

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON TEACHING**  
**January 26, 2010**  
**Tuesday, 10 a.m.-11:30 a.m., Kerr Hall Rm 129**

Present: M. Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani (Chair), Kate Edmunds, Hongyun Wang, Gordon Wells, Stephanie Casher (ASO)

Guests: Jessica Fiske-Bailey, Jim Phillips

Absent: Clare Max, Dan Scripture

The minutes of January 12, 2010 were approved.

**Announcements from Center for Teaching and Learning (Jessica)**

Assistant Provost Jessica Fiske-Bailey updated the committee on two upcoming workshops being sponsored by the Center for Teaching and Learning—one on “Stereotype Threat,” and another aimed at helping faculty to interpret and utilize student evaluations to improve teaching. She wanted to know 1) if COT was interested in co-sponsoring the events and 2) if COT had any suggestions on how to increase faculty attendance and participation.

The committee discussed at length various strategies for increasing faculty participation. COT had the following suggestions:

On Diversity/Stereotype Workshop

- Since many faculty schedules are already impacted by a host of meetings and teaching commitments, it might be best, instead of asking faculty to attend a workshop, to deploy workshop facilitators to department meetings to do 15 minute presentations.
- Study results and workshop materials could be distributed to departments, to be included as an agenda item for discussion at department meetings.
- Workshops could be filmed and/or taped for future screenings.
- Special workshops tailored to students could be filmed, and then shown at first class meeting of the quarter.

On assisting faculty to interpret student evaluations

- Empower students to take an active role in shaping their classroom experience.
- Encourage students to provide **mid-term** evaluations, which may be much more effective in helping faculty to improve their teaching.
- Encourage departmental mentoring of new faculty.
- Host workshops/panels and send targeted invitations to recent hires (hired in past three years). This could help build a cohort among new UCSC faculty.
- Poll recent Teaching Award recipients about how they handle student evaluations; Professors with consistently excellent evaluations could be asked how they structure feedback mechanisms in their classes, to try to get an idea of best practices.
- Host a faculty open forum on “What do we consider good teaching?”
- Host virtual webinars throughout UC to collaborate with other campuses that are doing work/hosting seminars on these topics.
- Profile departments with stellar mentoring practices.

### **Next Steps for IIG Preproposal vetting**

COT will host a drop-in preproposal workshop for faculty interested in applying for an IIG on Tuesday, February 9<sup>th</sup>, from 11:30am-1pm. Stephanie and Jessica will draft an announcement, and distribute.

### **Report from Humanities Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution**

The committee began discussion on the report from the Humanities Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution by considering whether they felt Chair Gonzalez-Pagani (a member of the Languages Program), should recuse herself. The committee felt that her perspective could be valuable, and did not feel a formal recusal was necessary. They agreed that COT response would be formulated as a group, and sent out under the signature of all COT members.

In the preliminary discussion, the following concerns were raised:

- It should be understood (and restated) that Language and Writing instruction is the bedrock of the education for ALL majors and divisions.
- If UCSC wants to be realistic about educating students for the 21<sup>st</sup> century (i.e. to compete in a global marketplace), we should not be cutting languages.
- The Chancellor cites “Cross Cultural Initiatives” and “Transnationalism and Globalization” as two key points for his overall campus vision, along with promoting undergraduate excellence and fostering diversity. Cutting Languages (in addition to cuts to EAP programs) seems to directly conflict with this vision.
- It should be pointed out that low enrollment is not an issue—in fact, most language courses are *overenrolled*. What seems to be driving decisions is that the powers-that-be don’t feel that language instruction is essential to preparing a professional workforce. This assumption needs to be corrected.
- What is the relationship between suspended language course offerings and EAP program language requirements? Will cuts in languages adversely affect student’s ability to study abroad?
- Is replacing faculty separations in the Language Program with Graduate Student Instructors really the best way to teach these courses?
- Regarding the proposal to split up languages and move them to other departments—it should be pointed out that there is no actual cost savings in this solution.
- How does the privatization of the University (i.e. turning it into a business focused on products, output, and generating external revenue) put the Humanities at a disadvantage, and how is this playing out in the conversation about Reconstitution? What is at stake for the greater educational mission if we continue down this road?

Finally, what this document lacks is a clear vision for the future. Enacting cuts, without a vision, does not lay the groundwork for where we go from here. Rather than moving forward hastily with cuts and alterations that cannot be reversed, perhaps some time should be spent formulating a hybrid model that would allow the flexibility for program restoration if the funding situation improves.

COT will continue discussion at the next meeting, and finalize its formal response.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40am.

So attests,

M. Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani, Chair  
Committee on Teaching