

**Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Draft: Advisory Guidelines on Writing Performance (Narrative) Evaluations**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Senate Regulation 9.2.1 on written evaluations refers readers to "CEP Advisory Guidelines on Writing Narrative Evaluations." In its report to the Senate on November 9, 2000, CEP stated it would "submit for Senate review new Advisory Guidelines to make explicit the flexibility and options for preparing narrative evaluations." CEP invites comments on the attached Draft Advisory Guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
Donald Brenneis  
Carolyn Dean  
Richard Hughey  
Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*  
William Ladusaw, Provosts' representative  
Isaac Menashe, Student representative  
Justin Revenaugh  
Greta Slobin  
Carol Freeman, Chair

May 9, 2001

**Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Advisory Guidelines for Performance (Narrative) Evaluations**

May 2001

**Table of Contents**

- 1. Introduction**
  - 2. Senate regulations regarding performance evaluations**
  - 3. Examples of performance evaluation**
  - 4. Who reads performance evaluations?**
  - 5. Consistency and thoroughness**
  - 6. What is and is not acceptable content?**
  - 7. Mapping adjectives to grades**
  - 8. The coursework description field**
  - 9. The question of timeliness**
  - 10. Closing remarks**
- Appendix 1: Sample transcript**

## 1. Introduction

Almost from the founding of the campus, UCSC has used written performance evaluations to evaluate student performance, rather than relying solely on conventional letter grades. This practice reflects our conviction that the results of higher education cannot be adequately summarized in a single, one-dimensional measure, namely an A, B, C, D or F. The campus acknowledges the cost of the system in faculty, administrative, and staff time. However, our performance evaluation system has proven valuable to students and the faculty and is viewed in retrospect by many of our alumni as one of UCSC's most valuable features. There is abundant evidence that it has served our students well in their endeavors after UCSC and is a major force in recruiting students to the campus.

Research indicates that students' understanding is promoted by environments that prioritize learning goals and evaluate performance in ways that are closely tied to processes of learning and instruction (see the National Academy of Sciences report: "How People Learn," 1999). Viewing a situation as an opportunity for learning—as opposed to merely a validation of ability—induces students to choose more challenging tasks, persevere in the face of difficulties, perceive instructors and peers as resources rather than as potential obstacles, and develop long-term interest.

According to UCSC students and graduates, this form of assessment helps students distinguish their strong and weak areas and helps them detect patterns in their performance across quarters. It focuses their efforts on improvement, encourages them to go beyond expectations, and helps them learn to collaborate, creating an intellectual culture in which students with different talents and perspectives learn to respect differences rather than compete with one another along a single dimension of performance.

In the year 2000, UCSC adopted a revised student evaluation system that added mandatory letter grades, previously a student's option, to the existing performance evaluation system. This revision, which recognizes the near universality of letter grades in academia, established a parallel system of letter grades and GPAs at UCSC. It did not replace written performance evaluations nor did it modify that system or its scope. Written performance evaluation continues as the lynchpin of student assessment at UCSC. It anchors a system that encourages students and instructors to get to know one another, that allows instructors to acknowledge and document the full range of student achievement, and that provides much more information than do conventional transcripts—information the outside world, by and large, greatly desires.

In order for the performance evaluation system to flourish, it is important for instructors to understand the system and to find ways of writing evaluations that work for them in their courses. The performance evaluation system acknowledges the tremendous variations of classroom environments, evaluation strategies, and logistic concerns from course to course across our campus. The performance evaluation system presents a set of tools that are flexible, individual, and powerful. It does not impose stylistic uniformity, nor does it carry uniform expectations of instructors. Rather, it offers each instructor the means to evaluate students as best fits the course and the student. This guide details the performance evaluation system at UCSC and provides helpful tips, some recommendations, and a catalog of sample student evaluations including a sample transcript. The latter are intended to document the rich variety of written evaluation possible within the performance evaluation system and to offer ideas and templates for evaluation writers.

## 2. Senate regulations regarding performance evaluation

- 9.2.1 At the end of the term, each instructor teaching a credit-granting course shall prepare a written evaluation for each student who receives a grade of P, A, B, C, or D in his or her class. The narrative evaluation must evaluate the quality and characteristics of the student's performance in the class.
- 16.2.1 Each instructor in a graduate course shall prepare a written evaluation at the end of the term for each graduate student in his or her class who takes the course for credit.
- 9.2.2 Evaluations are to be filed with the Registrar and the student's college at the time of filing the end-of-term course reports or no later than 15 working days after the close of the term.
- 16.3.1 An appeal may be filed if the student is persuaded that the instructor has given a grade notation or narrative evaluation based on:
- A. inappropriate criteria such as race, politics, religion, age, sex, or national origin.
  - B. capricious or arbitrary application of appropriate criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirement.

These regulations can be faithfully redacted as follows: *The instructor of record must submit a performance evaluation for each undergraduate student who receives credit for the course and for all graduate students enrolled. The evaluation must describe, and is limited to, the quality and characteristics of the student's work. It is due 15 working days after the end of the quarter.*

With the exception of excluding clearly inappropriate material, the only requirement on evaluation content set by Senate regulations is that they describe the "quality and characteristics of the student's work." No list of characteristics is provided, nor is there any expectation determining length, thoroughness, or specific content. The decision on how best to describe the quality and characteristics of student work is yours. You may decide to write highly individual evaluations of each student. You may decide to use a spreadsheet macro to transform your grade sheets into descriptive text or to drive menus and grids. Performance evaluations may simply state the grade received, they may go further and contextualize the grade awarded the student, or they may be more synthetic. It is left to the instructor of record to decide what form of evaluation is most efficient, effective, and appropriate for your course and your students.

## 3. Examples of performance evaluation

To demonstrate the flexibility and power of performance evaluations, we offer the following examples. The course title is in **bold** face; course descriptions are in *italic* face. A longer list of sample evaluations can be found in Appendix I.

---

*Example #1:*

### **Elementary Latin**

*The first quarter of Latin forms and syntax, using the Smith and Jones textbook. Evaluation based on class participation, quizzes, midterm and final examinations.*

Grasp of Forms: Very Good

Grasp of Syntax: Good

Skill in Translating: Very Good

General Comments: Susan worked hard and the results were obvious. She needs only to tighten her knowledge of syntax a bit more. This was a B performance.

*Example #2:*

**Introductory American Politics**

Susan produced good work in the class by the end of the quarter. Her work showed marked improvement on both the short essays and the midterm and final exams. Her early essays were adequate, but did not always show a grasp of the material; her final essay, however, was of excellent quality, well argued and smartly written. Her midterm was quite an uneven effort. She easily passed the first half of the exam but failed to complete the essay portion. On the final, by far the most difficult exercise, Susan acquitted herself nicely. She demonstrated a competent grasp of the material necessary for an understanding of American political development. Aside from some minor conceptual confusion at the outset, the paper was a fine synthesis of course materials. Susan attended and participated in sections regularly, and gave a fine oral presentation of a chapter in Shell's *Time of Illusion*.

---

*Example #3:*

**Introductory Physics**

Overall Grade: B+

Performance on comprehensive final: Very good.

Performance on midterm exams: Very good.

Performance on homework: Excellent

---

*Example #4:*

**International Politics**

*An upper-division course on the theory and history of international relations. Written work consisted of an in-class midterm, used for indicative purposes only, a short analytic paper, and a take-home final.*

Ms. Slug earned a C.

---

*Example #5:*

**Calculus**

*Evaluations were based on the midterm (30%), a comprehensive final examination (40%) and 5 homework assignments (30%). Textbook: Jones and Smith, fourth edition.*

Midterm: C

Final Exam: B-

Homework: B

---

*Example #6:*

**Introductory Human Evolution**

*This is a large lecture course accompanied by weekly lab-discussion sections. Evaluation is based on midterm and final essay exams, participation in weekly sections, and a term paper.*

Susan's midterm showed a fair understanding of the issues but confusion about some concepts. Susan followed up by rewriting the problem areas on her test and working diligently to clear up these minor confusions. She improved her class performance by writing a very good final exam. Susan wrote a thoughtful term paper on primate communication. Susan was a dedicated member of her weekly discussion section, and contributed many good ideas and insights into the matters being discussed. Overall, Susan's mastery of the material presented in this class was good—a B.

---

*Example #7:*

### **Computer Organization**

*Introductory assembly language and computer architecture. Weekly programming assignments in MIPS (simulator) and HC11 (standalone microcontroller kit) assembly languages. 4 graded and 6 checked off programming assignments. Overall score composed of final (30%), weekly quizzes (35%), checked programs (10%), and graded programs (25%).*

89 students with 78 taking final

	Score	Rank	Min	Max	Ave	SD
Graded Labs:	88	16	2	100	72	21
Chckd Labs:	100	1	20	100	82	18
Quizzes:	71	31	16	93	63	16
Final:	80	15	39	100	67	13
Overall:	81	15	7	97	66	20

Present 2 out of 2 times attendance was taken.

Overall class performance: very good (B+)

Susan's last lab project was particularly good; rather than just write a simple Hi-Lo game, she implemented a Mastermind game that made excellent use of the HC11 kit's character display, blinking lights, and switches.

---

*Example #8:*

### **Physical Geology**

*Introductory course using Jones and Jones, 4th edition. Students assessed on three exams (50%), four homework assignments (35%) and section participation and project (15%). 95 students completed the course. There were 15 A's, 30 B's, 30 C's and 10 D's assigned.*

Susan received scores of 100, 77, 88 and 74 on the four homework assignments (relative to class averages of 92, 86, 91 and 95, respectively). Compared to her peers, this is good work. She tended to do well with interpretation and synthesis, but struggled with more quantitative (numerical) questions. On the three exams, Susan earned scores of 77, 71 and 77 (relative to class averages of 71, 77 and 74) placing her right at the class average. Again, problems with quantitative questions, especially calculator exercises, were apparent. Her section project was a nicely researched and well-organized introduction to the geologic history of the Pinnacles National Monument. Overall, Susan's work was average.

---

*Example #9:*

### **Introductory Writing**

In this introductory writing class, Susan Slug attended class regularly, contributing frequently and usefully to discussions. She satisfactorily completed five of six assigned essays, with revisions. After a somewhat uneven start to the quarter, Susan made substantial progress in explaining her ideas more clearly and coherently, adding greater depth to her analyses, and improving the accuracy of her proof reading and use of sources. Her final essay in a series of papers on the Napster controversy was particularly well done. When she adds discipline and careful revision to her considerable stylistic flair, Susan's essays are interesting and effective.

---

*Example #10:*

### **Beginning Sculpture**

*Sculpting techniques in ceramics, issues and concepts related to the body and its representation, approaches to the artistic process, the relationship of contemporary art to studio practice.*

Susan's sculpting skills in this course were very good, her glazing and conceptual skills were good. Her fish sculpture showed very good use of texture and visually interesting form. A suggestion is that she take more risks with sculpture by working on more challenging forms and concepts. Susan was active in class discussions and participated in firing the kiln.

---

As is clear from the above and the second appendix, performance evaluations may take many forms, allowing you to find the mode of evaluation that works best for you in your courses. UCSC's commitment to written performance evaluations comes at the cost to you of time. You are encouraged to use the flexibility of the performance evaluation system to optimize the balance of benefits and cost.

## **4. Who reads performance evaluations?**

Performance evaluations become part of the student's permanent transcript and reach a large and diverse audience. In addition to the student, performance evaluations will be reviewed by college academic staff, the student's department and by anyone to whom the student sends the complete official transcript, including fellowship and scholarship review panels, graduate and professional school admissions committees and potential employers. Of this audience, only the student has had access to instructor feedback, comments, and scores provided during the quarter—forms of "real-time" evaluation that should not be deferred to an end of quarter written evaluation. Bearing the audience in mind, performance evaluations should provide the necessary context to be understood by readers who were not in the course, don't have access to course materials or syllabi, and may not be familiar with narrative evaluation generally. In other words, you should write evaluations under the assumption that your audience lies outside UC Santa Cruz. Because outside readers may be overwhelmed by volume, we recommend that, except in extraordinary circumstances, each evaluation you write be succinct and less than 150 words in length.

Evaluations are not proofread by anyone but you, but their audience is global. Please adhere to appropriate (proper) grammar and stylistic practices. What you write reflects on UCSC as a whole. See [http://pio.ucsc.edu/style\\_guide.html](http://pio.ucsc.edu/style_guide.html) for the official campus style guide.

## **5. Consistency and thoroughness**

The majority of performance evaluations generated at UCSC document performance in courses of 50 or more students. In courses of this size it is often difficult, if not impossible, to come to know each student personally. Some students will make the effort to establish a fuller relation with you; others will not. As a result, you will find that the level of commentary you are able to provide in performance evaluations will vary from student to student. This raises an important question: should you restrict yourself to indicators of student performance that are universally shared by students (such as test scores, evaluations of written work, etc.) or can your evaluations vary? This is for you to decide: Senate regulations afford you complete authority in determining the degree of consistency and thoroughness of performance evaluation. In making this determination, however, there are a number of factors you may wish to consider. Do you wish to acknowledge student effort at developing a fuller line of communication with you? Have you strayed from evaluating performance to commenting on personality? Will your comments be understood by the student and other readers? Regardless of class size, remember that it is the quality of the evaluation that is important, not its length.

## **6. What is and is not acceptable content?**

Evaluations describe the quality and characteristics of student performance in the class. Comments not germane to student performance are not acceptable in performance evaluations. For example, "Student A is very bright but did not commit sufficient effort to this course" does not document performance and is, at best, conjecture. It is better to let the student's work speak for itself, for example, "Student A's work was mixed. Two papers were highly insightful and superbly crafted while the other two were sloppily assembled and cursory." Similarly, "Student B did not do well on the midterm as the result of a severe case of flu" is not acceptable. You may think that providing personal information (flu) puts a poor performance into a more favorable context, but a potential employer might not agree. We recommend substituting the phrase, "circumstances beyond his/her control," in cases where such explanation is deemed necessary.

Student ability, health, physical or learning disabilities, religious and political beliefs, and the like, are never considerations in student assessment and have no place in performance evaluation. Students have the right to initiate grievances for performance evaluations that they feel are based on criteria other than academic performance or that apply academic criteria in an arbitrary or capricious way that does not reflect student performance in relation to course requirements. The student grievance procedure can be found in Appendix C in the Manual of the Santa Cruz Division Academic Senate (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/manual/SCapp99.html#AppendixC>).

The explicit mention of letter grades in performance evaluations is permitted. Given the near universal character of letter grading systems, inclusion of a letter grade or grades in an evaluation may provide a compact and potentially precise summary of student performance. However, letter grades are single-dimensional indicators of student performance and are inherently limited. Further, letter grade inflation is perhaps as universal as letter grading itself, rendering letter grades even blunter indicators of performance and threatening the universality of their meaning. CEP recommends that you bear these considerations in mind when using letter grades in written evaluations (see also section 8). CEP further recommends that the instructor respect the decision of students enrolled on a P/NP basis by avoiding mention of a letter grade in the performance evaluation, especially during the current transitional period when not all students are subject to mandatory letter grades.

## 7. Mapping adjectives to grades

The majority of students in a course will receive a letter grade at the end of the quarter. At the end of the quarter, it is important that the performance evaluation be consistent with the summary letter grade. The following table will help you choose adjectives that are consistent with the grade assigned. These rough correspondences have emerged as the consensus of a large number of UCSC faculty and are consistent with Systemwide regulations. The list is not exhaustive, and many other descriptors are appropriate.

Grade	P/NP	Adjectives
A	P	Honors, superb, outstanding, excellent, top-notch
B	P	Very good, quite good, above average
C	P	Average, satisfactory, fairly good, passing
D*	NP	Below average, barely passing, marginal
F	NP	Poor, inadequate, inferior, unsatisfactory

\*At UCSC the grade of D results only in credit toward the requirement of 180 credit hours for graduation; courses for which the student receives a grade of D do not count toward major, minor, or college requirements or for general education. There is no C-; students whose work is passing, but below C in quality receive a D. The choice of adjectives in the evaluation should be consistent with the grade of D.

## 8. The coursework description field

The instructor may choose to write a brief description of the coursework that the Registrar inserts at the beginning of each student's evaluation. This is information about the classwork that is applicable to all students in the class and does not vary from student to student. Typical content includes the scope of the course, textbooks used, a breakdown of assignments and exams, etc. In larger classes, the coursework description is well used to document the basis of student evaluation. You may wish to include the average grade or median score for the class as a powerful hedge against grade inflation. You should usually avoid simply quoting the catalog description of the class which is available on the web.

The Committee on Educational Policy imposes a limit of 60 words on coursework descriptions. Although this may seem restrictive, it must be remembered that a student's transcript is an evaluation of that student's work, not a series of expansive coursework descriptions written by instructors with understandable pride.

CEP recommends that you revise your coursework description with each offering of the course.



### 9. The question of timeliness

As the instructor of record, you are responsible for providing a performance evaluation for every student receiving credit in your course and for doing so in a timely fashion (see regulation 9.2.2 above). When evaluations are not written, students are deprived of important feedback on their performance, they and their academic advisors/preceptors are deprived of evaluations for academic standing review, honors and awards, and student applications to graduate programs and professional schools may be compromised.

### 10. Closing remarks

UCSC is unique in the University of California system, and amongst major research universities in the US, in providing written performance evaluations to students—a key aspect of our continuing commitment to undergraduate education. The continued vitality of our performance evaluation system relies on the faculty's willingness to use the system to their best advantage by authoring evaluations that are accurate, meaningful, and readable, but which do not unduly tax the instructor or require an alteration in her/his pedagogy. Used properly, the written performance evaluation system should not be a burden, but rather a tool in teaching. Experiment, talk with colleagues, examine the many example evaluations in this document and, most important, let the system work for you and your students.

---

## Appendix 1: Sample performance evaluation transcript

This sample performance evaluation transcript is edited from an actual student's official transcript. The format has been altered for use in this document. The variety of evaluation types and forms is indicative of the various practices of faculty across campus. Course titles are indicated by **bold** face. Coursework descriptions are in *italics*.

MOST RECENT ACADEMIC YEAR: 1988-89

### FALL QUARTER 1988

**ELEMENTARY LATIN** – *The first quarter of Latin forms and syntax, using the Moreland and Fleischer textbook. Evaluation based on class participation, quizzes, midterm and final examinations.*

Grasp of Forms: Very Good

Grasp of Syntax: Good

Skill in Translating: Very Good

General Comments: Susan worked hard and the results were obvious. She needs only to tighten her knowledge of syntax a bit more. This was a B performance.

**ACTING STUDIO II** – *Dealt primarily with an attempt to identify individual acting problems for each student through exercise, scene work, and monologues. There was considerable work done on "body centers," actions and activities, objectives and hidden objectives, and interactions.*

Ms. Slug began the quarter with severe limitations as an actress in the areas of voice and diction. These included a propensity for introspective pauses that prohibited her from speaking in complete sentences, a lack of vocal energy often rendering her inaudible, and sloppy articulation. Susan tackled these problems immediately and made great improvement. Her final performance as Dorine, in a scene from Moliere's *Tartuffe*, proved that her self-confidence eliminated her vocal problems. Her growth as an actress during this quarter was remarkable, resulting in an overall grade of B.

WINTER QUARTER 1989

**BEG SCULPTURE** – *Class projects were a two-figure composition, a one-figure composition, an armature using plastilina, an abstraction and two waxes.*

Overall grade: C+.

Susan could have improved her work habits and obtained better results. Overall though, I feel she has potential, is a good student, and I would recommend that she continue to study sculpture.

**ELEMENTARY LATIN** – *The second quarter of forms and syntax, using the Wheelock text. Evaluation based on class participation, quizzes, final examination.*

Susan's performance in this class was always satisfactory and often good—earning a B- for the quarter. The only major gap in her mastery of Latin is difficulty in dealing with syntactic function. Her reading ability is good. With a bit more attention to detail, Susan's work will be first-rate.

**POLITICS TUTORIAL**

Susan did very strong, at times excellent, work in this tutorial on revolution and reaction in Latin America. She read extensively from a selection of materials on politics in Cuba, Chile, Mexico, Nicaragua, Brazil and the Southern Cone. She prepared incisive, cogent written summaries of the major arguments of all the readings that we then discussed during our tutorial sessions. The summaries, like Susan's comments during our bi-weekly sessions, showed conclusively that Susan acquired a firm and fairly sophisticated handle on core theoretical issues central to the study of Latin American politics. Her two analytical essays were creatively conceptualized and successfully probed complex questions. Overall, an A performance.

SPRING QUARTER 1989

**INFECTIOUS DISEASE** – *Historical readings, augmented with contemporary biological and medical thought, were utilized to demonstrate how various cultures from a variety of eras have dealt with infectious diseases. Two papers and two examinations were required for the course.*

Susan Slug earned a B+.

**POLITICAL CHANGE - THIRD WORLD** – *Surveyed political change in comparative perspective by focusing on the revolutions in Russian, China, Mexico and Iran, on reform in Turkey and Japan, and on personal rule in post-colonial Africa. A brief summary exercise on basic theoretical material and two take-home examinations were required.*

Susan Slug progressed impressively in this course from a fine midterm examination to work of truly outstanding distinction on her (delayed) final examination. Her midterm essay showed her adept at comparison of two countries in terms of social structures, elite political choices, and similarly successful institutionalization of flexible political institutions; she made very good use of concepts drawn from a general text on the subject but skimmed somewhat on the telling application of historical detail to substantiate her case and reveal its more intricate dimensions. Her final examination paper, however, was beyond criticism. In her long comparative essay on two royal responses to the challenge of modernization she used her three texts not only to structure a notably clear and faithful presentation of the unacceptable choices forced on modernizing monarchs but also to reveal the complementary quality of the contributions of her three authors. Theoretically sophisticated, analytically incisive, and firmly substantiated in clear prose, it was among the best essays of its kind I have received in the past decade.

Overall, an A.

ACADEMIC YEAR 1987-88FALL QUARTER 1987

**BIBLE AS LITERATURE** – *An in-depth study of selected Biblical passages. There was a midterm and a final, one 10-page paper, and about 15 Biblical verses to be learnt by heart.*

Susan earned a B.

Her midterm and final displayed a weak knowledge of Biblical facts and characters, but showed fair interpretations of the texts assigned.

**STATE & ECONOMY**

Ms. Slug's work was generally very good.

First essay: good understanding of the arguments.

Second essay: very good -- clearly and systematically evaluated argument.

Third essay: the weakest, failing to fully address the question.

Ms. Slug's answers were often imaginative, but frequently roughly written.

**INTERNATIONAL POLITICS** – *Was an upper-division course on the theory and history of international relations. Written work consisted of an in-class midterm, used for indicative purposes only, a short analytic paper, and a take-home final.*

Ms. Slug earned a B-.

WINTER QUARTER 1988

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION** – *An upper-division course on International Organizations' and other non-state actors' role in international politics. Evaluations based on two take-home exams. Midterm contained two parts: individual and collective essay. Two final essays required.*

Susan's performance on the individual section of the midterm was well written but hardly analytical. The collective paper in which she participated was of good quality, demonstrating a mastery of the required material. In the first section of the final she chose to discuss the function of diverse international organizations. The paper quotes extensively from their mandates and gives little understanding of the problems they face on the nature of the changes that they seek. Overall Susan's performance was of satisfactory quality. She understood some of the major readings and theories. This was a C performance.

**FIELD STUDY IN POLITICS**

Susan Slug undertook a quarter of field study as an intern in Assemblyman Sam Farr's local district office. She produced a very nice circumstantial account of the round of her daily work and the conclusions she drew from it. Selecting three cases for close analysis, she recounted her frustration in attempting to measure up fully to her own conception of the demands of the job and her eventual realization that these frustrations were systemically rooted in a difference between an administrative and a legislative/political definition of "service" to constituents. Maintaining a tight connection between her own observations and a more general analytic understanding of political processes, she developed an argument that spoke directly both to her role in the field and to her academic responsibilities as a student of politics. It was a dual role that did not seem to come easily to her, but the results clearly justified the great effort she put into it.

**INTRO STUDIES IN ACTING** – *Course involved exercises, ensemble acting, papers, discussions, and performances.*

Susan's work in the class earned a B+.

Comments: She is the kind of dedicated and sensitive team player required by an ensemble acting class or any collaborative endeavor.

SPRING QUARTER 1988

**WORLD HISTORY & RELIGION** – *The history of the major religions in the modern period bringing out the relationships of political, economic and social history to the inner thinking and practice of the religions. Each student was required to do library, and if possible, field research and to write two papers.*

Ms. Slug earned a B.

**INTERNATIONAL LAW, WORLD ORDER** – *A survey of issues on the international legal agenda in order to analyze the relationship between law and politics in the international system. Course requirements: three short papers and a take-home final exam.*

Susan's first paper assessing the legality of Israel's abduction of Eichmann from Argentina in 1962 was well argued, indicating a thorough understanding of the key concepts of the course. The second paper was an assessment of the legality and feasibility of U.S. foreign policy options in Nicaragua. The paper demonstrated an excellent understanding of both the political and the legal implications of each of the options presented. The third paper topic was the legality of the Strategic Defense Initiative. The paper was a very competent assessment of the legal, philosophical, and political positions at stake in the SDI debate. Susan was a central participant in the class debate on whether the U.S. would be justified in intervening in Haiti to protect human rights. Her final exam was her least impressive piece of work. Although it touched on the major issues of the course, it did so superficially, citing little of the assigned literature. Overall, however, her performance was good.

**ACTING STUDIO I**

Ms. Slug's talent as an actress was exhibited this quarter in several unusually sensitive and complex performance assignments and written analyses. Furthermore, Susan obviously devoted substantial time, thought, and hard work to the class. If anything, she "worried" far too much about things.

Susan made great strides in overcoming severe inhibitions that would be a formidable, if not impossible, barrier to further acting endeavors. When released, her work was marked by an open vulnerability I have rarely seen in an acting student. Susan scheduled several appointments outside of class, again an indicator of her 100% commitment to learning the material covered in this course.

Still, Susan's written and performance work was wildly inconsistent. Her performance as Beth in a scene from Shepard's *A Lie of the Mind* was exceptional. Yet Susan did not feel she had done well. This lack of self-objectivity is dangerous to an actor. Susan over-intellectualizes the acting process to a fault, resulting in subjective choices that lead to inconsistent, hit-or-miss performances. She must learn to simplify her approach to acting, stop thinking and re-thinking, make one choice at a time and then just do it.

ACADEMIC YEAR 1986-87FALL QUARTER 1986

**INTRO HUMAN EVOLUTION** – *A large lecture course accompanied by weekly lab-discussion sections, introducing students to evolutionary theory and mechanisms; primate behavior and evolution; fossil and molecular evidence for human evolution and variation; techniques applied to the study of human origins. Evaluation is based on midterm and final essay exams, participation in weekly sections, and a term paper.*

Susan's midterm showed a fair understanding of the issues but confusion about some specific concepts. Susan followed up by rewriting the problem areas on her test and worked diligently to clear up these minor confusions. She improved her class performance by writing a very good final exam. Susan wrote a thoughtful term paper on primate communication. Susan was a dedicated member of her weekly discussion section, and contributed many good ideas and insights into the matters being discussed. Overall, Susan's mastery of the material presented in this class was good—a B.

**PHILOSOPHY OF LAW**

Susan's work showed earnest effort, but was marred by insufficient critical (and self-critical) probing. Her initial paper raised good questions, but did not pursue any very far. Her second paper again made good points, but seemed confused on central issues. And her final paper (on "Reverse Discrimination") clearly stated a view, but without confronting the difficulties or arguments associated with that view. Her class presentation (on abortion) was in some ways thoughtful, but again less than wholly persuasive. Despite the flaws in her performance, the interest and energy she gave the course were evident. Overall, a B- performance.

**GENERAL PHYSICS** – *Course traces the development of the Newtonian world picture and the challenge to it by special relativity and quantum physics. While conceptual aspects were stressed, some basic calculation techniques were also included.*

Overall Grade: B+.

Performance on comprehensive final: Very good.

Performance on midterm exams: Very good.

Performance on homework: Excellent.

WINTER QUARTER 1987

**INTRO CULTURAL ANTHRO** – *Introduction to major concepts and approaches in social and cultural anthropology, while examining issues in American society and culture as well as studying other cultures and societies. Students are evaluated on their in-class midterm and final exams, 5- to 7-page term project, quiz, and participation in sections.*

Susan earned an A-.

Comment: Her observational study of "punk rock" rituals was outstanding, engagingly written, sensitively detailed, and featured an insightful symbolic analysis.

**CRITICAL THINKING**

Susan Slug did excellent work on her quizzes, indicating conscientious preparation of the assigned materials. She did outstanding work in deductive logic for both the midterm and final exam, showing that she was able to render arguments into standard form and correctly determine validity. Susan wrote very good analyses of the inductive arguments for the final exam, criticizing material fallacies, faulty analogies and non-representative samples. Overall, an A- for the quarter.

**MODERN POLITICAL THEORY** – *Course examined early modern political theory, from the Renaissance through the Enlightenment. Course work consisted of two lectures and one section discussion a week, the texts, and three papers.*

Susan's work for this course was very good, a B+. Ms. Slug wrote three essays -- the first, a consideration of human will in Luther and Machiavelli; the second, an analysis of nature and human nature as themes which inform the theories of obligation, community and sovereignty in Hobbes and Locke; and the third, a discussion of the contrast between Rousseau and previous social contract theorists on the question of political legitimacy. Although new to the discipline of political theory, Susan produced interesting work that reflected her increasing confidence and ability to engage the course material. She regularly attended weekly discussion sections and raised relevant and importantly perplexing questions.

SPRING QUARTER 1987

**INTRO ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES** – *An overview of the range of substantive concerns involved in the study and resolution of environmental issues. Emphasis is on social institutions and how they shape perceptions and understanding of the environment. Requirements: three essays, journal, quizzes, and final examination. Enrollment: 240.*

Susan completed the essays in a timely manner; this written work demonstrated an adequate command of the course material. The overall quality of her written work was good, reflecting improvement throughout the quarter. Susan's journal of a courtyard was of very good quality; her careful observations were insightful and revealed creative work. Susan's participation in discussion section was frequent and informed. The quality of her verbal skills was very good. Her performance on the two quizzes and final examination was good. Based on her overall academic performance, Susan warrants a B+ summary evaluation.

**INTRO AMERICAN POLITICS**

Susan produced good work in the class by the end of the quarter. Her work showed marked improvement on both the short essays and the midterm and final exams. Her early essays were adequate, but did not always show a grasp of all the material; her final essay however, was of excellent quality, well argued and smartly written. Her mid-term was quite an uneven effort. She easily passed the first half of the exam but failed to complete the essay portion. On the final, by far the most difficult exercise, Susan acquitted herself nicely. She demonstrated a competent grasp of the materials necessary for an understanding of American political development. Aside from some minor conceptual confusion at the outset, the paper was a fine synthesis of course materials. Susan attended and participated in sections regularly, and gave a fine oral presentation of a chapter in Shell's Time of Illusion.

**RECENT POLITICAL THEORY**

Susan did good, solid B work for this course. She attended sections regularly and her occasional comments contributed to group discussion. Her papers were thorough and thoughtful. Her first essay, on Tocqueville, showed a fine understanding of the complexities of the thinker. The paper would have been stronger if Susan had put more of her own views into her conclusion, but it remained a good start to the course. And each subsequent paper was better than the one before. Her final essay on Nietzsche and Marx was lucid, tightly written and argued, and gave a good account not only of what but of how they think. Susan showed that she has learned to write about difficult theoretical questions with economy and skill.

ACADEMIC YEAR 1985-86FALL QUARTER 1985

**FEMALE PHYSIOLOGY** – *Anatomy and physiology of women's reproductive system. Midterm, final and research paper required.*

Susan earned a B.

Comment: She received satisfactory grades on both the final and midterm exams, and did consistently well on the quizzes. Her research paper on the complications in birth was outstanding; one of the best in the class.

**CORE COURSE: IDENTITY, HISTORY, COMMUNITY** – *This course section satisfies the writing-intensive portion of the general education requirements.*

Susan Slug revealed the seriousness with which she approaches learning. Her oral presentation was well executed and tremendously thought-provoking, drawing on the lectures, readings and her own experiences with a critical subject. She participated in a tremendously successful small group in which students engaged in critical thinking, shared skills and developed valuable friendships. Her research project, while short, provocatively utilizes concrete, engaged writing.

**INTERMEDIATE HEBREW** – *Coursework involved written tests and oral presentations.*

Susan's work earned a B+.

#### WINTER QUARTER 1986

**INTRO CHEM NUTRITION** – *Covered the chemical and physical properties, digestion, absorption and metabolism; food sources and effects of deficiencies or excesses of carbohydrates, fats, proteins, vitamins and minerals. Requirements included weekly quizzes and a final exam.*

Overall, a C+.

**INTERMEDIATE HEBREW** – *Coursework involved written tests and oral presentations.*

Susan's work earned A-.

#### **COMPOSITION & RHETORIC**

Susan made an effort to develop her writing skills and demonstrated a good understanding of the literature and issues covered. However, while the expression and organization of her papers during the term was good, her final paper contained many proofreading and spelling errors and some problems with the clear organization and expression of her ideas. I suggest that she take more writing courses to further improve her skills. She completed all of the course assignments and was an active participant in most class discussions and group editing sessions. Overall, Susan's writing and thinking skills showed good improvement over the quarter. B-.

#### SPRING QUARTER 1986

#### **PUBLIC HEALTH**

Susan placed in the upper fifty percent of the class. Her midterm score was in the top thirty percent of the class and her final score was below average. Her research paper on toxic waste was excellent - very well written and documented and presented in a clear, well-organized style. Her health assessment and weekly health journal were good although they did not seem to represent much effort. Overall, a B.

**INTRO HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY** – *Evaluation based on a midterm examination and a comprehensive final examination.*

Susan earned a C.

**INTRO SOCIOLOGY** – *Covers the definition of the field and presents an analysis of basic concepts and methods in sociology. Students are required to tie their readings and the class discussion to the observable social world by doing a field study.*

Susan earned an A-.

Comment: Her participant observation project researching gender differentiation in response to greetings was systematic and self-reflective.