

ZONE 2 – ENCOURAGING & MAINTAINING ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Ad Hoc Committee Representing Zone 2 – Jeannie Metzger, Rebecca Rankin

1) Advising – Focused primarily on faculty advisors.

Comment- Have been told that although faculty are assigned as faculty advisors, “...you don’t really meet with them.” This was a few years ago. I hope this has changed.

Strongly recommend ongoing training of faculty to advise.

Faculty advising should be an expected part of faculty member’s job (not a reason for “merit pay”).

Is already implemented, but should be put in writing.

Professional staff felt that regular (non-faculty) Academic Advisors need to be mentioned here.

2) Infrastructure

Recommendations #2 in report – I think the extended hours offered by the library and computer labs already satisfy the need/demand. But, ongoing studies on peak usage times should be implemented to allow for adjustments to the schedules when necessary.

How was the above item determined? Professional library staff felt that it is important to mention that the library DOES keep a tally of when & how many students come into the library.

Money (or lack thereof) seems to be a primary issue here. More emphasis needs to be placed on fundraising and should play a larger, more recognizable role (which is needed in order to fund the technological advancements to upgrade the classrooms, labs, etc.)

Professional staff felt that the Student Services areas (such as Bursar’s office, Registrar’s office, etc.) need to be mentioned here.

3) Programs

Students need more recognition for scholarly achievement across the board, since some schools do honor them and some don’t).

Review of “programs” should be ongoing, with time frames placed in writing (e.g. every two years these should be reviewed by various constituencies).

Faculty should expect students to participate in these programs, colloquiums, presentations of projects, etc., to keep the students encouraged and to get them to excel at their discipline of study.

4) Research

Good to go.

5) Teaching

Continue Student Persistence position/person/role. (Who is it?)

Benchmarks – Evaluations – Student evaluating teachers) – use as a tool for ongoing performance.

Keep UCET.

In the Professional Staff meeting, it was discovered when discussing student persistence, that there is a “retention committee” (formed by Jennifer Good; David Odgen is on that committee – for (future) reference on this topic).

Additional Recommendations by Biweekly Staff Council

Offer expanded format for student input on teaching and teachers in the forms of:

- a) appropriately scheduled meeting with VC Academic Affairs with forum open to entire student body or departmentally.*
- b) provide students either departmentally or via syllabus with procedure and proper channel for voicing complaints or concerns about instructor or method(s) of instruction. (It is noted here that instructors will welcome this as an excellent opportunity to improve their professional effectiveness. Those instructors who feel they have learned all they can in this area, probably have.)*
- c) encourage student feedback. The end of semester student evaluations do not provide any closure*