12: Overall measurement of satisfaction.

Questions 13 and 14: open-ended questions for anecdotal evidence.

Concerns from committee: Discussed concerns about its use for tenure and promotion. Also discussed that unsuccessful evaluation often occurs because students don't want to engage. Finally, it was discussed that faculty might resist yet another form of measurement. Overall, however, the committee commended the students on their highly professional job and this detailed and careful effort.

If UCT members have additional feedback or concerns (especially negative ones) about this advising survey, please contact any members of the committee. Contact Anna Rhodes at anna.rhodes@bc.edu.

Item #2 Peer Review of Teaching: Initial Discussion of Potential for Establishing a General Guide to Departments.

Time didn't really allow a discussion of this, so Chris posed this question:

Need to discuss a general guideline for departmental peer review of teaching. Between now and next meeting, what would you put in the guidelines for peer review across the university? What should a teaching review include?

Item #3 Short Update and TAMs and TAMEs.

Bob, Chris and Paula will review them soon.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.