College Tenure Process Report: Part 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| College | Choose an item. |
| President |  |
| TAP leader(s) |  |
| Report completed by |  |
| Date | Click here to enter a date. |

The College Tenure Process Report is completed in the spring semester of every academic year. During the first month of the spring semester, the college conducts its own review (self-study) of the tenure process to determine strengths and areas for growth. Part 1 of this report is completed by the college administration once they have concluded their internal review. Part 2 of the report is completed by District Academic Affairs. To complete Part 2 of the report, District Academic Affairs considers the following evidence: an examination of portfolios submitted by tenure-track faculty members from that college whose contract renewal/tenure decisions have already been board approved, and discussions with the college administration. If the college is found to be out of compliance, an action plan must be developed with the college and include specific steps for returning to compliance, a timeline, responsible parties, and an outline of how District Academic Affairs will monitor and support this process.

|  |
| --- |
| Inclusion of all required documents and signatures |
| Has the Portfolio Checklist been completed for each portfolio reviewed by District Academic Affairs? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Classroom Observations |
| **Standard:** Formal observations are accompanied by sufficient meaningful feedback with the dual purposes of accurately evaluating the faculty member including identifying areas of strength and areas for growth, and providing formative feedback to help the faculty member improve instruction. Comments include concrete evidence from the observation and adequately explain the ratings selected for each section.  |
| Based on the portfolios reviewed, does the college demonstrate adherence to the standard? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Classroom observation write-ups **consistently meet** the standard above and **often exceed** expectations by providing particularly insightful or useful commentary on the faculty member’s classroom teaching. | [ ] **Acceptable**Classroom observation write-ups **consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Borderline**Classroom observation write-ups **do not consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Classroom observations **rarely meet** the standard above. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Department Chair Letters and Contextualized Data Reports |
| **Standard:** Department chair letters and reports are well written and professional. Each letter or report offers thoughtful discussion on the specific tenure-track faculty member. * Each letter includes the result of the departmental vote as well as sufficient evidence supporting the department chair’s recommendation.
* Contextualized data reports include a discussion of the faculty member’s retention and success data, as well as any other relevant data (e.g., exit exam pass rates or other departmental assessments, as appropriate). Data are appropriately contextualized by having comparison to similar classes or sections as determined by the department. Anomalies are appropriately addressed.
 |
| Based on the portfolios reviewed, does the college demonstrate adherence to the standard? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Department chair letters and Contextualized Data Reports **consistently meet** the standard above and **often exceed** expectations by providing a particularly thorough and thoughtful evaluation of the faculty member and the data. | [ ] **Acceptable**Department chair letters **consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Borderline**Department chair letters **do not consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Department chair letters **rarely meet** the standard above. |
| [ ] **Acceptable**Contextualized data reports **consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Borderline**Contextualized data reports **do not consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Contextualized data reports **rarely meet** the standard above. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Feedback on Rubrics Completed by College Administration |
| **Standard:** Rubrics completed by the college administration are accompanied by sufficient meaningful feedback with the dual purpose of accurately evaluating the tenure-track faculty member and providing formative feedback to help the faculty member improve. Rubric ratings of Unacceptable, Borderline, or Commendable/Exemplary are accompanied by comments explaining these ratings. All open-ended questions/comment boxes are completed. |
| Based on the portfolios reviewed, does the college demonstrate adherence to the standard? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Feedback on rubrics **consistently meets** the standard above and **often exceeds** expectations by providing particularly insightful and/or useful commentary on the faculty member’s portfolio. | [ ] **Acceptable**Feedback on rubrics **consistently meets** the standard above. | [ ] **Borderline**Feedback on rubrics **does not consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Feedback on rubrics **rarely meets** the standard above. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Congruence Between Portfolio Evidence and Feedback/Rubric Ratings |
| **Standard:** The rubric ratings and portfolio feedback provided by the college administration match the evidence provided in the portfolio. |
| Based on the portfolios reviewed, does the college demonstrate adherence to the standard? |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**N/A | [ ] **Acceptable**Rubric ratings and portfolio feedback provided by the college administration **consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Borderline**Rubric ratings and portfolio feedback provided by the college administration **do not consistently meet** the standard above. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Rubric ratings and portfolio feedback provided by the college administration **rarely meet** the standard above. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Congruence Between Feedback/Rubric Ratings and President’s Decisions |
| **Standard:** The decisions for contract renewal/tenure are justified by the rubric ratings and feedback. In exceptional cases where a college President’s decision may conflict with the rubric ratings, a statement justifying the decision is provided. This statement adequately explains why the case is exceptional and makes an effective argument that the President’s decision is in the best interest of the institution and the students. |
| Based on the portfolios reviewed, does the college demonstrate adherence to the standard? |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**N/A | [ ] **Acceptable****In all decisions**, the standard above **is met**. | **Borderline**N/A | [ ] **Unacceptable****In at least one decision**, the standard above **is not met**. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Action Plan Quality and Support |
| **Standard:** Action plans for individual tenure-track faculty members are developed when appropriate (as determined by the Second Semester Review, portfolio feedback, or Department Chair request). Action plans include the following elements: clear steps, a timeline, responsible parties, and an outline of how the college will support the faculty member. Evidence is provided that the college offered the support detailed in action plan. |
| Based on the evidence specified above, does the college demonstrate adherence to the standard? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Action plans and evidence of support **meet** the standard above and demonstrate that tenure-track faculty members have been extremely well-supported and have shown significant growth. | [ ] **Acceptable**Action plans **meet** above standard and evidence of support is provided. | [ ] **Borderline**Action plans **do not consistently meet** above standard and evidence of support is provided. | [ ] **Unacceptable****Significant problems have been identified** regarding the college’s creation or support of action plans. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Special Focus (when applicable) |
| **Standard:** Any special focus from the previous process report has been addressed and District Academic Affairs has no further concern in this area. |
| **Special focus (if any, or write N/A):**  |
| Based on the evidence specified above, has the college addressed the concerns from the previous process reports? |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**N/A | [ ] **Acceptable**Special focus has been adequately addressed. | [ ] **Borderline**Some evidence that the special focus has been addressed, but concerns remain. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Little or no evidence that the special focus has been addressed. |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Compliance Determination |
| Based on the above report, is the college in compliance? Is there a special focus needed for the next process report? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**College has demonstrated exemplary execution of the tenure process. | [ ] **In Compliance**College has demonstrated acceptable execution of the tenure process with no specific concerns noted. | [ ] **In Compliance with Additional Focus**College has demonstrated acceptable execution of the tenure process; however, additional focus on one or more area is required before the next review. | [ ] **Out of Compliance**Significant problems have been identified regarding the college’s execution of the tenure process. An action plan is included with this report to return the college to compliance. |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Provost | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  | Click here to enter a date. |