

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Annual Report 2020-21

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Teaching (COT) met remotely 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 and making revisions on the newly instituted Student Experience of Teaching surveys (SETs), communicating with faculty about best practices for increasing SETs response rates, and soliciting nominations and selecting recipients of the annual student-nominated Excellence in Teaching Award. COT also revised the nomination and selection process for the new Distinguished Teaching Award and selected the second year's recipient of this award. Teaching on our campus was greatly impacted by the unusual and continued events of the global COVID-19 pandemic. COT's agenda was affected as well; we prioritized staying informed about campus decision-making related to teaching, especially through our consultations with Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (AVPTL) Jody Greene, and attempted to find ways to support instructors in this challenging climate. We outline the committee's major activities below.

I. SETs Implementation

A. Monitoring the New SETs and New Platform (Blue)

Last spring, as the campus moved into remote teaching and learning, COT decided to revise the SETs to make them more appropriate for the moment. In consultation with the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL), and with feedback from the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), we shortened the SETs (keeping in mind how overwhelmed students were feeling under the circumstances), removed a few questions that seemed irrelevant for remote teaching, and added a question asking students to reflect on their experience with the shift to remote teaching.

This was also the first year implementing the new platform for delivery of SETs, Blue from Explorance. Working closely with Rebecca Peet, SET Service Manager from Information Technology Services (ITS) and AVPTL Jody Greene, COT weighed in on a variety of decisions about implementation of the new platform. This included questions about the format of reports of SETs results for instructors and TAs, type and delivery of reminder messages for students and faculty regarding SETs, and format of teaching tables for personnel reviews. The COT chair was also sometimes consulted when troubleshooting problems or unexpected events that inevitably arose as part of the implementation of a major new system. The committee is extremely grateful to Rebecca Peet for her tireless work in getting this system set up and dealing with many potential problems as they arose this year!

B. Revisions to SETs and Design of Personnel Teaching Table Questions

Given the extraordinary circumstances of the past year, COT redefined goals for review of SETs with an eye toward being responsive to the current pandemic situation while also considering long term evaluation and revision of SETs. With these goals in mind, COT worked with Anna

Sher from the Institutional Research, Assessment and Policy Studies (IRAPS) and Jody Greene, AVPTL and CITL Director, to design a small study to test different versions of several of the SETs questions that were potential teaching table questions, with particular interest in understanding how students interpreted the questions. COT pursued this study to ensure that questions elicited information that will be most salient for instructors and for reviewers of personnel files.

As background, the research on student evaluation undertaken by COT, CITL and IRAPS over the past several years led to the removal of the “overall effectiveness” question which has been found to be particularly prone to bias. The new SETs questions were written to reflect students’ specific experiences with different aspects of the teaching in their courses. One important feature of the Blue platform is the ability to automatically produce multiple reports. This means that instead of using a teaching table that summarizes students’ answers to one question, we have the capacity to include multiple questions in table format for our personnel review process, which can provide a more comprehensive picture of instructors’ approach to teaching.

The IRAPS findings from the small study completed in Winter 2021 informed COT’s recommendation regarding which particular questions might be included in teaching tables. In the study we also tested variations in wording of these questions to further finetune the meaning and attempt to remove unintended bias. We report in more detail on the questions we proposed for the teaching tables in the section below on COT’s collaboration with CAP. The complete current SETs, with teaching table questions identified, are included in Appendix I of this report.

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

As mentioned above, the committee spent some time this year reviewing the SETs questions, considering which questions to recommend for teaching tables, and working with Anna Sher from Institutional Research, Assessment and Policy Studies (IRAPS) on a small study during winter 2021. Based on this study’s findings, and subsequent consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), COT recommended revised wording for several SETs questions, including three SETs questions that we recommend as teaching tables to be included in personnel reviews. The committee chose questions that capture several important aspects of teaching and course organization, and that are appropriate for both face-to-face and remote teaching. As it turns out, these three questions are based on the same three that CAP and COT had proposed for teaching tables in 2019, and yet each of the questions has been slightly revised. The specific wording of these proposed questions is based on an integration of the initial SETs, the revised COVID version, and the IRAPS study.

The following three Student Experience of Teaching (SET) items are COT’s recommendation, with CAP’s approval, to be included in future teaching tables:

- Question 5: The instructor used course time effectively to support my learning.
- Question 6: The instructor explained concepts in ways that supported my learning.
- Question 12: Lectures and other instructor-produced presentations (e.g., video-recorded lectures) were well structured and had clear goals.

When they approved these choices, CAP recommended to COT that we avoid any further changes to SETs. COT agrees that it would be ideal to maintain consistency going forward, to avoid further confusion about an already complex transition. At the same time, the extraordinary circumstances of the pandemic makes it difficult to know whether further changes might be needed. One question that came up this year was whether a separate version of SETs is needed for asynchronous online courses. For now, COT chose to avoid this action. The IRAPS study’s findings suggest that the currently revised SETs questions are appropriate for students in remotely taught courses. COT plans to revisit the question of a distinctive set of questions for online SETs after the campus returns to a more “normal” context of mostly face-to-face teaching.

D. Student Response Rates on SETs

COT has continued to monitor SETs return rates. These rates declined from an overall rate of 47.2% in fall 2018 to 38.2% in spring 2019, and then, unsurprisingly given the circumstances of shelter-in-place conditions and remote instruction, they declined further during 2019-20 with a low of 19.9% in winter 2020. This past year, it was encouraging to see the response rates rise a bit (see Table 1 below) but they are still lower than rates prior to the move to online SETs. To address the response rates, COT sent out a memo to faculty encouraging them to remind their students to fill out SETs (March 2, 2021, See Appendix II). We based our suggestions in this message on the “best practices”¹ for increasing response rates that have been identified by COT in previous years together with AVPTL Jody Greene. Perhaps COT should consider sending similar memos each quarter in the future. We also worked with CITL to create content regarding best practices which can be found on the CITL website.

Further, a subcommittee of COT, including the student representatives, worked with the Student Union Assembly (SUA), Director of Online Education Michael Tassio, and Online Education (OE) staff to produce several videos explaining the importance of SETs and encouraging students to complete their SETs. This subcommittee was charged with putting together a messaging campaign to encourage increased response rates on SETs. The campaign was aimed at both students and instructors. Importantly, the emphasis of the campaign was on the use of SETs by instructors to improve courses rather than on personnel actions for instructors. The main content of this campaign was real voices of students, TAs and instructors discussing why they fill out SETs and how they have used SETs to change their courses. This short video was embedded in Canvas². COT will continue to monitor response rates and work with CITL to promote strong response rates.

Table 1: SET Return Rates AY 2020-21

TERM and FORM	Arts	Hum	PBSci	BSOE	Soc Sci	Colleges	Overall
Fall 2020							
COVID-19 Form	37	45	48	51	52	62	48.72

¹ <https://citr.ucsc.edu/best-practices-for-improving-sets-response-rates/>

² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S0rvbA22E8g>

Winter 2021							
COVID-19 Form	39	49	40	48	49	47	45.02
Spring 2021							
COVID-19 Form	27	40	36	42	49	36	38.28

II. 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 their teaching. ETA winners are based on student nominations.³ In 2020-21, COT evaluated nominations by 386 students, for over 262 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. Nandini Battacharya received the Ron Ruby award, funded separately by the PBSci division, with a \$2000 cash award.⁴

2020-21 Excellence in Teaching Award Recipients (in alphabetical order):

- Elizabeth Beaumont, Politics
- David Bernick, Biomolecular and Engineering
- Nandini Battacharya, Mathematics
- Audun Dahl, Psychology
- Alegra Eroy-Reveles, Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Michael Hance, Physics
- David Ingleman, Anthropology
- Philip Longo, Writing Program
- Ana Maria Seara, Language and Applied Linguistics
- Donald Williams, Theater Arts

B. Distinguished Teaching Award

This year, COT invited nominations for the second annual Distinguished Teaching Award, created last year in 2019-20. In contrast to the student-nominated Excellence in Teaching Award, this is a campus-wide faculty-nominated award. Department chairs, Program chairs, and College Provosts were invited to nominate one person from their department or program for “The

³ This year (as in 2019-20), in an effort to reduce the workload on strained faculty and staff, COT eliminated the step of requesting statements of teaching from nominees and letters of support from department chairs or other faculty members.

⁴ The PBSci Division notified COT in April 2020 that they were increasing the Ron Ruby award from \$750 to \$2000.

Distinguished Teaching Award.” We used a simple nomination form, designed last year, 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 17 nominations from outstanding faculty across the campus. Every COT member read all of the submitted nominations, created a short list and met to discuss the candidates and make the difficult decision. COT members were delighted to choose Ingrid Parker, Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, as this year’s Distinguished Teaching Award winner. The awardees from 2019-20 and 2020-21 will be invited to give public talks next year; details will be worked out in the coming year.

III. Other Issues

A. COT members additionally serve as representatives on a variety of campus committees. These include subcommittees within ITS as well as committees within other campus units. We list below the main committees to which COT members contributed this year, and briefly describe those contributions.

- **Canvas Steering Committee:** This committee met roughly quarterly. Primary discussions of importance to COT revolved around which additional tools are available to support instructors’ and students’ use of Canvas and the overall effectiveness of Canvas as the campus LMS to support instruction. There is an ongoing issue about which discussion forum may be suitable to replace Piazza. There will be continuing discussions of importance to COT about privacy, who owns Canvas courses and who has access to course materials, and cost of tools. The chair of the committee, Leslie Kern, ITS Learning and Instructional Tools Product Manager, attended two COT meetings at which time many of the issues of concern were discussed directly with the full committee.
- **SETs Core Team:** COT’s chair met as needed and consulted on email, along with AVPTL Jody Greene, with Rebecca Peet and other ITS staff members regarding the implementation of the Blue platform for SETs. Occasional meetings and demos with the Explorance team also took place this year; the chair of CAP, Junko Ito, also joined several of these meetings.
- **Online Degree Program Workgroup:** This group, organized by Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Herbert Lee, met in January 2021 to discuss the prospect of online degree programs at UC Santa Cruz and to develop a charter that would help guide future discussion and consideration of proposed online degrees. The COT representative, along with many other participants, worked to ensure that the charter prioritize student learning and experience in evaluating proposals for online degrees. We encouraged more research to evaluate assumptions about the accessibility of online degree programs and urged the university to avoid creating a two-tiered educational experience that would undermine UC Santa Cruz’s commitment to equity.
- **Iclicker Workgroup:** This working group has only ever met once. During that meeting the scope of the committee work was outlined, involving proposed examination of student response systems and the level of support that should be provided. After that first

meeting, COVID emergency measures took precedence over this work for most of the committee members, especially the ITS staff.

- Baytree Bookstore Committee: This group, formed to evaluate potential private partners for the Baytree Bookstore. COT participated because the outcome has implications for instructors' discretion in selecting course material and student access to course materials. The committee held several meetings in the spring to hear about experiences from other UC campuses and to highlight questions to consider in the contract evaluation, including how to ensure competitive pricing, effective coordination with the library, and ensuring students and faculty will be well-served by the new arrangement. Bids will be reviewed this summer.
- OPI Pedagogy Subcommittee: This subcommittee, chaired by AVPTL Jody Greene, considered a set of questions generated by the Online Degree Program Workgroup described above. The group discussed the specific set of questions assigned to them and collaborated to answer the questions, which focused mostly on the potential positive features of pedagogy of online courses.

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

Systemwide:

- Systemwide Proposed Revisions to SR 544
- Systemwide review of Online Undergraduate Degrees
- Systemwide Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)
- Systemwide Review SARS-CoV2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program

Divisional:

- CEP's Policy for Graduate Student Instructors
- CPEVC's Budget Cut Targets
- VPAA's Proposed Interim COVID-Related Caregiver Modified Duties
- CITL's External Review & Funding Request
- Bay Tree Bookstore Review
- Winter Quarter Administrative Calendar
- SAP: Team Teaching Barrier Reduction Project
- VPAA's Remote Work Policy for Senate Faculty
- CEP and GC's Revised Online Course Policy

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 Leslie Kern, ITS Learning and Instructional Tools Product Manager and Product Manager Stefanie Nielsen about better links between COT and the groups within ITS who are focused on instructional technology. And we consulted with Anna Sher from IRAPS about research regarding SETs.

Outside of our meetings, the COT chair consulted with the chair of Committee on Information Technology (CIT), Brent Haddad, and with Chair of the Senate, David Brundage, regarding how the Senate can better consult on issues of instructional technology, and with the chair of Graduate Council (GC), Donald Smith, regarding problems of anonymity with the use of SETs in graduate classes. Both of these issues are important future concerns for COT to consider.

IV. Carry Forward

- SETS:
 - Continue to communicate with faculty and department chairs about the changes to SETs, best practices for encouraging increased response rates, potential strategies for using reports and custom items in Blue (See COT memo to faculty sent on June 9, 2021, Appendix III).
 - Identify anonymity thresholds for small classes, including graduate classes, to guide future assessment strategies.
 - Consider whether to create a different SETs form for online (especially asynchronous) courses
- Continue to consider ways to support faculty (in conjunction with CITL) in further developing alternative ways to assess teaching excellence (beyond SETs)
- Continue to work with CAP on ways to improve equity and effectiveness of processes of evaluating teaching (especially for Teaching Professor series).
- 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 (talks or panel discussion discussed above)
- 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 Senate consultation for decisions about instructional software supported by the campus.

Respectfully Submitted;

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Frank Bäuerle

Nicholas Brummell

Robin Dunkin

Kate Jones

Maureen Callanan, Chair

Clara Weygandt, NSTF Representative

Nikka Malakooti, GSA Representative

Madison Hassler, SUA Representative

Ryan Mariveles-Poquis, SUA Representative

August 31, 2021

Appendix I. Standard SETs

REVISED SPRING 2021

Student Experience of Teaching (SET) Survey

A Collaboration of COT and CITL, in consultation with IRAPS, CAP and ITS⁵

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

⁵ Questions 5, 6, and 12 will be used for the teaching table.

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:

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

(Scale for 5-9 is: unable to comment/never/occasionally/somewhat frequently/frequently/very frequently)

5.⁶ The instructor used ~~course~~ **class** time effectively to support my learning.

6.⁷ The instructor ~~communicated and~~ explained concepts **in ways that supported my learning 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.

9.⁸ The instructor helped me ~~feel~~ **find ways to engaged** with the course ~~materials.~~

⁶ IRAPS report suggests that Q5 could be a possible teaching table question based on correlation (convergent validity) and qualitative analysis.

⁷ IRAPS report suggests that Q6 could be a possible teaching table question based on correlation (convergent validity) and qualitative analysis.

⁸ IRAPS report recommends that if Q9 remains that it should be followed by its explanation in Q10 because students responded in a variety of ways; qualitative detail is needed for the question to be useful

Comments (OPEN ENDED)

10. Please restate your answer to Question 9 and explain it. For example, the instructor helped me **feel engaged** with the course materials “somewhat frequently” because....

FEEDBACK ON COURSE:

(Scale for 11: never understood the goals/at the beginning of the course/at the end of the course)

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

(Scale for 12-14 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 12-14. Otherwise select “unable to comment.”

12. Lectures and other instructor-**produced** ~~led~~ presentations (e.g., **video-recorded lectures**) were well structured and had clear goals.

13. In-class activities were well structured and had clear goals.

14.⁹ 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 15 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)

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

Comments OPEN-ENDED

16.¹⁰ Please describe any specific **teaching practices and materials** (lectures, seminar discussions, small group activities, demonstrations, instructional videos,

to instructor. Question 9 could be useful for tracking improvement over time. Changes cannot be made unless you have specific qualitative feedback. Students understood the word “engaged.”

⁹ Students provided short thoughtful responses regarding low stakes assignments vis-a-vis high stakes assignments.

¹⁰ Question 16 is now a consolidation of two former questions: “teaching practices” and “course elements.” Many students could not differentiate between teaching practices and course elements in their comments. Please see the IRAPS report. As a result we combined these questions.

homework, individual conferences, study guides, papers, etc.) the instructor used that you found helpful or unhelpful to your learning in this course.

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

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

Preparation for the Course

19.¹¹ 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

Comments OPEN-ENDED

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

¹¹ Question 19 has been made more specific based on the IRAPS study.



Rebecca Hurdis <rhurdis@ucsc.edu>

Support for SET response rates

Academic Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>
To: Senate Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>
Cc: Rebecca Hurdis <rhurdis@ucsc.edu>, Jody Greene <jgreene@ucsc.edu>

Tue, Mar 2, 2021 at 9:51 AM

Dear Instructors,

On behalf of the Committee on Teaching (COT) we are writing to provide you with support materials to encourage your students to provide thoughtful and useful feedback on the Student Experience of Teaching surveys (SETS) sent out at the end of the quarter (*for winter SETS open on March 1*). SETS are the primary tool that we can use to understand how students are experiencing our courses and how we might make meaningful change to our courses to improve learning. Additionally, SETS are still used in personnel reviews for faculty and low response rates can introduce additional bias into these responses. Below, we offer a few concrete suggestions on how to encourage students to fill out the SETS and provide feedback that is respectful, thoughtful, and useful for instructors. Additionally, we are providing an [email template](#) that you can modify and send to students to encourage responses. We hope you will find these materials helpful in soliciting the kind of feedback that is valuable for continuing to evolve your teaching practice.

Sincerely,
The Committee on Teaching

[Quick Tips to Getting Better Student Feedback on SETS](#)

Talk to Students about SETS

- Explain to students that their comments on SETs are extremely valuable for you as you strive to improve your courses for future students. Providing specific examples of how you have modified your teaching based on feedback in SETS can be especially valuable.
- Let students know that the SETs are taken seriously as a way for student voices to be considered when faculty are reviewed for merit and promotion. It may surprise students to know that each and every SET is read both at the department level and by the university-wide personnel committee that reviews each member of the faculty every 2-3 years.
- Reassure students that their responses are always confidential and not seen by the instructor until after grades are submitted.
- Give students [concrete guidance](#) on how to give useful feedback to an instructor.

Specific Actions

- Take class time to give students an opportunity to fill out SETs
- Many faculty offer a small fraction of extra credit to the entire class if a threshold response rate (often 70-75%) is reached. This strategy is one of the most effective ways to promote a high return rate.
- Follow up with a personal email asking that students provide their thoughtful feedback on the SETS.

Make Feedback Routine

- Consider gathering [mid-quarter feedback](#) and discuss the results with students. Include changes you make based on the feedback as well as things you may not change and why. It inspires confidence that you will use the feedback to benefit other students.

Sincerely,
The Committee on Teaching

--
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division
125 Kerr Hall
UC Santa Cruz
(831) 459-2086
(831) 459-5469 (FAX)
Website: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/>

Appendix III. COT to Faculty and Instructors re Regarding SETs, June 9, 2021



Rebecca Hurdis <rhurdis@ucsc.edu>

COT regarding SETs

1 message

Academic Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>

Wed, Jun 9, 2021 at 4:25 PM

To: Senate Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>

Cc: Jody Greene <jgreene@ucsc.edu>, Rebecca Peet <rpeet@ucsc.edu>, Stephanie Nielsen <smniel@ucsc.edu>

Congratulations on reaching the end of another year, this time a full academic year of remote teaching! Thank you for all of the hard work it took to make the many adjustments needed to continue to support our students in their learning. As this year draws to a close the Committee on Teaching (COT) would like to update you about (1) a few changes regarding Student Experiences of Teaching surveys (SETs), and (2) ongoing issues our committee will address more fully next year.

Recent updates:

- We will be returning to the standard SETs starting in Fall 2021 (instead of the revised and shortened version implemented in Spring 2020 to address the unique emergency situation of moving to fully remote teaching). COT has revised wording of a few of the standard questions based on testing by IRAPS and consultation with CITL, as well as CAP. The goal of this revision was to clarify questions and reduce bias. The IRAPS testing suggests that these revised questions make sense to students even in remote classes.
- Our new platform for SETs, BLUE, is fully online. Many thanks to Rebecca Peet, for her tireless work on making this transition.
- Moving forward, COT and CAP recommend that teaching tables in personnel reviews consider students' responses to three particular questions rather than just one. For the standard form used by nearly all departments, COT removed the "overall effectiveness" item because of extensive research showing such vague questions to be particularly open to bias. Considering patterns across a range of questions will give a more holistic picture of students' responses. BLUE makes it possible for these three teaching tables to be created and exported to DivData. Rebecca Peet and Stephanie Nielsen are working with departments to transition to this new practice for fall.

Looking forward to the 2021-22:

- Over the coming year, COT will provide further guidance about the ways that BLUE can support instructors in exploring their own SETs responses over time. For example, we will be exploring optional functionality in BLUE that could allow instructors to see student responses disaggregated by demographic groups.
- COT will work with CITL to make a recommendation regarding SETs for small classes; in order to protect students' anonymity, many campuses do not use SETs for classes with enrollments lower than 5-10. We have already recommended a default of not sending out SETs for independent studies or thesis research except in rare cases where departments specifically need SETs for those courses. COT will work with CITL to come up with a recommended threshold and policy that seems appropriate for our campus.
- COT will also work with CITL to determine whether a different version of SETs should be developed for online asynchronous courses.

COT looks forward to working with faculty through this transition. We wish you all a restful summer!

Sincerely,
Committee on Teaching

--

Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division
125 Kerr Hall
UC Santa Cruz
(831) 459-2086
(831) 459-5469 (FAX)
Website: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/>