Agenda for HDC Meeting (Chairs and Department Managers)
Thursday, May 16, 12:00 Noon-2:00 p.m.
Humanities 1, Room 202

I  Announcements
   12:00 noon – 12:10

II Online Course Evaluations
   12:10 - 12:30  Update, Discussion on implementation

III Development Report
   12:30 - 12:45  Annual Giving
                  Special Guest: Pete Ragias, Director of Development for Annual Giving, Marketing & Membership Programs

IV Program Learning Outcomes
   12:45 – 1:00  Discussion of Herbie Lee’s call for Outcomes by December 16, 2013

V  Divisional Academic Plan
   1:00 – 1:15  Update, status and next steps
Thanks, margaret. I will fold this into our next Divisional Council meeting. I appreciate the clarity of the recommendation.

Best,

Bill

On Oct 26, 2012, at 4:13 PM, Margaret Godoy wrote:

Dear Bill,

David, Anne and I advise that you formally mandate a shift to the OCE system as a Division beginning Fall 2013. While all our departments can proceed with using it now, we recommend waiting to require this until we have more information about the development and improvement of the OCE system in the coming year.

Specifically, we feel it is important to learn more about what progress is made with the future implementations outlined in the letter from VPDUE Hughey:

- Request submitted to the Data Warehousing Steering Committee for campus-wide archiving of OCE data.
- Working with the Academic Senate to establish a condensed version of the current template, whereby all instructors and courses would be evaluated according to a standard set of questions; beyond the standard set of questions, CSAs would be able to include their own department-specific questions as needed.

If significant progress is made with the items listed above, this would address some of the key concerns outlined in the letter submitted to VPDUE Hughey (attached) from our undergraduate program directors.

Additionally, it is important to give our departments time to prepare for transitioning to the OCE system in terms of coordinating the mandatory online access and training for first time users. Starting the OCE system in Fall 2013 will give our departments adequate time to prepare for this change, regardless of what progress the Data Warehousing Steering Committee and Academic Senate make in the coming year.

Please let me know if you have any questions about our recommendations.

Thank you,

Margaret

On Mon, Oct 22, 2012 at 1:51 PM, Humanities Dean <ladusaw@ucsc.edu> wrote:

David, Anne, & Margaret,

This is the latest pronouncement from the VPDUE's office about Online Course Evaluations. It clarifies the expectations of Course Sponsoring Agencies as the office of record for the evaluations. Given the discussion about the potential savings for the personnel process and workload for department offices, it seems advisable that I should formally mandate a shift to this system as a Division at the earliest feasible point.
Based upon my quick review of this document, however, it seems that we are still far from having an option for customizing the template. This is urgent enough that I ask the three of you to find a time to discuss the pro's and con's of a Divisional mandate and its timing and present the options to me for decision.

thanks,

Bill

https://ue.soe.ucsc.edu/OCE-procedures

Begin forwarded message:

From: ugdiv ugdiv <ugdiv@ucsc.edu>
Date: October 19, 2012 4:22:55 PM PDT

Subject: Online Course Evaluations – Additional Procedures

ACADEMIC DEANS
COLLEGE PROVOSTS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
DEPARTMENT MANAGERS

Please see the attachment regarding Online Course Evaluations - Additional Procedures, sent to you on behalf of Richard Hughey, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education.

Let me know if you experience difficulties opening this document.

Sincerely,
Daria E. Troxell
Divisional Assistant

Division of Undergraduate Education
(831) 459-2351
dtroxell@ucsc.edu
Mail Stop: Chancellor's Office

<CU ED online eval response to VPDUE Hughey.pdf>

William A. Ladusaw
Prof. of Linguistics
Dean of Humanities
University of California, Santa Cruz
October 19, 2012

ACADEMIC DEANS
COLLEGE PROVOSTS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
DEPARTMENT MANAGERS

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Online Course Evaluations – Additional Procedures

As we continue to monitor the progress of the Online Course Evaluation (OCE) system\(^1\), I write to share with you updates as well as two additional procedures in using the system.

**SUMMARY**

- For Fall 2012, it is our understanding that 8 out of 10 colleges intend to use the system for core course evaluations.
- The entire divisions of Arts and Physical & Biological Sciences use OCE.

We request that Course Sponsoring Agencies (CSAs) follow the procedures below, which are being added to the Online Course Evaluations **uniform procedures** that were distributed in May 2012:

**NEW PROCEDURES**

1. **5th-Week Roster**
   During the last cycle, some students who officially dropped a course were emailed an evaluation for a course in which they were no longer enrolled. This may have occurred because the evaluation was created prior to the 5th-week roster. The concept is thus: rosters remain dynamic (i.e., are updated according to add/drop/swaps) until they are attached to an evaluation. Once they are attached to the evaluation they become static and will not change to reflect enrollment in the course. Therefore, it is recommended that CSAs not attach a roster to an evaluation until after the Add/Drop/Swap deadline. This will ensure the most accurate roster for the course.

2. **Archiving OCEs**
   Since the CSA is the office of record for instructor evaluations [not Faculty Instructional Technology Center (FITC)], it is imperative that CSAs download both the PDF and excel spreadsheet for archiving purposes. A memo recently sent out by APO advised departments to have the excel file on hand should it be required during the faculty personnel review process. It is not enough to download the PDF only. During the faculty review process, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) prefers to look at student comments within the context of all feedback provided by an individual student. It provides additional context for interpreting the individual remarks. Without the excel file, CAP has no way of connecting free response comments to multiple-choice comments for an individual.

For a complete list of OCE procedures visit: [https://ue.soec.ucsc.edu/OCE-procedures](https://ue.soec.ucsc.edu/OCE-procedures)

**TRAINING AND SUPPORT**
The Faculty Instructional Technology Center (FITC) provides consulting and support for the course-sponsoring agency’s administrator. First-time users must: a) request access with authorization from their department manager via [itrequest.ucsc.edu](http://itrequest.ucsc.edu) and b) attend Training for **Online Course Evaluations** before issuing any evaluations (see list of this quarter’s offerings below). For questions contact: Rebecca Peet (9-1573, [rpeet@ucsc.edu](mailto:rpeet@ucsc.edu)) or Robin Ove (9-2436, [robin@ucsc.edu](mailto:robin@ucsc.edu)).

---

\(^1\) Previously referred to as Online Instructor Evaluations (OIE), renamed so as not to conflict with the Office of International Education.
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Online Course Evaluation Training and Consulting
When using Events Manager, please sort by "Unit":

1. Training for Online Course Evaluations – Thursday, November 1
Unit managers, or their designees, who did not participate in the previous quarter rollouts and are planning to use the online course evaluation system must sign up for a training session offered by Faculty Instructional Technology Center (FITC). Class registration is through the UCSC Events Manager: http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/.

2. OCE Training: Custom Questions & Consulting – Friday, November 2
This training is designed for units that will be customizing the standard UCSC template with department-specific questions. Attendees must have prior OCE experience, or have attended the training course on November 1. Class registration is through the UCSC Events Manager: http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/.

SCANTRON ALTERNATIVE
Units choosing to use the Scantron system will need to budget for the printing and processing costs and provide a FOAPAL for recharges. If you need Scantron forms, please contact Daria Troxell at ugdiv@ucsc.edu. For more information on processing the forms, visit the Learning Technologies website at http://its.ucsc.edu/scantron/evals/index.html.

FUTURE IMPLEMENTATIONS
We will continue to develop and improve the OCE system based on campus needs and input from end users. A request has been submitted to the Data Warehousing Steering Committee for campus-wide archiving of OCE data. We also hope to work with Academic Senate to establish a condensed version of the current template, whereby all instructors and courses would be evaluated according to a standard set of questions; beyond the standard set of questions, CSAs would be able to include their own department-specific questions as needed.

More information on Online Course Evaluations can be found at http://its.ucsc.edu/ecommons/evaluation-system/index.html. Feedback on policies related to evaluations may be provided to Senate committees, Deans, and Chairs, or directly to ugdiv@ucsc.edu. Feedback on technical issues and improvements may be provided to http://its.ucsc.edu/feedback.php.

Thank you for your continued support as we further work to improve the online course evaluation system and the evaluation process across the campus. Your feedback is essential to the success of this system on our campus.

Sincerely,

Richard Hughey
Vice Provost and Dean
of Undergraduate Education

cc: CP/EVC Galloway
Senate Chair Konopelski
Manager Ove
AVC Peterson
Director Phillips
CAP Chair Ravelo
Academic Senate Office
Assistant Deans
Curricular Analysts
Department Assistants
Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Richard Hughey
Chair Charlie McDowell, COT
Chair Christina Ravelo, CAP

August 15, 2012

Dear VPDUE Hughey, COT Chair McDowell, and CAP Chair Ravelo,

At a May 14, 2012, meeting of Humanities Division undergraduate program directors and Dean Bill Ladusaw, we discussed online course evaluations and found that we had some shared concerns that we would like to communicate to you.

First, we would like to emphasize that we are not opposed to the general concept of online course evaluations, although we admittedly prefer the return rates for our current system, which exceed those projected for the online system.

Second, we understand that adjustments to the first 29 questions are not possible at this particular point, since the focus is currently on data integration and analysis, which depends on employing the current template for uniformly structured information.

However, it is also our understanding that once this current phase is complete, there might be a possibility of returning to the basic template and making revisions. It is our belief that there are important adjustments to be made that would still satisfy the requirement for standardization across departments and divisions. Most importantly, we believe these revisions would help the course evaluation forms better fulfill the committee's and university's mission of fostering good teaching.

Linguistics and Literature, in particular, have engaged in extensive departmental discussions that produced new course evaluation forms to this end. With these as models (attached), we offer the following recommendations.

Most significantly, questions regarding student profile and course appraisal should precede questions regarding instructor appraisal. That is, the student should first consider his or her level of engagement with the class, then consider the structure of the course itself, and only finally comment on the instructor. The point of this is to steer the course evaluation form away from measuring instructor popularity, which is not always directly correlated to learning outcomes, and toward having the student think hard about his or her actual learning experience. This, in turn, would make the course evaluation forms more meaningful in the faculty review process.

In addition, it is very likely that 29 questions, plus optional questions a given department might want to pose, are too many. Responses to some questions likely correlate strongly with those of other questions, and the length of the survey may depress return rates and reduce the thoughtfulness of the students' answers. We have concerns with the wording of some of the questions as well, but rather than
getting caught up in details, we recommend reduction of the number of questions to
the essentials.

We appreciate the hard work and challenge involved in getting a new system like
this established, and our hope is to contribute to this process.

Best,

Noriko Aso, Undergraduate Program Director for History
Neda Atanasoski, Undergraduate Program Director for Feminist Studies
Kirsten Gruesz, Undergraduate Program Director for Literature
Jaye Padgett, Undergraduate Program Director for Linguistics
Eric Porter, Undergraduate Program Director for American Studies
Abe Stone, Undergraduate Program Director for Philosophy
Literature Course and Instructor Evaluation

Instructor ___________________________ Quarter (circle): F W SP Year ________
Course Number ________________________ Course Title _______________________
Your Major __________________________ Class (circle): Frosh Sophomore Junior Senior
Did you take this course: A. ___ to fulfill a general education requirement; B. ___ to fulfill a Literature major requirement; C. ___ for general interest; or D. ___ for another reason (please specify) ____________________________?

The purpose of this evaluation is to help maintain and improve the effectiveness of instruction in the Literature Department at UCSC. Teaching evaluation forms will be used by the instructor for revision and improvement of future courses and by the department in evaluating the instructor’s teaching performance. In keeping with the UCSC Principles of Community, we ask that your comments show respect for the instructor and your fellow students. The instructor will not see these forms until grades for the course have been submitted.

Please indicate your responses using this scale: 5= Strongly Agree; 4= Mildly Agree; 3=Neutral; 2=Mildly Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree; and N/A= not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Self-Assessment

I put significant effort into this course 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
I came to each class meeting prepared and on time 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
I read all assignments carefully 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
I consulted the instructor outside of class 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
I made good use of supplementary course materials and resources 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
I contributed to a positive learning environment 5 4 3 2 1 N/A

Course Assessment

The course established and maintained high intellectual standards 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
The readings were well chosen 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
The syllabus was organized and made clear the goals of the course 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Assignments were clear and addressed important issues of the course 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Overall quality of the course was high 5 4 3 2 1 N/A

Instructor Assessment

The instructor’s lectures showed careful thought; they were on topic and clear 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
The instructor was open-responsive to student questions and concerns 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
The instructor was available for consultation outside of class 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Overall instruction in the course was of high quality 5 4 3 2 1 N/A

If applicable:
The instructor facilitated productive in-class discussion 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
The instructor’s comments on written work were useful 5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Literature Course and Instructor Evaluation

Overall Comments and Suggestions:

What were the major strengths of the course?

What could the instructor do to improve the course?

Please make any comments you feel would be useful to the instructor and the department about the items listed below or other aspects of the course:

1. Readings:

2. Discussion:

3. Assignments:

4. Supplementary materials and resources (films, slides/presentations, guest lectures, Living Writers series, etc.):

February 1, 2011
Please give serious thought to your comments. They play an important role in evaluating the instructor's teaching. They will also be studied by the instructor after the final grades have been posted, and used to improve future offerings of the course. Your comments will always remain anonymous.

1. Your major:
   - Linguistics
   - Language Studies
   - Other

2. Why did you take this course?

3. About how many hours per week, outside of class time, did you devote to work for this course?

4. What did you perceive the goals of the course to be?

5. Has the course been successful in achieving these goals? If not, why not? If so, how?

6. What did you like most about this course?

7. If you could change one thing about this course, what would it be?

8. What advice would you give to a fellow student contemplating taking this course?
9. Please evaluate the instructor on such issues as clarity, enthusiasm, availability, and overall teaching effectiveness.

Rate the quality of the following from poor to excellent.
1 = Poor
2 = Fair
3 = Satisfactory
4 = Very Good
5 = Excellent

10. Instructor's overall effectiveness as a teacher

11. The course overall as a learning experience

12. The value to your learning of the following:

a. Course content:

b. Course organization:

c. Readings, if any:

d. Written work/other work:

13. Any additional comments?
From: Margaret Godoy <mamag@ucsc.edu>
Subject: Humanities Undergraduate Program Directors Online Eval Response
Date: August 17, 2012 11:07:15 AM PDT
To: VPDUE <vpdue@ucsc.edu>, charlie@cs.ucsc.edu, acr@ucsc.edu
Cc: "William A. Ladusaw" <humdean@ucsc.edu>, David Symonik <dsimonik@ucsc.edu>, Noriko Aso <naso@ucsc.edu>, Neda Atanasoski <natakos@ucsc.edu>, kgruesz@ucsc.edu, Jaye Padgett <padgett@ucsc.edu>, Eric Porter <ecporter@ucsc.edu>, abeStone <abestone@ucsc.edu>, Marti Stanton <mstanton@ucsc.edu>, Ashley Hardisty <ashleyh@ucsc.edu>, Stephanie Hinkle <sshinkle@ucsc.edu>, Hollie Clausnitzer <hncausn@ucsc.edu>, Judith Plummer <jplummer@ucsc.edu>, Margaret Godoy <mamag@ucsc.edu>

Dear VPDUE Hughey, COT Chair McDowell, and CAP Chair Ravelo,

On behalf of Dean Ladusaw and the Humanities Division undergraduate program directors, attached are the following documents:

1. Humanities Division Undergraduate Program Directors Online Eval Response
2. Literature Course and Instructor Evaluation
3. Linguistics Instructor and Course Evaluation

Thank you,

--
Margaret Godoy
Academic Programs and Human Resources Analyst
Division of Humanities
University of California, Santa Cruz
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
mamag@ucsc.edu
831.459.4477

CUPD online ...df (23.6 KB) LIT.Evaluatio...pdf (31.1 KB) New_ling_on...pdf (38.8 KB)
May 1, 2012

ACADEMIC DEANS
COLLEGE PROVOSTS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
DEPARTMENT MANAGERS

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Online Course Evaluations - Uniform Procedures

We are pleased to share with you information from the winter deployment of the Online Course Evaluation (OCE) system¹. Overall feedback continues to be positive from students and staff.

**SUMMARY**

- 15 new departments came onboard Winter quarter including the entire Division of Physical and Biological Sciences
- 387 online survey instruments (either single course or groups of over 50 courses by department) were issued with a possible 34,436 total responses.
- Response rates: 58% undergraduate, 62% graduate²

To improve response rates and to facilitate standardized reporting, we have targeted three (3) areas:
- Increasing communications to students and faculty explaining the value of evaluations
- Establishing a defined schedule for quarterly evaluation open and close period
- Using the approved UCSC Template

Based on user feedback, implementing uniform procedures across campus will increase the response rate, ensure data integrity, and improve reporting. Please adhere to the following procedures when utilizing the Online Course Evaluation system:

**UNIFORM PROCEDURES**

1. **Standard Template**
   Do not alter the standard template, questions 1-29. Departments can add department-specific questions at the end of the survey beginning with question 30. Altering the template will result in data not being archived properly. Any modifications made to the standard template will jeopardize data integrity over time.

2. **Communication Plan**
   At UCSC, faculty engagement appears to be the single most important factor to increase student participation and response rates. Department Managers and Chairs can increase response rates by alerting faculty of the dates that evaluations are to be completed and requesting that they encourage their students to complete the online review process even in courses that do not use eCommons for any other purpose.

   A comprehensive communication plan includes:
   - A message from the Department Chair or Provost to students and faculty communicating the importance of course evaluations and noting the ease of doing so online.
   - Information and instructions for faculty to give to their students about online

---

¹ Previously referred to as Online Instructor Evaluations (OIE), renamed so as not to conflict with the Office of International Education.

² A review of data from 300 institutions found that while the online evaluations had lower response rates, student responses were similar. A 2006 review of online evaluation at a single university noted that, "A diminished response rate to course evaluations has less to do with the method of distribution than it does with faculty and student engagement."
evaluations (e.g., passwords used, anonymous, confidential, value of constructive criticism and feedback) and how the data will be used.

- Department-specific student notification and reminder text should be included in each survey (evaluation), specifying open and close dates. For Spring quarter, it is important the evaluation period close by Sunday, June 10 at 11:59 p.m. prior to the start of final exams.
- Information for instructors about when the results will be available to them and in what format.

Sample communications are attached.

3. Deployment Period

Students and faculty expressed confusion regarding the timing of the evaluation process because different dates have been used by departments over the past two quarters. Historically, paper evaluations were handed out to students in the final week of classes, prior to finals week. With the online process this practice should NOT change. Evaluations need to be collected prior to finals week. This has been, and will continue to be standard campus practice. Please set up Spring 2012 evaluation as follows:

- **Evaluation period**: online evaluations should be available from Tuesday, May 29 to Sunday, June 10 at 11:59 p.m. Evaluations should cease being available by Sunday, June 10 at 11:59 p.m.

- **Student Notification**: until such time that there is a technical solution to aggregate notification (i.e., students receive only one email that includes information on all evaluations they have yet to submit), choose the notification reminder setting ‘every-other-day’ for each evaluation instrument.

4. File Naming

To maintain the integrity of our archival process, it is imperative for departments to appropriately name both the evaluation instrument and the report data file. The following are examples of appropriately named files:

- Best practice for naming an evaluation for a single course:
  TERM / COURSE / CLASS NUMBER / INSTRUCTOR
  Ex. W12 SOCY 177G 12345 Smith

- Best practice for naming a group or batch of evaluations:
  TERM / DEPARTMENT
  Ex. W12 Music Dept Course Evaluations

5. Faculty Review of Evaluations

Faculty may see their evaluations once the grade posting deadline has passed and it has been verified that they have submitted grades for their course. Until all grades for a course are submitted, faculty should not review evaluations. This standard campus practice is not changing.

- All units are responsible for the distribution of the evaluation reports directly to their own faculty, just as they have done when using Scantron or other evaluation processing methods. It is important that the administrator communicate with instructors their schedule for the release of this information. It is not currently available online for instructors.

6. Faculty Communication

Communication from faculty to their students is of the utmost importance to increase student response rates. Some methods to increase student response rates include:
- Remind students of the deadline date of the evaluation and the importance of results after each class.
- Explain in the course syllabus the importance of student input for course improvement and that their evaluations are taken seriously and do effect change.
- Reinforce the message that instructors will not have access to individual student evaluations. Summary reports will be provided only after grades are submitted.
- Remind students that their response will be used to improve the course for future students. Students should know that a professor will take their feedback seriously and specific actions will be taken to resolve any issues raised.
- Help students understand how to give constructive criticism. This will help students give valuable feedback. Further, this action will help convince them that their comments will be heard.
- Direct students to a computer laboratory where they can submit their evaluations.
- Consider the use of department- or course-level incentives. Departments have access to the list of students who have completed evaluations; some faculty have used this information within their classes. Of course, such information should not be shared with fewer than 10 respondents, as it may make responses identifiable. Evaluations can be submitted without answering any questions.

**TRAINING AND SUPPORT**
The Faculty Instructional Technology Center (FITC) provides consulting and support for each course-sponsoring agency’s administrator. First-time users must: a) request access with authorization from their department manager via irequest.ucsc.edu and b) attend New User Training before issuing any evaluations (see list of this quarter’s offerings below). For questions contact: Rebecca Peet (9-1573, rpeet@ucsc.edu) or Robin Ove (9-2436, robino@ucsc.edu).

**Online Course Evaluation Training and Consulting**
When using Events Manager, please sort by “Unit”:

1. **New User Training – Monday, May 7**
   Unit managers, or their designees, who did not participate in the previous quarter rollouts and are planning to use the online course evaluation system must sign up for a training session offered by Faculty Instructional Technology Center (FITC). Class registration is through the UCSC Events Manager: [http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/](http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/).

2. **Creating Custom Questions – Tuesday, May 8**
   This training is designed for newcomers to the Online Evaluation system who will be customizing the standard UCSC template with department-specific questions. The prerequisite for this course is “New User Training” (Monday, May 7). Class registration is through the UCSC Events Manager: [http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/](http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/).

3. **Hands-on, Open Office, Consulting – Tuesday, May 8**
   FITC will meet with users to answer questions and assist them with spring Online Evaluations deployment. Class registration is through the UCSC Events Manager: [http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/](http://events-manager.ucsc.edu/).

**SCANTRON ALTERNATIVE**
Units choosing to use the Scantron system will need to budget for the printing and processing costs and provide a FOAPAL for recharges. If you need Scantron forms, please contact Daria Troxell at ugdiv@ucsc.edu. For more information on processing the forms, visit the Learning Technologies website at [http://its.ucsc.edu/scantron/evals/index.html](http://its.ucsc.edu/scantron/evals/index.html).
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FUTURE IMPLEMENTATIONS
We will continue to develop the Online Evaluations system based on campus needs and suggestions to every extent possible. One upcoming project is for data warehousing capabilities and BiobibNet integration to significantly automate the inclusion of course evaluations within the academic review process.

More information on Online Course Evaluations can be found at http://its.ucsc.edu/ecommons/online-evaluations/index.html. Feedback on policies related to evaluations may be provided to Senate committees, Deans, and Chairs, or directly to ugdiv@ucsc.edu. Technical feedback may be provided to http://its.ucsc.edu/feedback.php.

Thank you for your feedback and continued support as we further develop the online evaluation system and work to improve the evaluation process across the campus.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Hughey
Vice Provost and Dean
of Undergraduate Education

Attachment: Sample Communications

cc: CP/EVC Galloway
   Chair Gillman
   Manager Ove
   AVC Peterson
   Director Phillips
   CAP Chair Takagi
   Academic Senate Office
   Assistant Deans
   Curriculum Analysts
   Department Assistants
APPENDIX A
Sample Communications

SAMPLE 1 – General Communication

To: Instructors and Students

From: [Academic Department Name]

Re: Announcing use of eCommons Online Course Evaluation System for ____ Quarter Courses

[Your Academic Department Name Here (i.e., Anthropology)] is using the new eCommons Evaluations System to collect end-of-the quarter instructor and course evaluations. Evaluations will open ____ and close ____. All students in our courses will have access to the evaluation tool in eCommons, whether or not the class used an eCommons site for course work.

How it works:

Students will receive an email when the evaluation survey is available. The email will provide information regarding the evaluation as well as a link to the evaluation in eCommons. Students can click the link, login to eCommons and find the evaluation to take and submit. Alternately, students can login to ecommons.ucsc.edu and click the Evaluation System tool to see current available evaluations. Student submissions are anonymous and confidential. Instructors cannot identify which submissions belong to which students and will only be able to review the data collected after all grades have been submitted.

SAMPLE 2 – Instructions to students

Please give serious thought to your comments. This evaluation will become part of the faculty member's personnel file to be reviewed by colleagues and administration when considering the instructor's future teaching assignments and promotions. Your comments will be studied by the professor after grading your work and may be used to improve future offerings of the course.

SAMPLE 3 - System Email Notification to students after an evaluation has been made available:

All information submitted to the Evaluation System is confidential. Instructors cannot identify which submissions belong to which students. Students are required to login to the system for the sole purpose of providing students access to the appropriate evaluations for their associated courses. Please send privacy concerns to ecommons.help@ucsc.edu

An evaluation (NAME) for: CLASS NAME GOES HERE is ready to be filled out. Please complete this evaluation by DATE THIS DATE IS FROM YOUR SETTINGS at the latest.

You may access the evaluation at:

https://ecommongs.ucsc.edu/direct/eval-assigngroup/10
If the above link is not working then please follow the Alternate Instructions at the bottom of the message.

Enter the site using your username and password. You may submit the evaluation once only.

Thank you for your participation.

Should you encounter any technical difficulty in filling out the evaluation, please send an email to ecommons.help@ucsc.edu clearly indicating the problem you encountered. For any other concerns please contact your department.

Alternate Instructions:

1) Go to https://ecommons.ucsc.edu/xsl-portal

2) Enter your username and password and click on 'Login' button.

3) Click on 'Evaluation System' in the left navigation menu under My Workspace.

4) Click on YOUR CLASS NAME GOES HERE link under evaluation name.

SAMPLE 4 — Reminder text for students who have not submitted an evaluation during the open period:

Instructor Evaluations are important. Please take the time to submit the evaluation for CLASS by the DEADLINE.
Dear Colleagues,

Please find attached our campus call for Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment. All programs with undergraduate or graduate degrees will need to participate, including interdisciplinary degree programs such as Italian Studies, Legal Studies, DANM, or TIM. We view this process as important for our own students and the quality of their educational experience, as well as necessary for our upcoming WASC review. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Herbie Lee
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

--
Kerr Hall 215
Ext. 9-2351
vpaa@ucsc.edu
Mail Stop: Chancellor's Office

Call_Degree....pdf (109 KB) Template_as....pdf (164 KB) Template_cu....pdf (307 KB)
From: Vice Provost for Academic Affairs <vpaa@ucsc.edu>
Subject: Call for Degree Program Learning Outcomes
Date: April 24, 2013 3:27:01 PM PDT
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DEANS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Dear Colleagues:

RE: Call for Degree Program Learning Outcomes

This call is for a campus-wide effort to establish a faculty-driven, program-centered, sustainable process for the assessment of student learning outcomes at both the undergraduate and graduate program levels. In particular, we ask now for the definition of program learning outcomes (PLOs), demonstration of how the required courses align with the PLOs, and creation of a plan for assessing the PLOs, by the end of Fall 2013. This process will require a collective effort of faculty in each program, and is best approached as a formalization of and an improvement on the already existing activities of faculty who evaluate student work to satisfy program requirements.

To assist faculty in this process, we are providing institutional support in the form of online materials including the UCSC Guidelines for Developing and Measuring Program Learning Outcomes, templates for a curriculum matrix and an assessment plan, examples from other institutions, and insights from our four pilot programs. You can find these and other materials at http://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/accreditation/. Starting in May 2013 departments can contact our on-campus specialist Dr. Anna Sher (asher@ucsc.edu) for consultations. She will begin a series of workshops to assist faculty with the development of outcomes and assessment plans in Fall 2013.

As an institution of higher education, student learning is at the core of our mission and so is concern with improvement of educational effectiveness. In response to the nationwide movement to pursue these core goals with greater transparency, faculty across the UC system have articulated educational goals and have begun systematically evaluating student attainment of these goals as a means to continuously improve the curriculum, teaching, and advising. This focus on articulation and assessment of student learning outcomes is consistent with the standards of the campus accreditation agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). At this point, we are the only UC campus that has not yet defined PLOs.

Based on the experience of other UC campuses, we envision a two-phase process. The first phase, to be completed by the end of Fall Quarter 2013, involves articulating PLOs, demonstrating curricular alignment with the PLOs, and developing plans for assessing them. The second phase, beginning by Spring 2014, entails departments starting to implement their assessment plans.

Learning outcomes summarize the most important knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes that students are expected to develop over the course of their studies. The program learning outcomes clearly communicate the faculty’s expectations to students, provide a framework for faculty
evaluation of the curriculum based on empirical data, and help improve and measure the impact of implemented changes. This approach allows students to understand how the program curriculum is designed to help them develop skills and knowledge, help them identify their own strengths, weaknesses, and progress, and help prospective students select a program of study.

The program learning outcomes must be posted on the departmental website, and communicated to all students and advisers. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) recommends including them in the UCSC General Catalog. When clearly articulated and publicized, the program learning outcomes can help all students, especially those who do not have the benefit of familial experience with college such as our first generation students.

As a starting point, faculty may consider the program description that states the goals or mission of the program, a description of capstone-like experiences, and/or discipline-specific, published standards. While developing program learning outcomes, faculty are asked to check how student achievement of each outcome is supported by the curriculum and document this alignment in a curriculum matrix or table (a template is provided). This matrix is required for all undergraduate and master’s programs, and encouraged for doctoral programs. The articulation of student competencies may provide faculty with valuable insights into (i) a cumulative impact they expect to have on student development of skills and knowledge, (ii) how well the existing curriculum supports these expectations, and (iii) how the curriculum can be improved.

While drafting the program learning outcomes, faculty are asked to develop an assessment plan to evaluate one learning outcome (or more) per year over the next six years with the expectation that all outcomes will be assessed at least once within an external program review cycle. The assessment is based on evaluating student performance as a group/ cohort rather than tracking performance of individual students. The plan specifies what evidence will be collected and analyzed to demonstrate levels of student achievement. For example, already existing student work (capstone-like experience, qualifying exam) collected from a student cohort (or a sample of graduating students) may provide appropriate evidence for the program outcome assessment. At the same time, faculty may need to tailor their evaluation tools to specific outcomes because of the aggregate nature of course grades and standardized test scores. A template for an assessment plan is provided. We will also provide online materials such as the UCSC Guidelines for Developing and Measuring Program Learning Outcomes in May 2013, as well as workshops and consultations focusing on assessment starting in Fall 2013.

Our campus-wide goal is to introduce student learning outcomes-based practices in the most meaningful and useful way to faculty and students. For example, we emphasize that outcomes need to be stated in a way that is measurable because it improves the clarity of outcomes (to both students and faculty) and ensures a more effective assessment in the future. At the same time, as faculty engage in assessment, they may revise the program learning outcomes as needed.

Faculty contribution is essential to the success of this campus-wide effort and our re-accreditation in 2014-15 and in the subsequent years. We encourage you to provide departmental support to faculty who will take leadership in this process and to recognize their contribution as a valuable service to our students and the university as a whole. This contribution may also be
recognized as part of the teaching component in personnel reviews, similar to program
development or major curricular restructuring.

To summarize, for each undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral degree program the faculty are
expected to:

- articulate program learning outcomes,
- demonstrate curricular alignment, and
- develop an assessment plan.

Please provide the department or program web url where your PLOs are published, the
curriculum matrix, and assessment plan to my office no later than December 16, 2013.

Starting in Winter or Spring 2014, faculty are expected to begin implementing their assessment
plan by developing evaluation tools and conducting data collection. At least one assessment
study, focusing on one or more program learning outcomes in a given program, should be
completed during the 2014-15 academic year, including analysis and interpretation of the results
and development of recommendations.

I welcome any questions you may have at vpaa@uesc.edu

Sincerely,

Herbert Lee
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
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Cc: Vice Chair Brenneis
Vice Chancellor Delaney
Director Fernald
CP/EVC Galloway
Director Harhen
VPDUE Hughey
Special Assistant Jarvinen
Chair Konopelski
CEP Chair Larrabee
VPDGS Miller
Principal Analyst Moses
Graduate Council Chair Schumm
Research Analyst Sher
Assistant Deans
Curriculum Analysts
Department Managers
Academic Senate Office
A template for an assessment plan of program learning outcomes (PLOs)

An assessment plan is program-specific and covers all PLOs. Faculty may decide to evaluate one learning outcome or more outcomes per year over the next 6 years with the expectation that all outcomes will be assessed at least once within an external program review cycle. The plan outlines when each PLO will be assessed, what evidence will be collected and by whom, who will conduct the evaluation and analyze the results.

What is the purpose of assessment?
Assessment is an integral part of using PLOs to improve student learning. It provides evidence of whether (most) students have learned what the program intended and at what level. It also provides valuable insights about how the program can be improved to achieve the desired results.

Components of an Assessment Plan

According to the WASC standards, two types of evidence, direct evidence (for example, student competency as demonstrated in a senior thesis or on a qualifying exam) and indirect evidence (student self-reported levels in surveys) should be part of assessment.

Although the table on the next page shows a hypothetical set of PLOs, it includes indirect evidence based on three surveys regularly administered at UCSC:

- student self-reported levels of competencies are captured in UCUES survey and the Graduate Student Survey (overseen by UCSC's Institutional Research), and
- information on post-graduate employment of undergraduates is now collected by the First Destination Survey (overseen by the UCSC Career Center).
An assessment plan for an undergraduate program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Is this an existing assignment or it will be created?</th>
<th>From whom evidence will be collected</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>When evidence will be collected</th>
<th>Analysis, report, recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
<td>Senior thesis</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>All graduating seniors (or randomly selected 30 seniors)</td>
<td>A scoring rubric will be developed</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
<td>Student survey data (UCUES)</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Declared majors</td>
<td>Report provided by Institutional Research</td>
<td>2012-2014 UCUES</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2</td>
<td>Lab report</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Students enrolled in PHYS134</td>
<td>An existing scoring rubric will be revised</td>
<td>Winter –Spring 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2</td>
<td>Survey of postgraduate activities (Career Destinations Survey)</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Report from the UCSC Career Center</td>
<td>2013-2015 Career Destinations Survey</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLO 3
PLO 4

In addition to the assessment plan summarized in a table, a brief statement on how this assessment may be used for program improvement is recommended for each outcome.
NOTES:
An assessment process is defined for each PLO although the same type of student work (e.g., senior project, a dissertation proposal) can be used to assess multiple PLOs.

PLO assessment is conducted based on a cohort of students close to graduation (or a sample of that cohort); it is not intended to track individual students' performance.

Course grades and standardized test scores usually evaluate student performance on multiple dimensions. Course grades often include points for in-class participation and attendance. Thus a valuable assessment strategy may involve designing a scoring rubric to evaluate an already existing assignment in order to collect evidence specific to each of the expected program-level outcomes. Ideally, this rubric can be used in grading that course, evaluating senior theses or qualifying exams in the future.

The assessment plan focuses on evaluating individual students' competencies close to the time of their graduation. It may also involve evaluation of student work at an earlier (foundational) stage of the program if the faculty are interested in assessing whether and to what extent students further develop their skills and knowledge during the advanced coursework.
A template for a curriculum alignment matrix

The curriculum alignment matrix helps to analyze whether a set of learning outcomes is supported by the program's curriculum. It helps to clarify the relationship between what students do in their classes and faculty's expectations. The curriculum alignment matrix is required for all undergraduate programs and master's programs, and encouraged for doctoral programs.

The curriculum alignment matrix is a table with one column for each learning outcome and one row for each course or required event/experience. For undergraduate programs please include lower- and upper-division courses and indicate, where appropriate, the level of competency students are expected to develop. The levels may be differentiated, for example, I=Introduced, P=Practiced, D=Demonstrated, as shown in the table below. Alternate categorizations could also be used, such as Introduced/Reinforced/Mastery or Basic/Intermediate/Advanced expectations.

In addition to courses, other required events/experiences (e.g., internships, departmental symposium, advising session) may be included. Below is a hypothetical example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
<th>PLO 5</th>
<th>PLO 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic and Methods of Social Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Upper division course 1&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Upper division course 2&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above is based on a program with one path to degree. For a program with multiple paths to degree you may group courses by track, or if you prefer, you may complete separate matrices.
Interpreting the matrix to evaluate curriculum and PLOs

This matrix provides valuable insights into how each outcome is supported by the curriculum: whether it is introduced early, practiced in one or more courses, and demonstrated in upper-division work. If the matrix reveals some inconsistencies (e.g., some outcomes are not fully aligned with the courses, or some courses do not support any specific PLOs), faculty can use this information as the basis for a discussion of the relationship between the curriculum and the program outcomes. These discussions may result in improvement of the curriculum and/or in revision of a PLO in a way that corresponds to the courses taught.

Please note that if course objectives/learning goals are specified in syllabi, they can be useful for constructing the matrix, but the course objectives do not need to be identical to the program level outcomes.

Using the curriculum matrix for development of an assessment plan

The curriculum matrix should indicate at least one course/opportunity where students are asked to demonstrate mastery of each outcome before they graduate. While developing an assessment plan, faculty may focus on these courses and consider how they may use/revise existing assignments or activities to evaluate student achievement of the program’s outcomes.

Using the curriculum matrix to communicate PLOs to students and faculty

Departments are encouraged to publish the curriculum map and distribute it to students and faculty.

The visibility of PLOs and the program’s coherence may be improved by encouraging each faculty member to make explicit connections across courses for the students. For example, at the beginning of the course or unit, a faculty member can remind students what they were introduced to in another course and explain how the current course will have them practice or expand their knowledge. This can reinforce for students the overarching objectives of their program of study, and help them assess their own progress.

Graduate Programs

The curriculum alignment matrix is required for master’s programs, and encouraged for doctoral programs. In addition to required and elective courses, it may include the thesis or equivalent project, teaching requirement, research training (lab rotation), and examinations. An example of the matrix for a PhD program is shown on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PhD Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD Requirements</td>
<td>PLO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required course:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Course:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation proposal</td>
<td>X, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While faculty can simply indicate with an "X" a specific PLO that students develop in the required components of the program (i.e., courses, written proposals, research products, exams), the table may be as detailed as needed to help with the development of an assessment plan for each outcome. For example, if the faculty plans to assess one or more outcomes based on a dissertation proposal (one of the program requirements), they can include it in the matrix with a special marker "A"=assessment evidence collected.
The Essential Learning Outcomes

Beginning in school, and continuing at successively higher levels across their college studies, students should prepare for twenty-first-century challenges by gaining:

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
- Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts
  Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

Intellectual and Practical Skills, including
- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving
  Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

Personal and Social Responsibility, including
- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
  Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

Integrative and Applied Learning, including
- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies
  Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems

Note: This listing was developed through a multiyear dialogue with hundreds of colleges and universities about needed goals for student learning; analysis of a long series of recommendations and reports from the business community; and analysis of the accreditation requirements for engineering, business, nursing, and teacher education. The findings are documented in previous publications of the Association of American Colleges and Universities: Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College (2002), Taking Responsibility for the Quality of the Baccalaureate Degree (2004), and College Learning for the New Global Century (2007). For further information, see www.aacu.org/leap.