

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Annual Report 2023-24

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 including the implementation of new and revised Student Experience of Teaching Surveys (SETS), communicating with faculty about the new personalization questions option, and soliciting nominations for and selecting recipients of both the annual student-nominated Excellence in Teaching Award and peer-nominated Distinguished Teaching Award. We outline the committee's major activities below.

I. SETS

Supporting the effective use of SETS continued to be a significant part of COT's work this year. The major focus of the committee was in creating SETS that would return useful, unbiased, and appropriate results for specific types of instructors and classes. We also continued to work with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) to ensure SETS solicit valuable, equitable data that allow students' voices to inform evaluation of faculty's teaching as part of personnel reviews.

COT's goal in creating SETS for any class is to give undergraduates a place to reflect on their learning experience and give feedback to their instructors; to give instructors, whether ladder-rank faculty, lecturers, or graduate teaching assistants, feedback from students that will allow them to improve their classes and instruction; and to give CAP valuable and equitable data that can help students' voices inform evaluation of faculty's teaching as part of personnel reviews. While having standardized SETS is essential to providing consistent feedback and to reducing bias, COT notes that it is impossible to have one standard SETS that will elicit useful feedback for a variety of types of classes. Undergraduate classes, for example, are designed differently than graduate ones, and questions appropriate for online classes may not be useful for face-to-face classes. This year, COT worked with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Lee, Instructional Technology Specialist (ITS) Juliet Wilhelm, Manager of Learning and Instructional Tools Leslie Kern, Director of the Assessment for Learning Excellence and Equity Center (ALEEC) Anna Sher, Director for Graduate Student & Postdoc Professional Development Kendra Dority, Faculty Director of the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) Robin Dunkin, and Assistant Vice Provost for Educational Innovation (AVPEI) Michael Tassio to approve and roll out the Personalization Questions, approve the Online SETS, and develop, test, and approve the new Graduate SETS

After multiple years of modifications to the teaching table (to reflect revisions to the SETS, reduce bias, and respond to the disruptions of emergency shifts to remote instruction), in 2023, both CAP and COT sought to avoid further changes to the teaching table and focused instead on other questions around effective implementation, including enabling staff to generate teaching tables. Administrators of Blue, the system used to administer SETS and generate tables for personnel review, promised that teaching tables would automatically be generated. CAP responded to a COT memo (January 11, 2024) with concerns because the numbers of the teaching table questions had changed. It was COT's understanding that the identifier used to align the teaching table questions

was changed from the number of the question to an internal identifier. CAP's concern was that although the numbering was working for SETS in Blue, many SETS in a review period might occur before UC Santa Cruz adopted Blue, resulting in department staff producing teaching tables manually. CAP felt that having a consistent numbering of questions across all versions of the SETS would prevent confusion that might result in other problems. After discussion with VPAA Lee, Juliet Wilhelm, and Leslie Kern, and consultation with Anna Sher, COT decided that the order of the questions was important to maintain, but the numbering of the questions could be adjusted to make sure the teaching table questions were appropriately numbered 5, 6, and 12. This was completed for both the Online SETS and the Graduate SETS. This is a temporary solution and COT encourages VPAA Lee, Leslie Kern, and Juliet Wilhelm to explore permanent solutions to this issue.

In CAP's February 1, 2024 memo, they recommended that the new Online SETS begin in fall 2024, arguing that introducing new SETS at the beginning of the academic year will ensure that there is consistency and equity in how the information is being used in a given review year. After consultation with VPAA Lee, it was decided that both the new Online SETS and the new Graduate SETS would be rolled out in fall 2024.

A. Personalization Questions for Standard SETS

In fall quarter 2023, COT worked with ITS and TLC to roll out question personalization for SETS. The new personalization SETS had been developed and piloted in the 2022-23 academic year. The personalization allows instructors to add up to three questions from a bank of questions or write their own questions. If an instructor chooses to write their own, they are encouraged to work with the Teaching and Learning Center to ensure that the questions ask for the information the instructor actually wants in a way that avoids bias. TLC and ITS staff created a SETS personalization "How-To" guide (which is linked in quarterly SETS personalization communication sent to all instructors) and also held virtual training. Help was also available during IT office hours. COT sent an email on November 13, 2023 to all instructors introducing the new personalization Questions.

For fall 2023, personalized questions were added to 112 courses and one course had personalized questions for both the instructor and the teaching assistant. ITS received only three inquiries about SETS personalization questions, and no instructors attended the virtual training offered to support instructors. Furthermore, no instructors attending Instructional Technology office hours requested SETS personalization support. This indicates that communication to instructors about SETS personalization met the needs of instructors.

B. Online SETS

The Online SETS were developed and piloted in the 2022-23 year as a collaboration between COT, Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (AVPTL) Jody Greene, then-Director of Online Education Michael Tassio, Leslie Kern, and Juliet Wilhelm, and in recognition that the standard SETS did not adequately assess the unique nature of classes approved by CCI as online (either synchronous or asynchronous). The approval of the Online SETS was delayed due to the need to ensure that ITS and the Office of the Registrar would be able to appropriately identify approved online courses as opposed to those that

were designated remote only temporarily. In fall 2023, COT again reviewed and consulted with AVPEI Tassio and ITS, and approved the Online SETS.

On January 11, 2024, COT forwarded the approved Online SETS to CAP asking for comments. CAP responded on February 1, 2024 making three recommendations.

First, CAP expressed concern about Question 17, in which the student is asked whether “the course materials were organized in Canvas (or another site) making it easy to find what I am looking for.” Members of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) raised the same concerns. COT notes that this question would only appear on SETS for courses that are approved online courses (not for courses taught under emergency remote conditions). Such an online course, by definition, has to have some readily-accessible and effective online “home.” This question seeks to give instructors feedback on how effective their use of this “home” platform was for students, which is particularly important information for instructors of an online course to have (as an online course without a well-organized online presence will not be an effective online course). Considering the fact that platforms do change (currently only one approved online course uses a platform other than Canvas), COT has revised this question to de-emphasize the use of Canvas in particular as the subject of the question, by moving that inside the parenthetical phrase, so that the organization of course materials is the clear subject of the question.

CAP’s other concerns were the teaching table numbering (discussed above and below) and the request that the roll out of the Online SETS be delayed until the start of the new academic year (discussed above).

C. Graduate SETS

This year, COT continued the project of working to improve SETS for graduate courses, building on work completed last year by COT in collaboration with Graduate Council (GC) and the TLC. The all-new COT membership this year first oriented itself to last year’s work, then worked in collaboration with GC and in consultation with TLC and Institutional Research, Analytics, and Planning Support (IRAPS) to first develop a clearer understanding of the possibilities and difficulties of SETs in graduate courses, then to develop a set of questions to pilot, and finally to identify and recruit an appropriate group of graduate course instructors willing to use the pilot questions in their winter 2024 course SETS. COT would especially like to acknowledge the work of Assessment for Learning Excellence & Equity Center (ALEEC) Director Anna Sher in doing the work of piloting the questions, including finding the appropriate courses and instructors, and analyzing the results. COT considered the results of the pilot in spring 2024, in consultation with the VPAA and representation from GC and IRAPS. The committee developed a proposal for the content of Graduate SETS based on those deliberations. The proposed set of questions diminishes concerns about anonymity, and aims to capture some information particularly relevant to graduate course teaching while retaining questions relevant to both graduate and undergraduate course teaching. COT shared these recommendations with GC in spring 2024. As of the writing of this report, COT plan to share these recommendations with CAP and the new Graduate SETS will be implemented in fall 2024.

D. CAP Concerns Regarding Teaching Table Questions

On January 11, 2024, the newly approved Online SETS questions were sent to CAP with a request for comments. CAP's February 1 reply asked that the Teaching Table questions maintain the numbers 5, 6, and 12 in all versions of SETS questions. The previous year there had been problems with staff needing to pull and edit the teaching tables for personnel reviews rather than being able to use the tables produced automatically on Blue. This was caused by there being problems with the tables produced with Blue (even when the data was collected by Blue) and also with data collected before Blue was installed. Since departmental staff understood that the teaching table questions were always numbered 5, 6, and 12, changing those numbers would introduce confusion and potential error.

After several discussion with CAP co-chairs Maureen Callahan and Susan Gillman to clarify their concerns, and consultation with VPAA Lee, Juliet Wilhelm, and Leslie Kern, COT decided and communicated to CAP co-chairs on May 8, 2024 that the teaching table questions could retain their current numbering in all SETs until a solution to the problems in Blue that prevent the use of automatically produced tables without editing is resolved. While questions 5 and 6 are not impacted, in the new Online and Graduate SETS, question 12 has moved to a larger number. To maintain the correct numbers while also continuing the logic of the sequencing of the questions, adjacent questions can be condensed into one number with an A and B to differentiate the questions.

COT understands that Blue may never be able to produce a totally automatic and accurate table when the specific review periods require generation of tables that draw on multiple data systems used in prior years. That said, Blue needs to produce tables from their own data system that do not need editing.

Juliet Wilhelm worked with departmental managers from Engineering in summer 2023 in advance of the reviews in 2023-2024 to help them work more efficiently. She reports that these managers were much happier with the system after this training. There should be a push to train all the departmental managers in the most efficient way to produce teaching tables for personnel reviews.

As stated in the previously in this annual report, COT, CAP, and ITS will likely need to continue collaborating with Blue to help push toward the kind of automation that was the expectation when Blue was selected as the vendor.

E. Student Response Rates on SETS

COT has continued to monitor SETS return rates and we are pleased to report that the return rates for fall 2023 and winter 2024 have seen a significant increase in all divisions. There is a general trend for lower rates in the spring, and the rates did drop significantly due in part to the spring 2024 UAW Graduate Student strike. The increase in fall and winter is a result of several factors. First, SETS were integrated into Canvas beginning in fall 2023. This allows the students to access their SETS through a link in Canvas rather than a link in an email. The timing and wording of reminders have also been modified, and Canvas reminders about SETS have proven to be effective. COT would like to thank Leslie Kern and Juliet Wilhelm for their hard work that has increased the return rate. Further work needs to be done to encourage individual faculty and departments to find

ways to increase their class return rates. Work also needs to be done in addressing the drop-in spring quarter SETS rates.

Table 1: SETS Return Rates AY 2023-24

TERM	Arts	Hum	PBSci	BSOE	Soc Sci	Colleges	Overall
Fall 2023							
	37.25	46.12	43.77	52.63	53.05	51.29	47.32
Winter 2024							
	38.14	45.24	38.48	51.65	47.82	47.86	44.02
Spring 2024							
	24.38	32.20	36.58	45.96	32.89	25.74	34.96

II. Teaching Awards

With support from the Office of the Chancellor, COT continues to administer teaching awards and organize events to celebrate award recipients in service of the larger goal of promoting appreciation of outstanding teaching on campus. The committee continued the practice of completing the review and selection of the ‘Distinguished’ award in winter quarter and the ‘Excellence’ award in spring.

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.¹ This year, as in past years, the committee discussed best approaches for reviewing and evaluating the nominations in ways that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). In 2023-24, COT evaluated nominations by 370 students, for 216 different instructors.²

2023-24 Excellence in Teaching Award Recipients (in alphabetical order):

- Abdelrahman El Fikky, Teaching Assistant, Electrical Engineering
- Barun Dhar, Lecturer, Physics
- Pedro Morales-Almazan, Associate Teaching Professor, Mathematics

¹ 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.

² The number of nominations this annual cycle was smaller due to the public affairs not sending out the spring 2023 announcement.

- Sakae Fujita, Lecturer, Languages and Applied Linguistics
- Naya Jones, Assistant Professor, Sociology and Global and Community Health B.A.
- Carolyn Dean, Distinguished Professor, History of Art and Visual Culture
- Lisa Berkley, Lecturer, Crown College
- Samantha Gorman, Assistant Teaching Professor, Computational Media

To celebrate this year's teaching awards recipients, COT and the Office of the Chancellor organized a lunch for June 9 to distribute the physical awards and recognize the winners. Unfortunately, due to the student encampment at the base of campus, the graduate student strike, and the feeling of uncertainty on campus, with great reluctance and regret COT rescheduled the event to fall 2024. Tuesday Newsday announcements about the recipients are important to help spread awareness of the awards and the recipients.

B. Distinguished Teaching Award

This year, COT invited nominations for the fifth annual Distinguished Teaching Award, created in 2019-20. In contrast to the student-nominated Excellence in Teaching Award, this is a campus-wide faculty-nominated award. In order to help ensure equity in responses, COT reviewed the language of the call and implemented a word cap on the form to help course sponsoring organizations best understand how to prepare nominations.

The committee received 14 nominations from outstanding faculty (including lecturers and ladder-rank faculty) across the five divisions. 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 Nathan Altice, Associate Teaching Professor of Computational Media, as this year's Distinguished Teaching Award winner. There will be a lecture held in February 2025 as part of Teaching Week to celebrate Professor Altice. COT has worked with each recipient to determine the best format for their presentation (whether a conversation, a formal talk, or some other format). As the award becomes more established, a pattern of practice will emerge.

COT held their second in-person Distinguished Teaching event on February 29, 2024 from 4:00 pm - 6:30 pm, in conjunction with Teaching Week. It was also live casted. With introductory remarks from Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Lori Kletzer, 2022-23 recipient Alegra Eroy-Reveles was joined by Dr. Mica Estrada (UCSF), Yuliana Ortega (UCSC), and Yvonne Rodriguez (Surge Institute). Together in conversation, they discussed the many paradoxes of joining "soul and role" in teaching and mentoring, while also balancing life as Latina mothers and grandmothers. A recording, along with videos of prior DTF winners' presentations, is available on [COT's website](#). There was a great turnout for this event, which closed Teaching Week with over 100 people in attendance.

III. Other Issues

- A. COT members served 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.

- SETS Committee: The chair of COT regularly attended (approximately twice per quarter) meetings with ITS and the VPAA to discuss and track SETS changes, implementation, and other issues that arose.
- Technology Enhanced Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee (TETL). A COT member (Alegra Eroy-Reveles) participated on TETL, which is charged with bringing together staff and faculty to review and consider instructional technologies explicitly in the context of working towards campus priorities, making recommendations to the executive sponsors, while guiding the campus in making strategic and sustainable investments in instructional technologies. TETL met monthly from January to May 2024 to [develop a web presence](#), develop a process for receiving and evaluating requests (new and renewals) for educational technology, standardize a process for piloting educational technology with faculty innovators, and develop a process for communicating to the campus community regarding changes to educational technology.
- In the late fall quarter, Katharin Peter, the UC Santa Cruz Representative for the UC Open Educational Resources (OER) Task Force, consulted with COT.
- Consultation Request with CCI Chair Amanda Rysling: Undergraduate TA Requests
- Open Educational Resources (OER) Librarian Sarah Hare

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

Systemwide:

- Second Review of Proposed Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area H) (May 2024)
- Final report of the University of California Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities (May 2024)
- Proposed Academic Senate Statement on UC Quality (May 2024)

Divisional:

- Leading the Change Final Report (December 2023)
- VPDUE/GE's Syllabus Request (January 2024)
- CEP: Request to Review ADA Compliance Officers request for DRC Access to Canvas (April 2024)

IV. Carry Forward

- SETS:
 - Coordinate with SETS Executive Sponsor VPAA Lee and CAP co-chairs regarding implementation of SETS and communication with instructors, departments, and CSAs regarding best uses and practices. In particular, the impact of gender and race bias in SETS responses needs to be further assessed, and departments and CAP should address best practices for minimizing this impact on under-represented and minority instructors.
 - Continue to communicate with faculty and department chairs about the changes to SETS, and best practices for encouraging increased response rates.
 - Reevaluate TA SETS to make appropriate for all courses
 - Language around bias

- Awards events: review the events organized in 2023-24 and evaluate what approach makes most sense going forward. (e.g., how many events to have? What kinds of events to have? When to schedule?)
 - Discuss adjudicating Physical and Biological Sciences Division's Ron Ruby Award as part of the Excellence in Teaching award.
- Consultations:
 - Explore how COT can best work with ITS to support instructional and learning technologies.
 - Collaborate with the DRC Director regarding faculty responsibilities, effective communication with diverse teaching staff, and a potential revised DRC handbook. This may also be an area where TLC could collaborate.
 - Discuss possible areas of collaboration with Graduate Council, The Teaching and Learning Center, and Graduate Division, including possible ways of supporting effective mentoring of graduate students.
 - Evaluate role of TLC and consultation

Thank you to all the members of COT for their contributions of time, energy, and reflection this year. Our work was greatly enriched by having perspectives from students and instructors from across the university. The work of the committee simply could not happen without the expertise and patient guidance of our analyst, Rebecca Hurdis. The committee benefited enormously not only from her extraordinary organization skills, but also from her institutional memory, foresightedness, and remarkable goodwill in the face of another unpredictable year.

Respectfully Submitted,

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Alegra Eroy-Reveles

Nicol Hammond

Adam Smith

Megan Thomas

Elisabeth Cameron, *Chair*

Hazel Uber Kellog (*F*), SUA Representative

Camnhi Hoang (*F*), SUA Representative

Nathan McGregor, GSA Representative

August 31, 2024

Appendix A. Personalization Questions Added to SETS COT to CAP re SETs History

7/24/24, 10:45 AM

UC Santa Cruz Mail - Personalization Question Option Added to SETS



Rebecca Hurdis <rhurdis@ucsc.edu>

Personalization Question Option Added to SETS

Academic Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>
To: Senate Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>
Bcc: aso-staff2324-group@ucsc.edu

Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 3:57 PM

To: Instructors, GSIs and Teaching Assistants
From: Committee on Teaching

Dear Colleagues,

The Committee on Teaching (COT) in collaboration with the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) and Instructional Technology Services (ITS) would like to announce the launch of optional personalization questions for the Student Experiences of Teaching Surveys (SETS). Instructors will be able to add optional personalized questions November 14 through November 21, 2023 for their fall quarter SETS (which opens to students 11/27). We want to note two things quickly by way of introduction:

- Nothing is changing about the [standard SETS questions](#) or how they're used in personnel reviews.
- Adding personalized questions is completely optional, and students' responses to them would not be visible to others.

Please read on when you have a moment to consider whether you want to take advantage of this opportunity to get more specific feedback on your course than is covered by the standard SETS questions. If you do not have time to consider this for this quarter, we hope you might come back to it in a future teaching term.

Things to know: Student responses to personalized questions are handled differently than the standard questions.

- Answers to these questions will be visible only to you, not to your department or to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).
- You are welcome to include anything you learn from these questions in your personal statement when preparing your review file.
- Personalized questions can be selected by instructors and TAs. Only the individual instructors and TAs who add the questions will be able to see their students' answers (i.e. an instructor or TA can only see students' responses to the questions they themselves individually add).
- You can add up to three personalized questions to SETS.
- You can choose from a menu of available options for personalized questions, or you can write questions of your own design.
- If you wish to include a question of your own design (e.g., to get feedback on a particular assignment) consider reaching out to [TLC](#) or [ALEEC](#) for help in designing the question in a way that will be most likely to help you gather good data and minimize bias.

Reasons to use Personalized Questions: These questions can be used in important ways to collect specific feedback not available through use of the standard SETs questions.

- The selectable personalized questions have been developed to support faculty in getting specific data to help refine assignments, instructional approaches, evaluate learning activities, etc. while minimizing bias in students' responses. If the selectable questions are not specific enough, custom questions can be written.
- Personalized questions allow faculty to use the same questions over several iterations of a course in order to track the impact of particular course changes on students' learning.

How to add Personalized Questions: Instructors teaching this quarter will receive an email tomorrow (November 14th) with a link to their "Question Personalization Task" in the SETS system. For more information and full instructions, please

7/24/24, 10:45 AM

UC Santa Cruz Mail - Personalization Question Option Added to SETS

see the ITS knowledge article [How to Add Personalized Questions to SETS](#). SETS dates for question personalization, survey open & close, and report release can be found on the [ITS SETS webpage](#).

We're pleased that we could finalize and announce this initiative, and we are grateful to last year's COT, and colleagues in TLC and ITS, for working to make this happen.

Warmly,
Elisabeth Cameron, Chair
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 II. Online SETS Questions

REVISED SPRING 2024 APPROVED FALL 2023

Student Experience of Teaching ~~(SET)~~ Survey (SETS) ONLINE COURSES

A Collaboration of COT and ~~TLC~~ ~~CTL~~, in consultation with IRAPS, CAP and ITS¹

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

¹ Questions 5, 6 & 12 for teaching table

Comments (OPEN ENDED)

10. Please restate your answer to Question 11 9 and explain it. For example, the instructor helped me feel engaged with the course “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 12-15 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.”

12.⁴ Lectures and other instructor-produced presentations (e.g. video-recorded lectures) were well structured and had clear goals.

13. ~~In-~~Class activities, either done synchronously or asynchronously, were well structured and had clear goals.

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

15. Course materials were organized in Canvas (or on another site) making it easy for me to find what I was looking for.

(Scale for question 16 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)

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

Comments OPEN-ENDED

17. 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.

⁴Teaching Table Question

Comments (OPEN ENDED)

10. Please restate your answer to Question 11 9 and explain it. For example, the instructor helped me feel engaged with the course “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 12-15 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.”

12.⁴ Lectures and other instructor-produced presentations (e.g. video-recorded lectures) were well structured and had clear goals.

13. ~~In-~~Class activities, either done synchronously or asynchronously, were well structured and had clear goals.

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

15. Course materials were organized in Canvas (or on another site) making it easy for me to find what I was looking for.

(Scale for question 16 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)

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

Comments OPEN-ENDED

17. 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.

⁴Teaching Table Question

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

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

Preparation for the Course

20. 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

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

Appendix III. Graduate SETS Questions

APPROVED SPRING 2024

Student Experience of Teaching Survey (SETS) GRADUATE COURSES

A Collaboration of COT and TLC in consultation with ALEEC, CAP and ITS

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

Questions 1 and 2 about your year or program of study have been removed to protect your anonymity.

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%)
 - 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.

- 5.¹** The instructor used course time effectively to support my learning.
- Unable to comment
 - Never
 - Occasionally
 - Somewhat frequently
 - Frequently
 - Very frequently
- 6.²** The instructor explained concepts in ways that supported my learning.
- Unable to comment
 - Never
 - Occasionally
 - Somewhat frequently
 - Frequently
 - Very frequently
- 7.** The instructor provided useful feedback on my assigned work.
- Unable to comment
 - Never
 - Occasionally
 - Somewhat frequently
 - Frequently
 - Very frequently
- 8.** The instructor provided timely feedback on my assigned work.
- Unable to comment
 - Never
 - Occasionally
 - Somewhat frequently
 - Frequently
 - Very frequently
- 9.** The instructor created an environment in which I felt comfortable to ask questions or contribute to the class.
- Unable to comment
 - Never
 - Occasionally
 - Somewhat frequently
 - Frequently
 - Very frequently

¹ Teaching table question

² Teaching table question

10. The instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning from my peers.

- Unable to comment
- Never
- Occasionally
- Somewhat frequently
- Frequently
- Very frequently

FEEDBACK ON COURSE:

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

- Never understood the goals
- At the beginning of the course
- In the middle of the course
- At the end of the course

Instructions to students: Please only comment if the course contained the specific activity addressed in questions 16-18. Otherwise, select “unable to comment.”

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

- Unable to comment
- Never
- Occasionally
- Somewhat frequently
- Frequently
- Very frequently

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

- Unable to comment
- Never
- Occasionally
- Somewhat frequently
- Frequently
- Very frequently

14. The course assignments were clearly connected to the knowledge or skills relevant to the course learning goals.

- Unable to comment
- Never
- Occasionally
- Somewhat frequently

³ Teaching table question

- Frequently
- Very frequently

15. How did this course contribute to important aspect(s) of your graduate studies, research, and/or professional growth? Select all that apply.

- Helped me prepare for a program milestone (first year exam, QE, prospectus, etc.)
- Helped me decide on a potential topic for my research
- Helped me develop skills to become a more independent researcher
- Helped me develop skills to become a more collaborative researcher
- Improved or widened my methodological skills
- Improved my knowledge in a specific field, subfield, or interdisciplinary studies
- Helped me to develop professional skills (e.g., writing skills, presentation skills, pedagogical/teaching skills, grant writing, understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion)
- Helped me to decide on my career path
- Had a significant impact not listed above
- Had no significant impacts

15a. Are there any other ways in which this course has impacted you? Please describe.

16. Which of the following best describes your experience with the **amount of the assigned work** in this course, including readings, written assignments, problem solving, creative and other tasks/components:

- I found it to be unreasonably high from the beginning to the end of the course.
- I found it to be unreasonably high initially but I figured out how to manage it by the end of the course.
- I found it to be reasonable and achievable throughout the course.
- I found it to be unreasonably low at some point or throughout the course.

17. Which of the following best describes your experience with the **level of difficulty** of the assigned work in this course, including readings, written assignments, problem solving, creative and other tasks/components:

- I found it to be unreasonably high from the beginning to the end of the course.
- I found it to be unreasonably high initially but I figured out how to manage it by the end of the course.
- I found it to be reasonable and achievable throughout the course.
- I found it to be unreasonably low at some point or throughout the course.

18. Please describe any specific teaching methods and materials (lectures, seminar discussion, small group activities, readings or media, etc.) the instructor used that you found helpful to your learning in this course.

Question 19 is not part of the Undergraduate SETS

19. Please describe any specific teaching methods and materials (lectures, seminar discussion, small group activities, readings or media, etc.) the instructor used that you found unhelpful to your learning in this course.

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

21. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences in the course?
