Committee on Academic Personnel

Key Topics

I. Evaluation of Teaching

II. Contents of Review Files
Ia. TEACHING EVALUATION TEMPLATE

Effective 2013-14, all senate review files should include a TEACHING EVALUATION TABLE summarizing student evaluations of “overall effectiveness.”

*The table should include all years being evaluated with classes sorted by number and then by quarter in chronological order.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class number</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-01</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-01</td>
<td>W12</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-01</td>
<td>W13</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-101</td>
<td>W11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-101</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-101</td>
<td>S13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-280</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-280</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEA-280</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See sample template at: http://apo.ucsc.edu/docs/TeachingEvaluationTemplate.FromCAP.doc
Ib. TEACHING WORKLOAD

(Refer to the “Memo from CP/EVC and CAP Chair on Academic Advancement,” dated 8/5/14)
http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html

According to APM 210-1.d, faculty should strive to be excellent teachers across all levels of the curriculum and should be evaluated accordingly.

However, CAP recognizes that it is not practical for every faculty member to teach at all levels during every review period.

• Department letter should assess the quality of instruction in the context of expected workload.

• Department letter should explain the candidate’s teaching workload across all levels in the context of the department teaching policy.
Ic. ASPECTS OF TEACHING

• Number of classes taught

• How challenging the classes are (class size, level of instruction, type of instruction, difficulty/appeal of the topic, etc.)

• Whether new preparation or development was required

• Whether teaching included innovative and/or time-consuming approaches

• Mentoring of UGs, Grads, and Postdocs (Evaluate quality and quantity. Include information regarding student awards, fellowships, publications, and career placement, as relevant.)
II. CONTENTS OF REVIEW FILES

Chairs are responsible for ensuring that files are complete & accurate

• The titles of submitted work should be exactly the same as on the biobib

• All submitted work should be on the biobib and vice versa
BONUS!

CAP’s Top 10 List of Advice for Deans & Department Chairs:
http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/CAP_TOP10_List4Deans_Chairs_062714.pdf

CAP’s Top 10 List of Advice for Faculty:
http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/CAP_Top10_ForFaculty_070114.pdf