

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON TEACHING**  
**May 19, 2009**  
**Tuesday, 10-11:30 a.m., Kerr Hall Room 129**

Present: Elisabeth Cameron (Chair), Jessica Fisk Bailey (Asst. Vice Provost), Tammi Blake (Staff Advisor), Jim Phillips (Director of ITG), Hongyun Wang.

Absent: Doris Ash, Ian Fullmer (SUA Representative), Claire Max, Daniel Seldon.

Guests: Matthew Palm, Student Union Association (SUA),  
Victoria Pagani, chair-elect of COT 2009-10

1. Chair introduces Victoria Pagani as next year chair
2. Matt Palm on TA Diversity survey and training:
  - a. Background: students experienced inappropriate interactions with teaching staff at all levels in regard to diversity in the classroom last year. SUA is concerned that diversity issues contribute to retention issues. SUA notes that some students are afraid to report experiences because there might be consequences from professors. This year SUA representatives met with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies regarding this and how to enact change. Students are pushing for institutional TA training. A session with faculty and students was held. SUA then met with administration who recommended they get an endorsement from a Senate committee to move forward. SUA held a forum for grad students regarding diversity: TAs were present, had good questions and were interested in diversity training. SUA will begin by addressing diversity with TAs, then lecturers then ladder-rank faculty.
  - b. Discussion of SUA document regarding incidents of TA diversity insensitivity: In reviewing the incidents the committee concludes that they are the product of naïveté and misguided intentions on the part of the instructors. It does not seem that the professors and TAs in the reports were malicious; just not tactful or informed. The second example was second-hand and highlights the awareness that people react differently to the same information. Honest and clear communication in the classroom is key. It is noted that faculty and staff and TAs also experience diversity insensitivity.
  - c. SUA created a survey for students to study the problem but also went to the Office of Institutional Research which provided the group with the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) from 2008 which includes specific questions on diversity and discrimination. Matt Palm will be getting statistical data from this survey to present to the administration. The UCUES may either supplement the student survey proposed by SUA or supplant it if the data is useful.

- d. Training: Jessica shared information on an interactive theatre project in use at Berkeley and Cornell for diversity sensitivity training. The trainers for this project might be available in the fall to do a workshop on campus. They also teach a course for students to teach them how to conduct trainings. UCSC can approach it by first giving immediate training (outsourced) while the campus is obtaining its own resources for training. Students interested in the issue can coordinate the project. The Engaging Education (E2 ) board is interested in participating in a dialogue on this topic and will collaborate with SUA. The committee was reminded that the purpose of training is to provide instruction and material for how to interact with students in the classroom. A member expressed concern about the effectiveness of mandatory training; will it make a difference? Will faculty approve it?
  - e. Next steps: COT agrees that this is in their mandate and will support exploring this issue but does not want to set up more rules for teaching. COT would write a letter to the administration in support of institutionalized TA diversity sensitivity training if there is a consensus of the voting members. If SUA moves forward with their own survey COT would like to be involved in developing the wording. COT will set up a subcommittee to handle this issue. COT recommends that SUA find entrances to departments without making them targets so everyone receives the same message. “Awareness” or “sensitivity training” is how the subject should be approached. Matt Palm will continue to work on this issue next year and Jessica Fiske-Bailey will work on a pilot interactive theatre project and present it to The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and the VPDUE.
3. Introduction of members to Victoria Pagani.
  4. Announcements: The next meeting on June 2 is the last of the year. All members should plan on attending. The VPDUE will be here at 11 am for a final discussion of CTE.
  5. Jim Phillips reports that Sakai will be hosted externally; UCSC will be contracting with someone to host the servers and will have a tight contract in regard to intellectual property.
  6. Mini grants: Eight were received, five qualified but no grants from this group were funded.
  7. Restructuring the Call for IIG grants next year: Jessica distributed a sheet with identified issues and possible actions. The committee agrees that IIG grants can have the biggest impact by using them as seed money for innovated teaching programs. Other topics of discussion included the following:
    - a. This year COT is increasing the dissemination and assessment requirements for these grants so they have a lasting impact. The Committee charged the COT Chair-to-be, Jessica, and Elisabeth to work on the call over the with the goal of crafting new criteria, including specifics of assessment and dissemination.
    - b. A member would like to see a role for Sakai in the grants and suggested a Sakai theme for next year. Robin Ove of the Faculty Instructional

Technology Center (FITC) has a proposal for teaching and learning mentors assisting student and faculty in their adoption of new technology. He suggests that Eportfolios could dovetail nicely with general education changes and narrative evaluations. COT could consider support of an “early adopters” program but the grant money needs to be specifically for teaching and learning. It is suggested that a paragraph can be added to the Call suggesting themes: Sakai in the classroom, general education reform or cultural/diversity sensitivity in the classroom.

- c. COT must strongly state what this money is and isn't for. Everything must relate to teaching and learning on campus, not just a single instructor's teaching and learning. The grants must keep innovation as the focus. In the Call it should be clear that these grants do not support projects just because department budgets have been cut. It was suggested that the award could be attached to dissemination where faculty become teaching and learning mentors in reference to new technology. This may resolve some support issues and promotes local expertise. Grants can support creating a new course that does something new in the classroom not just a new course. Jessica suggests looking back several years in regard to new equipment and new courses and see what was really innovative to provide examples. The Call should clearly define what the committee means by innovative: *using cutting edge pedagogies and strategies in the classroom*. Regarding tech-related projects: if instructors are trying something brand new in the classroom it can be funded. However, the subsequent use of that technology will not be funded.
- d. For major grants the grant proposal processes are the same as mini grants. The committee questioned whether the major grants should require more background information and explanation. Questions can be added to the application for major grants to better discern the need for funding. COT members could go to department meetings in fall and winter so faculty can ask questions and have examples of grants funded available. An example can be crafted and posted online.
- e. Deadlines for applications: The committee decided that two deadlines be established for applications, fall and spring. The minigrants can be adjudicated and funded before the major grants so money available will be known. The committee decided that the major grant deadline should be in winter or early spring with funding in July. Minigrants will be due in by the last meeting in fall and then last meeting in winter to be adjudicated the first meeting in winter and spring. It was suggested that emergency funding always be considered immediately.
- f. Criteria: Grant criteria needs to be reworked it so it will be easier for the committee to score. This is subcommittee work.
- g. Funding summer salary: The committee considers whether this has it been successful or if it should be dropped in favor of course relief. It is noted that summer salary gives flexibility so faculty can take on other opportunities and not have to take time out from teaching during the year for course development. Course relief provides time rather than money. A

committee member notes that giving summer salary is paying for something faculty would do anyway. Course relief is valuable and gives time for faculty to spend on innovative teaching projects. It is suggested that the committee develop a compromise: course relief to be generally awarded but in unusual circumstances summer salary can be an option. After receiving such a proposal the committee can suggest summer salary but it will not be listed as an option in the Call.

- h. COT could look at naming grants and get donations/solicited funds by approaching development offices and see if they would be interested in getting some of the grants named and endowed for teaching innovation. Perhaps the committee can take this up next year.

Reminder: Teaching awards ceremony: June 5<sup>th</sup>, 3:00-5:00 pm.

So Attests,

Elisabeth Cameron, Chair  
Committee on Teaching