CAP'S TOP TIPS FOR CHAIRS

*1. Review of Teaching Professors and Tenure Track Professors***:** As of 2019-20, Teaching Professors are evaluated in a process that parallels that of Ladder Rank Faculty. See: [Guidance for evaluation of Teaching Professors and for the application of the campus Special Salary Practice](https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/10-08-20-evc-cap-lsoe-eval-guidance.html)[1]
The review criteria differ slightly, as follows:

Teaching Professors
Teaching and mentoring
Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity
Service (university, professional, public)
Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

Ladder Rank Faculty
Research, scholarly and/or creative achievement
Teaching and mentoring
Service (university, professional, public)
Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

In the tips below, we use "research, teaching, and service" as shorthand intended to refer to areas of evaluation for files in both the Teaching Professor and ladder rank lines.

2. Career Equity Review: When a Senate faculty member believes they are at a rank and/or step that is seriously inconsistent with their accomplishments in their discipline, they may request a Career Equity Review (CER). The CER examines a faculty member's career, focusing on the period from UCSC appointment onward, in order to determine whether the cumulative outcomes of personnel actions have resulted in the appropriate rank and/or step. Tenured Ladder Rank Faculty members and Teaching Professors with security of employment may request a CER only when either on the CALL for, or requesting to be reviewed for, one of the following three major personnel actions: promotion to full rank, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale. The decision to request a CER rests with the candidate. A recent revision of the CER policy, issued 9-22-2023, clarifies the period of review: https://apo.ucsc.edu/policy/capm/412.000.html.

3. (NEW) Community-Engaged Work: The campus has published new guidelines for the assessment of community-engaged work across the three areas of review in personnel cases. This work often spans or integrates the different areas. Departments should explain and evaluate such contributions within and/or across the areas in department personnel letters.

---

[1] https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/10-08-20-evc-cap-lsoe-eval-guidance.html

https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/08-11-23-cap-cpevc-community-engaged-scholarship.html

4. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: We value and recognize contributions to diversity in all three areas. DEI contributions often span research, teaching, and service. Significant DEI work in any area can contribute to an evaluation of "excellent," "outstanding," or "beyond outstanding" work in that area. Evaluate contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in research, teaching, and/or service, as specified by Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 210.[2] DEI contributions may be included in their relevant individual sections on research, teaching, and service, or in a separate summary paragraph, or both. It is important for the department letter to explain in its closing paragraph how DEI contributions were part of an "excellent," "outstanding," or "beyond outstanding" recommendation for any of the three areas.

5. Biobib and File Components: Ensure that the file is complete, the biobib is up-to-date and aligns with the personal statement, and all uploaded documents are openable pdfs. Disorganized files take more time to review and make accurate assessment difficult.

6. Department Letter: Department letters should be brief and use non-specialist language wherever possible. The best letters, even for major actions and accelerations, are typically three to five pages long. The most important functions of the letter are to highlight and contextualize the key elements of the file, so too much detail can undermine that clear mapping. If needed, paraphrase, but do not quote extensively from the APM, the external letters, the candidate's personal statement, or Student Experience of Teaching Surveys (SETS). Be explicit about rank, step, and salary recommendations, and justify the recommendation based on the merits of the file: e.g., "We support a one-step merit advancement and an additional salary increase equivalent to one-third step (G1) based on outstanding research and excellent teaching and service." Contextualize any "no" votes if possible, stating that some faculty members saw the file differently. For example, "The majority of faculty supported an acceleration based on outstanding work in all areas; a minority evaluated the service as excellent and recommended a G2." If there are "no" votes that cannot be explained, please simply state that there was no discussion that explains those votes.

7. Review Period: Clearly indicate the period of review (month/year to month/year). For major action reviews (i.e., midcareer, promotion, advancement to Professor Step VI, and advancement to Above Scale), include everything since the last major action as well as from the most recent period since the last review. This includes all research and service contributions, as well as teaching tables from the whole review period and SETS from the most recent, shorter period. In these major actions or career equity reviews, please specify which achievements occurred within which time periods.

---

[2] https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-210.pdf

Revised 1/05/24

8. Scholarly Work:

    a. For Ladder-faculty files: Contextualize the scholarly work to help readers at later stages of review understand its contributions to and impact on the field. A concise summary of relative productivity and an assessment of the work's impact should specify the quality, quantity, and significance of the research, as well as how it is positioned in relation to the candidate's discipline or sub-field. External funding should be included, and its significance explained, in the context of the candidate's own research as well as campus research centers and initiatives, as a measure of broad impact.

    b. For Teaching Professor files: It is important to recognize that this category is generally much broader for Teaching Professors than for Ladder Rank Faculty. For instance, scholarly activity can, but need not include traditional disciplinary research and/or research in the broadly described area of "Scholarship on Teaching." Under certain conditions, the scholarly work can overlap with the other areas of review. See the Guidance for evaluation of Teaching Professors and for the application of the campus Special Salary Practice[3] memo for a more detailed list on what can constitute scholarly work for Teaching Professors at UC Santa Cruz. As with Ladder Rank Faculty, clarify how the professional or scholarly achievements contribute to the field or goals of the work. External funding, if present, should be included, and its significance explained, as a measure of impact.

9. Work in Progress: For regular merits, publications (in-press and published) are considered finished and are counted once, so they should be submitted at the time when they will have the maximum impact. At times, and most often in book- or text-based fields, it is appropriate for the candidate to include an unfinished, draft item (In-Progress, Under Review, Under Revision, Submitted, Revised and Resubmitted) to demonstrate ongoing progress on a major review-spanning work. Department letters must state clearly what work-in-progress was done during the period of review, how it has changed since the prior review, and, in major actions, distinguish between the "promotion" period (extended period since the last major action) and the shorter period since the most recent review.

10. External Letters: For files containing external letters, the professional stature of the letter writers and their relationship to the candidate should be addressed in the confidential list of letter writers. External reviewers should not be collaborators or former mentors of the faculty member under review. The independence of the reviewers is best guaranteed by dividing the list roughly equally between candidate- and department-recommended names. The reviewers should include at least one UC faculty for their familiarity with the UC rank-and-step system. For Updated and Consolidated Guidance on External Letters, see https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/06-30-23-cpevc-updated-consolidated-solicited-letters.html

---

[3] https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/10-08-20-evc-cap-lsoe-eval-guidance.html

11. Teaching and Mentoring: Is the teaching load the norm for your department? Reference standard workload, courses taught, class size, course level, course release, and buyouts. Evaluate teaching effectiveness. APM 210[4]: "It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction." Note that expectations about teaching-across-the-curriculum may be different for (1) Teaching Professors and (2) departments that do not have lower-division or graduate-level teaching responsibilities

Provide multiple types/sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness, at least two; SETS must be included in the file but are not required to be one of the two primary sources of evidence. Beginning in fall 2023, personnel review teaching tables are requested summarizing the SETS responses for three specific questions (#5, #6, #12). Information about auto-generated Teaching Table Reports in Blue (the SETS system), as well as step-by-step instructions for how to edit the tables in Google Sheets or Excel, can be found in this article: Teaching Table Instructions for Department Staff.[5] The auto-generated reports are only available to department staff who have requested SETS report access in Blue. Please email sets@ucsc.edu for support.

Other possible sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness are: discussion of pedagogy and reflection on SETS in the personal statement, syllabi and other classroom materials, documented use of the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC). The TLC provides a webpage[6] with additional guidance on documenting teaching evidence and examples of forms of evidence. Evaluate *both* teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. Highlight student achievements and, where known, post-graduation trajectories for doctoral and master's advisees.

12. Service: Evaluate contributions in light of the time commitment required and the overall value of those contributions to the constituencies they serve. Simply listing committees or tasks is not optimally helpful to subsequent reviewers. Describe major service contributions to the department, campus, UC system, and profession, as well as any public service performed, indicating which were particularly time-consuming, challenging, and/or significant. Expectations for service change as faculty move through the ranks. See 2021-22 CAP Annual Report, Section IIA on Service Expectations[7] (pp. 6-8). Keep in mind with confidential service work that confidentiality should be maintained. For example, mention serving on one ad hoc committee, or on departmental committees for two personnel reviews, but do not identify the people reviewed.

---

[4] https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-210.pdf
[5] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wh2zhr86tyofBPHRLlU1f0UkbZFy6rkAljOkHEM-2hE/edit#heading=h.2btrcrfiyt3z
[6] https://tlc.ucsc.edu/resources/demonstrating-teaching-effectiveness/demonstrating-teaching-effectiveness-for-personnel-review/
[7] https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap-annual-reports-folder/cap-annualreport-2021-22_scp20311.pdf