

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Annual Report 2019-20

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Teaching (COT) met approximately every other week throughout the academic year to conduct business regarding their charge of fostering and promoting effective teaching. COT continued ongoing activities such as reviewing progress on the newly instituted Student Experience of Teaching surveys (SETs), and soliciting nominations and selecting recipients of the annual student-nominated, Excellence in Teaching Award. COT also created and implemented a nomination and selection process for the new Distinguished Teaching Award. We revised our committee's charge this year. Teaching on our campus was greatly impacted by the unusual events of the year, including the graduate student COLA strike and the campus responses to the COVID-19 epidemic. We outline some actions taken in response to these events and other activities of the committee below.

I. New SETs Implementation & Selection of New Platform

A. Monitoring the New SETs

Over the past several years, a main focus of COT's work has been careful study of existing research on student evaluation, and a major overhaul of the wording of SETs questions to make them a more effective component of evaluating teaching excellence. The 2017-18 COT Annual Report provided background information regarding the charge and impetus for revising SETs, including initial faculty surveys to assess faculty needs. The 2018-19 COT Annual Report explained the work involved in revising this new tool for including student voices in the evaluation of instructors' teaching. Two aims of the revision have been to make SETs less bias-prone and to make them a useful tool for faculty to assess their own teaching in a reflective way. The implementation of the revised SETs was initially planned for spring 2019, but rescheduled for fall 2019 due to technical difficulties with the What Do You Think (WDYT) platform. The SETs implemented in fall 2019 can be found in Appendix I of this report.

COT began the 2019-20 year discussing how we might monitor the success of this new tool. Despite all of the work undertaken in previous years, we recognized that many faculty members were unaware of the changes in the SETs, including renaming them as student "Experience" of teaching (rather than "evaluation"), changing the content of the questions, and removing the "Overall effectiveness" items for instructor and course. This last change has caused some confusion among faculty, and COT plans to continue to communicate the reasons for the change -- mainly that there is evidence that such overall items are more prone to bias than more specific and activity-oriented items. We began to plan strategies for communicating about these changes and seeking feedback from faculty during 2019-2020, however the unprecedented events of the year led us to delay these communication and assessment plans.

B. Replacing SETs Platform

Simultaneously, we joined campus plans to replace WDYT with a more flexible and reliable platform. Especially during Fall 2019, the COT chair met with the working group overseeing the

replacement of the What Do You Think (WDYT) platform. Chair Callanan met periodically with this working group throughout the academic year, which was headed by Rebecca Peet, SET Service Manager from Information Technology Services (ITS), and included Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (AVPTL) and Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) Director Greene, and Director for Learning Technologies, Jim Phillips, and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Chief of Staff, Michael Tassio. The working group facilitated demonstrations of top contenders with COT and CAP members. At the end of Fall quarter, on December 12, 2019, an off-cycle funding request was submitted to interim Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (iCPEVC) Kletzer, from Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Herbie Lee, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Services Van Williams, and COT Chair Callanan with the request to purchase BLUE by Explorance, a platform that promises much more flexibility and was assessed as better meeting our campus needs. Approval of the request was granted by interim CPEVC Kletzer on April 7, 2020. Due to hard work on behalf of campus staff, the contract was executed in time for Explorance to implement the system for fall 2020. The COT chair has occasionally consulted with Rebecca Peet throughout spring and summer regarding questions that have arisen about setting up the interface of the platform. COT will continue to monitor this transition in 2020-2021.

Because of the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 move to remote instruction, COT decided to make a temporary change to the SETs. A few items that mentioned classroom issues were removed, and an item was added that asked students to comment on whether and how the move to remote instruction impacted their learning. The temporarily modified SETs form for spring and summer 2020 is attached in Appendix II. COT will consider whether to continue with this modified form for fall 2020, and for any subsequent quarters in which remote instruction continues.

C. Student Response Rates on SETs

COT has continued to monitor student return rates, which declined from an overall rate of 47.2% in fall 2018 to 38.2% in spring 2019, and then declined further this year (see Table 1 below). In anticipation of even more drastic reductions in return rates because of the circumstances of shelter-in-place conditions and remote instruction, COT sent out a memo to faculty encouraging them to remind their students to fill out SETs, and letting them know about the modifications COT had made to the form (See Appendix III). We based our suggestions in this message on the “best practices” for increasing response rates that have been identified by COT in previous years together with AVPTL Jody Greene.

Table 1: SET Return Rates AY 2019-20

TERM and FORM	Arts	Hum	PBSci	BSOE	Soc Sci	Colleges	Overall
Spring 2020							
COVID-19 Form	24.08	36.43	27.45	33.45	31.02	31.13	30.1
Winter 2020							
Standard SET Form	14.9	22.87	18.29	17.91	25.95	18.29	19.9

Fall 2019							
Standard SET Form	34.9	42.82	31.97	32.1	54.53	43.82	37.7

II. COT & CAP Collaboration Regarding Teaching Table for Personnel Reviews

As explained above, the “omnibus” SETs question regarding “overall teaching effectiveness” was removed because of concerns with bias. However, this is the question that has been summarized in teaching tables as part of personnel reviews. During 2018-19, CAP met with COT and IRAPS to discuss alternatives to the existing practice of summarizing students’ responses to the omnibus item in the teaching tables. While the research supports using more than one item as a focus for personnel reviews, the current SETs platform (WDYT) made that difficult. CAP members chose to use the following item for teaching tables:

- The instructor communicated clearly and explained concepts effectively. (Question 6)

COT members consulted with CAP again in 2019-20, once in a joint meeting, and several times through email and discussion between the chairs of the two committees. For example, the COT and CAP chairs were both present for demos of the potential new SETs platforms, and had opportunities to discuss how the different platforms would serve the needs of the campus, both for faculty’s self-assessment and for personnel reviews. One message that came through clearly from our consultation with CAP was that, despite critiques of SETs as a primary focus of evaluation due to bias, CAP members value them as the only way we currently include student voices about their learning in faculty review.

On January 15, a joint communication from COT and CAP was sent to Divisional Deans, Department Chairs and Department Managers regarding the revised SETS and the evaluation of teaching in personnel files (see Appendix III).

COT plans to consult with CAP again in 2020-2021 to further discuss best practices regarding teaching tables for personnel reviews. One of the advantages of the new SETs platform, Blue, is that it will make it much more feasible to produce teaching tables for more than one item from the students’ SETs responses.

III. Teaching Awards

A. Excellence in Teaching Awards

COT is charged with the administrative oversight of the Excellence in Teaching Awards (ETA). In adjudicating these awards, we look for evidence that the nominee has thought deeply about teaching and learning and effectively applies that thinking in the classroom. ETA winners are based on student nominations. This year, in light of the enormous stress and added workload of the move to remote instruction, we did not want to create additional work for faculty. Therefore, COT eliminated the step of requesting statements of teaching from nominees and letters of support from department chairs or other faculty members. In 2019-20 COT evaluated

nominations by 675 students, for over 342 different instructors. We see this as evidence of the extraordinarily strong commitment by UCSC faculty and instructors to students and their learning. We had to postpone the celebratory luncheon because of shelter-in-place orders, but we hope to be able to reschedule it for next year. Faculty received a \$400 cash award. The recipient of the Ron Ruby award, funded separately by the PBSi division, received \$2000.¹

2019-20 Excellence in Teaching Award Recipients (in alphabetical order):

- Nathan Altice, Computational Media
- Peter Alvaro, Computer Science and Engineering
- Javier Fernández Agüera, Languages and Applied Linguistics
- Megan McNamara, Sociology
- Russell Rodriguez, Music
- Savannah Shange, Anthropology and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies
- Bakthan Singaram, Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Amanda Smith, Literature

B. Distinguished Teaching Award

This year, COT followed up plans made in the previous year, and created a campus-wide faculty-nominated teaching award. In contrast to the student-nominated Excellence in Teaching Award, chairs were invited to nominate one person from their department or program for “The Distinguished Teaching Award.” In consultation with AVPTL Jody Greene, we created a simple nomination form asking nominators to comment on three questions:

- How does the nominee contribute to the culture of teaching on campus?
- How does the nominee utilize a research-based pedagogical approach?
- How has the nominee contributed to educational equity?

We received 22 nominations from outstanding faculty across the campus. Every COT member read all of the submitted nominations, created a short list and met to discuss. Faced with an extremely difficult decision, COT members decided to choose two awardees, and the Distinguished Teaching Awards were awarded to: Professor John Tamkun, Professor in MCD Biology, and Professor Jackie Gehring, Teaching Professor in Politics. The awardees will be invited to give public talks; details will be worked out in the coming year.

IV. Charge Revision

In Spring quarter 2020, COT undertook a revision of the committee’s charge. The changes to the charge involved several issues: (1) The new wording removed language about an instructional improvement grant program that no longer exists, (2) Revised language was added to bring the charge into line with current practices regarding COT’s responsibilities for campus policies regarding evaluation of teaching, and (3) Because of evolving titles and roles in both ITS and CITL, we shifted away from a listing of particular individuals who “sit with” COT toward more flexible wording regarding regular consultation with administrative offices with whom we consult most closely. The proposed changes to the charge were voted on and approved at the spring 2020 Academic Senate meeting. See Appendix VI.

¹ The PBSi Division notified COT in April 2020 that they were increasing the Ron Ruby award from \$750 to \$2000.

V. COVID-19

A. Collecting Solutions Google Form

In light of the urgent move to remote instruction at the end of winter 2019, COT consulted often with AVPTL Greene for updates on policies and asked how our committee could be helpful. One action item that emerged from these discussions was the creation of a google form to invite faculty to share solutions they had discovered to some of the problems around remote teaching that arose. The form also asked for problems that faculty needed help solving. AVPTL Greene requested our permission to share access to the google form with staff members in her office and in online education. This became a useful tool for connecting faculty with staff members who were able to help solve specific problems.

B. SETS

As mentioned above, and shown in Appendices I and II, COT also made changes to the SETs to better acknowledge the extraordinary conditions of teaching and learning faced by instructors and students during the pandemic. COT sent out additional messaging to faculty on May 11, 2020 (Appendix IV).

C. Correspondence to ASC Lau

On May 1, 2020, COT sent correspondence to Academic Senate Chair Lau with concerns about how COVID-19 and the impacts on teaching raising the following recommendations:

- to automatically extend the tenure clock for all untenured faculty
- to make optional the inclusion of SETs from Winter and Spring 2020 in personnel reviews (also sent to the VPAA for consideration)
- to revise the SETs questions for Spring quarter to reflect the current situation.

VI. Other Issues

A. COT members additionally serve on subcommittees including the Canvas Steering Committee, Students Device Response System and the SETs core team. Members also consulted with groups working on design of new classrooms. However, with the urgency of the COLA strikes and COVID19, many of these subcommittees did not meet or met infrequently.

B. COT, along with other Senate committees, reviewed proposed divisional and systemwide policies or revisions, including the following:

- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Copyright Ownership
- Systemwide Review of the Academic Council's Standardized Testing Task Force Report
- Systemwide Review of BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the SAT/ACT Essay Requirement
- Student Success Division Report
- Chancellor's Memo on the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (ODEI) Restructuring
- Draft Campus Internationalization Plan
- Proposed Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) Appointment Criteria.

C. COT consulted regularly with AVPTL Jody Greene to continue to find ways to work closely with CITL, and to request updates about the campus response to COVID-19. We also consulted with Jim Phillips about reorganization in ITS, and about ways to better connect with the areas of ITS most focused on resources for teaching.

VI. Carry Forward

- Continue to communicate with faculty and department chairs about the changes to SETs
- Continue to consider ways to support faculty (in conjunction with CITL) in further developing alternative ways to assess teaching excellence (beyond SETs), especially in light of continued remote teaching.
- Continue to work with CAP on ways to improve equity and effectiveness of processes faculty evaluation of teaching
- Make plans to study and assess how the new SETs are being received (with IRAPS and AVPTL).
- Consider additional funding sources for teaching awards:
 - Write grant proposal to UCSC Foundation, requesting funds for the award and related events
 - Seek funds from Senate for the award and related events
 - Develop and plan DTA event-talk (discussed above)
- Update COT website: COT hopes to develop a stronger web presence and resource materials for the upcoming new SET platform (potential collaboration with FITC).
- Consider possible collaborations with DRC and CITL surrounding best practices with working with students with accommodations.
- Continue to discuss and consider how COT and CITL can best complement and support one another, including working together on issues regarding the campus closure and remote teaching.
- Continue to support campus-wide (e.g. CITL, Senate, etc.) intentions to increase resources for anti-racist pedagogy.
- Consider collaboration with ITS, and with CIT, CAF, CEP, and other senate committees to consider issues of accessibility for teaching technology, and issues of procedures for making decisions about instructional software supported by the campus.

Respectfully Submitted;
COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Hunter Bivens
Nicholas Brummell
Robin Dunkin
Sylvanna Falcón
Maureen Callanan, Chair

Clara Weygandt, (NSTF)
Jim Phillips, sits with, Director of Learning Technologies
Jody Greene, sits with, Director of the Center for Innovative
Teaching and Learning

August 31, 2020

Appendix I. Standard SETs Fall 2019

Student Experience of Teaching (SET) Survey

*A Collaboration of COT and CITL, in consultation with IRAPS,
Incorporating input from CAAD, CAP, CEP, APO, and SEC*

The purpose of this anonymous survey is:

1. To give you a chance to reflect on how your experience with your instructor influenced your learning in the course;
2. To give your instructor feedback that may be helpful in improving the effectiveness of their **instruction** or the **design** of this course.
3. To give university administration and instructor's department/program/college evidence of your instructor's teaching effectiveness for their personnel reviews.

The instructor will not see responses until after grades have been submitted.

Please **only comment on your experience with the primary instructor**. Please fill out a **separate survey for any teaching assistants** for this course.

STUDENT INFORMATION

1. What is your current class standing at UCSC?
 - Freshman/first year
 - Sophomore/second year
 - Junior/third year
 - Senior/fourth year
 - Fifth-year senior or more
 - Master's student
 - PhD student
 - Other
2. Why are you taking this class?
 - Required for my major/minor
 - Elective for my major/minor
 - Part of a proposed major/minor I am exploring
 - To fulfill a GE requirement (outside my major/minor)
 - General interest in the topic
 - Other reasons
3. What percentage of class meetings taught by this instructor (in person or remotely, not counting sections or labs taught by others) did you attend? (Note: 1 week = 10%)
 - I withdrew from the course.
 - 0-24%
 - 25-49%
 - 50-74%

- 75-100%

4. About how many total hours per week, outside of class meetings, did you spend on work for this course?

- 0-3 hours
- 4-6 hours
- 7-9 hours
- 10-12 hours
- 13 hours or more

FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION:

(Scale for 5-8 is: unable to comment/never/occasionally/somewhat frequently/frequently/very frequently)

5. The instructor used class time effectively to support my learning.
6. The instructor communicated and explained concepts clearly.
7. The instructor provided useful feedback on my assigned work (put “unable to comment” if you received feedback on your assignments only from a Teaching Assistant).
8. The instructor clearly communicated how assignments would be evaluated and/or graded.

FEEDBACK ON COURSE:

(Scale: never understood the goals/at the beginning of the course/at the end of the course)

9. I understood the learning goals or learning objectives of the course.

(Scale for 10-12 is: unable to comment/never/occasionally/somewhat frequently/frequently/very frequently)

Please only comment if the course contained the specific activity addressed in questions 10-12. Otherwise select “unable to comment.”

10. Lectures and other instructor-led presentations were well structured and had clear goals.
11. In-class activities were well structured and had clear goals.
12. Problem sets, writing assignments, and other homework, over the course of the quarter, helped me feel prepared for examinations, papers, and projects.

(Scale for question 13 is: no assigned reading/I did little to none of the assigned reading/I found the reading somewhat useful/I found the reading useful/I found the reading very useful)

13. I found the assigned reading I completed to be useful to my learning in the course.

Comments OPEN-ENDED

14. Please describe any specific **teaching practices** (such as lectures, seminar discussions, small group activities, individual conferences) the instructor used that you found helpful or unhelpful to your learning in this course.

15. Please describe the specific **course elements** (including readings, films, homework, guest lectures, instructional videos, examinations, papers, study guides, or other elements) that were helpful or unhelpful to your learning in this course.

16. What suggestions, if any, do you have to improve this course? Please be as specific as possible.

17. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Preparation for the Course

18. Did you feel prepared, by prerequisites or prior coursework, for the work required in this course?

- Unable to comment
- Not at all prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Prepared
- Very prepared

Comments OPEN-ENDED

19. Please restate your answer to Question 18 and explain it. For example, I felt somewhat prepared because

Appendix II: Spring and Summer 2020 Modified SETS for COVID-19

Student Experience of Teaching (SET) Survey *A Collaboration of COT and CITL, in consultation with IRAPS, Incorporating input from CAAD, CAP, CEP, APO, and SEC <and modified by COT, with input from CITL and CAP, for Spring 2020>*

NOTE: Spring 2020 has been a very difficult quarter for everyone. We recognize that the emergency move to remote instruction required students and faculty to rapidly adjust to new ways to teach and learn. The SET survey for this quarter has been shortened and slightly revised to reflect the unprecedented situation.

The purpose of this anonymous survey is:

1. To give you a chance to reflect on how your experience with your instructor influenced your learning in the course;
2. To give your instructor feedback that may be helpful in improving the effectiveness of their instruction or the design of this course.
3. To give university administration and instructor's department/program/college evidence of your instructor's teaching effectiveness for their personnel reviews.

The instructor will not see responses until after grades have been submitted.

Please only comment on your experience with the primary instructor. Please fill out a separate survey for any teaching assistants for this course.

STUDENT INFORMATION

1. What is your current class standing at UCSC?

- Freshman/first year
- Sophomore/second year
- Junior/third year
- Senior/fourth year
- Fifth-year senior or more
- Master's student
- PhD student
- Other

2. Why are you taking this class?

- Required for my major/minor
- Elective for my major/minor
- Part of a proposed major/minor I am exploring
- To fulfill a GE requirement (outside my major/minor)
- General interest in the topic
- Other reasons

3. What percentage of class activities or meetings did you participate in? (Note: 1 week = 10%)

- I withdrew from the course.
- 0-24%
- 25-49%
- 50-74%
- 75-100%

4. About how many total hours per week, outside of class meetings, did you spend on work for this course?

- 0-3 hours
- 4-6 hours
- 7-9 hours
- 10-12 hours
- 13 hours or more

FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION:

Instructions to students: Please respond as to how frequently the instructor did each of the following.

(Scale for 5-8 is: unable to comment/never/occasionally/somewhat frequently/frequently/very frequently)

5. The instructor helped me find ways to engage with course content.

6. The instructor communicated clearly and explained concepts effectively.

7. The instructor provided useful feedback on my assigned work (put “unable to comment” if you received feedback on your assignments only from a Teaching Assistant).

8. The instructor clearly communicated how assignments would be evaluated and/or graded.

FEEDBACK ON COURSE:

(Scale for 9: never understood the goals/at the beginning of the course/at the end of the course)

9. I understood the learning goals or learning objectives of the course.

(Scale for 10-11 is: unable to comment/never/occasionally/somewhat frequently/frequently/very frequently)

Instructions to students: Please only comment if the course contained the specific activity addressed in questions 10-11. Otherwise select “unable to comment.”

10. Lectures and other instructor-led presentations were well structured and had clear goals.

11. Problem sets, writing assignments, and other homework, over the course of the quarter, helped me feel prepared for examinations, papers, and projects.

Comments OPEN-ENDED

12. Please describe any specific teaching practices and materials (lectures, seminar discussions, small group activities, demonstrations, instructional videos, homework, individual conferences, study guides, papers, etc.) the instructor used that you found helpful or unhelpful to your learning in this course.

13. How did remote instruction impact (positively or negatively) your learning in this course?

Preparation for the Course

14. Did you feel prepared, by prior coursework at UCSC, community college, or high school, for the work required in this course?

- Unable to comment
- Not at all prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Prepared
- Very prepared

15. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix III: January 15, 2020 CAP & COT Correspondence to Department

January 15, 2020

Divisional Deans
Department Chairs
Department Managers

RE: Student Experiences of Teaching (SETs) and the Evaluation of Teaching in Personnel Review

Dear Colleagues,

As the chairs of the Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP) and Teaching (COT), we are writing to clarify the ongoing changes regarding Student Experiences of Teaching (or SETs), and to address some confusion that has been expressed regarding the implications of these changes for the evaluation of faculty teaching in the personnel review process.

Over the last several years, COT has worked closely with the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) to rethink the purposes of SETs and to revise the items used in these surveys. One revision made to UCSC's SETs was to remove the global items that ask students to evaluate the "overall effectiveness" of the instructor and the course. This revision is based on research findings suggesting that such overall evaluative items can be open to bias and problematic when interpreted as unitary measures of teaching.

Our campus began using the new version of the SETs this year, and we are in a transitional period during which COT will be consulting with faculty and students to evaluate the changes.

The new SETs are relevant to evaluation of teaching as carried out by every level of personnel review, including departments, deans, CAP, and other administrators. Because we have been using summaries of students' ratings of the global teaching effectiveness item in teaching tables, this practice is also in transition. When a new SET platform has been put in place that can auto-generate the teaching tables, a series of questions from the new SETs will be used in the table to assist reviewing bodies in their overall holistic review of teaching. No single question is an ideal indicator of teaching effectiveness. However, in order to reduce support staff workload during this time of transition, the table for classes using the new SETs will temporarily include only one question - Question #6, "The instructor communicated and explained concepts clearly." Please note that a review file that includes courses with the old SETs and courses with the new SETs will need to include two teaching tables: one table for the courses with the old SETs should report on the "overall effectiveness" data, and a second table for courses with the new SETs should include data on "communicated and explained concepts clearly."

CAP and COT will continue to work together to consider and implement new strategies for evaluating and improving teaching effectiveness, with the student responses to SETs questions as one part of the personnel review process. We recognize the amount of work that goes into creating these teaching tables for all levels of review, and we have petitioned for a SET platform that will

auto-generate these tables. We will be in touch with chairs and department managers as we move forward with this process.

Sincerely,

Maureen Callanan, Chair
Committee on Teaching

Lynn Westerkamp, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: Herbie Lee, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Jody Greene, Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning
Rebecca Peet, System Analyst, Information Technology Services

Appendix IV: May 11, 2020 Messaging to Faculty and Instructors re Update on 2020 Spring and Summer SETS

Update on 2020 Spring and Summer SETS

TO: Faculty & Instructors
FROM: Committee on Teaching
Subject: Update on 2020 Spring and Summer SETs

Dear Colleagues,

This memo serves as a brief update from the Academic Senate's Committee on Teaching (COT) regarding the Student Experiences of Teaching Surveys (SETs) for the current quarter. We understand that the administration has decided that SETs will be given to students this quarter as usual. Since COT has authority over the content of the SETs, we have decided to slightly adjust the wording to reflect the unprecedented situation of all remote instruction for this quarter and the upcoming summer sessions. COT is temporarily modifying the questions in consultation with appropriate campus leadership. In particular, the revisions remove any mention of classrooms, reduce the length of the survey (in recognition of students' feelings of being overwhelmed) and provide opportunities for students to express the ways that the move to remote instruction has impacted their learning. Should remote learning continue beyond summer sessions, we will be able to consider using this modified SET survey again until we are able to return to the original survey. Please note that in this temporary new version of the SETs, item 6 is still the item to be used for teaching tables in personnel actions, and this item is unchanged. Some departments have added custom questions to the SETs, or use their own form. If your department has designed custom questions or uses a fully customized form, Rebecca Peet of ITS is already in contact with your staff and will provide support to be sure that the custom questions are transferred over to the new template. We are grateful to Rebecca Peet for her help. We are in awe of how our colleagues have managed the challenges of this year and this quarter. We know that nothing is as usual this quarter, and we make this adjustment to the SETs in the spirit of collegiality. If you have any questions, feel free to contact Maureen Callanan, chair of COT, at callanan@ucsc.edu.

Thank you,
Committee on Teaching

Appendix V. June 5, 2020 Messaging to Faculty via Senate re Low SETs Responses

Dear Instructors,

I'm sorry to add to your email inbox during this difficult week and as this challenging quarter is drawing to a close. I'm writing as chair of the Committee on Teaching with the suggestion that you might want to encourage your students to respond to the Student Experiences of Teaching surveys (SETs) for your course. Not surprisingly, the response rate for this quarter is very low so far, with an average of 10% of students responding. You can check the response rate so far for your classes by logging in to UCSC WDYT on this page: <https://its.ucsc.edu/sets/index.html>

The window for students to submit SETs closes on Sunday June 7 at midnight. If you'd like to email your students to encourage them to respond to the SET survey for your class, here are some points you could make that have been found to be effective:

—let them know that the form has been modified for this quarter in response to COVID-19 conditions; it is shorter than usual and it provides an opportunity to talk about how the move to remote instruction has impacted learning

—explain that students' comments on SETs are extremely valuable for us as we strive to improve our courses for future students

—let students know that the SETs are taken seriously as a way for student voices to be considered when faculty are reviewed

While we cannot give individual students incentives for filling out SETs, some faculty offer a small amount of extra credit to the entire class if a large percentage of students fill out SETs (e.g., 1% for everyone if at least 85% of students in the class submit their surveys).

The campus is aware that response rates have been low across the campus this year. This is not a problem for individual faculty but a broader systemic problem that the Committee on Teaching will continue to address. We want to let students know that their feedback is valuable to us.

Thank you for your inspiring work this year and especially this quarter!

Sincerely,
Maureen Callanan, Chair
Committee on Teaching

Appendix VI. Charge

**COMMITTEE ON TEACHING
 Amendment to Charge**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Teaching (COT) proposes the following changes to our charge.

Existing Bylaw	Proposed Bylaw
Chapter 13. Committees	
13.30 Committee on Teaching	13.30 No changes
13.30.1 There are five Santa Cruz Division members. In addition, there are one non-senate teaching faculty representative, one graduate student representative, and no more than two undergraduate student representatives. The Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Director of Learning Technologies are invited to sit with the Committee.	13.30.1 There are five Santa Cruz Division members. In addition, there are one non-senate teaching faculty representative, one graduate student representative, and no more than two undergraduate student representatives. The Committee advises the Chancellor, Campus Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Provosts, College Provosts, Deans, Departments and instructors on priorities, policies and strategies related to teaching, instructional support and outcomes. The Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Director of Learning Technologies are invited to sit with the Committee
13.30.2 The duties of the Committee include: 1) To consult with departments as to the form and use of any methods designed to evaluate faculty teaching performance and to recommend to the Academic Senate how such methods should be used in the evaluation of faculty members' teaching effectiveness. 2) To propose programs that will foster good teaching, and to stimulate and aid all departments in strengthening their efforts to foster good teaching. 3) To formulate general policies concerning instructional support activities on the campus,	13.30.2 The duties of the Committee include: 1) To consult with departments as to the form and use of any methods designed to evaluate faculty teaching performance and to recommend to the Academic Senate how such methods should be used in the evaluation of faculty members' teaching effectiveness. It is also responsible for formulating and evaluating campus policies governing the evaluation of teaching (including course evaluations), and consults with the administration on implementation and archiving of course evaluations. 2) To propose programs that will foster good teaching, and to stimulate and aid all

<p>and to advise the administration regarding campus budgetary needs for instructional support.</p> <p>4) To initiate, receive, and adjudicate Instructional Improvement Grant proposals, and to make recommendations concerning funding of such proposals to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education. To establish policies for the adjudication of Instructional Improvement Grants, and to inform the Santa Cruz Division concerning those policies.</p> <p>5) To select Faculty and instructors to receive Excellence in Teaching Awards and other awards as appropriate.</p> <p>6) To provide direction to the Center for Teaching and Learning in matters regarding COT business, and when required, in any matters concerning CTL's instructional support.</p>	<p>departments in strengthening their efforts to foster good teaching.</p> <p>3) To formulate general policies concerning instructional support activities on the campus, and to advise the administration regarding campus budgetary needs for instructional support.</p> <p>4) To initiate, receive, and adjudicate Instructional Improvement Grant proposals, and to make recommendations concerning funding of such proposals to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education. To establish policies for the adjudication of Instructional Improvement Grants, and to inform the Santa Cruz Division concerning those policies.</p> <p>4) To select Faculty and instructors to receive Excellence in Teaching Awards and other awards as appropriate.</p> <p>5) To collaborate and consult regularly with the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, with Information Technology Services, and with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, in matters regarding teaching and instructional support.</p>
--	---