Second Semester Review Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tenure-track faculty member |  |
| College | **Choose an item.** |
| Date of Second Semester Review | **Click here to enter a date.** |

# Procedure

The faculty member provides the written Individualized Learning and Service Plan (ILSP) and Teaching and Service Philosophy draft to the president’s designee, department chair and TAP Leader prior to the Semester 2 Review Meeting. All participating in the meeting should read these documents as well as the faculty member’s self-evaluation completed for the Semester 1 portfolio before the review. Besides allowing for collaborative review of the written ILSP and Teaching and Service Philosophy draft, the Semester 2 review also allows the faculty member to orally present his or her understanding of the Talents of Teaching.

After the meeting, this report is completed by the president’s designee. This report is a consolidation of the president’s designee and department chair’s assessment of the faculty member’s Semester 2 ILSP, Teaching Philosophy, and oral understanding of the Talents of Teaching. The president’s designee, department chair and TAP Leader, will sign off after reviewing the completed report. The report is then sent to the faculty member within two weeks of the panel review meeting. It should be noted that the TAP Leader is not evaluating the faculty member or the ILSP, but ensuring that protocol is followed and helping to provide clarification on the process when necessary.

If an outcome is not approved, the faculty member is required to resubmit the revised outcome to the president’s designee within a specified timeline as determined by the president’s designee. The president’s designee will ensure that the faculty member makes the necessary revisions based on recommendations before final approval of the ILSP and will communicate approval to the faculty member, department chair and TAP Leader.

Faculty members may begin working on approved outcomes even if they have not received approval on all outcomes.

# ILSP Review

The purpose of the ILSP is to guide the faculty member’s professional development and service such that she or he can adequately demonstrate competence in all the Talents of Teaching in the final portfolio. The professional development and service plan outlined in this document should represent a significant yet realistic amount of work for the faculty member to complete during the tenure process. It is expected that the faculty member will participate in other learning and service opportunities beyond this plan (e.g. conferences, professional development workshops, student organizations, and/or faculty committees); however, this plan outlines the major accomplishments that will lay the foundation for the faculty member’s final argument for tenure.

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Member’s Context |
| Faculty member provides sufficient background information. |[ ]
| Faculty member describe his or her expected workload while completing the ILSP (to ensure the ILSP is realistic). |[ ]
| Faculty member describes in broad terms the skills, abilities and experiences brought to the position as well as specific strengths identified through the first semester of employment (e.g. through classroom observations and student evaluations). |[ ]
| Faculty member describes areas of the Talents of Teaching that have been identified for further growth through classroom observation, student evaluations and/or the faculty member’s personal assessment. |[ ]
| Faculty member identifies specific needs of the department, college or district. |[ ]
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Outcome # 1 |
| Outcome is stated clearly. |[ ]
| Rationale for the outcome is sufficient (e.g., outcome addresses one or more of the faculty member’s identified areas for growth and/or provides meaningful service to the department, college or district). |[ ]
| One or more of the Talents of Teaching addressed by the outcome such that the outcome will help to build an effective argument for tenure. |[ ]
| Appropriate resources are identified. |[ ]
| Implementation plan is clear, realistic, and appropriate. |[ ]
| Products/evidence identified will sufficiently indicate effective application of learning (for a learning outcome) and/or contribution of meaningful service (for a service outcome).  |[ ]
| [ ] **Approved** | [ ] **Not yet approved** | [ ] **Rejected** |
| Overall comments with any needed revisions clearly explained: |

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Outcome # 2 |
| Outcome is stated clearly. |[ ]
| Rationale for the outcome is sufficient (e.g., outcome addresses one or more of the faculty member’s identified areas for growth and/or provides meaningful service to the department, college or district). |[ ]
| One or more of the Talents of Teaching addressed by the outcome such that the outcome will help to build an effective argument for tenure. |[ ]
| Appropriate resources are identified. |[ ]
| Implementation plan is clear, realistic, and appropriate. |[ ]
| Products/evidence identified will sufficiently indicate effective application of learning (for a learning outcome) and/or contribution of meaningful service (for a service outcome).  |[ ]
| [ ] **Approved** | [ ] **Not yet approved** | [ ] **Rejected** |
| Overall comments with any needed revisions clearly explained: |

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Outcome # 3 |
| Outcome is stated clearly. |[ ]
| Rationale for the outcome is sufficient (e.g., outcome addresses one or more of the faculty member’s identified areas for growth and/or provides meaningful service to the department, college or district). |[ ]
| One or more of the Talents of Teaching addressed by the outcome such that the outcome will help to build an effective argument for tenure. |[ ]
| Appropriate resources are identified. |[ ]
| Implementation plan is clear, realistic, and appropriate. |[ ]
| Products/evidence identified will sufficiently indicate effective application of learning (for a learning outcome) and/or contribution of meaningful service (for a service outcome).  |[ ]
| [ ] **Approved** | [ ] **Not yet approved** | [ ] **Rejected** |
| Overall comments with any needed revisions clearly explained: |

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Outcome # 4 |
| Outcome is stated clearly. |[ ]
| Rationale for the outcome is sufficient (e.g., outcome addresses one or more of the faculty member’s identified areas for growth and/or provides meaningful service to the department, college or district). |[ ]
| One or more of the Talents of Teaching addressed by the outcome such that the outcome will help to build an effective argument for tenure. |[ ]
| Appropriate resources are identified. |[ ]
| Implementation plan is clear, realistic, and appropriate. |[ ]
| Products/evidence identified will sufficiently indicate effective application of learning (for a learning outcome) and/or contribution of meaningful service (for a service outcome).  |[ ]
| [ ] **Approved** | [ ] **Not yet approved** | [ ] **Rejected** |
| Overall comments with any needed revisions clearly explained: |

Note: a total of four outcomes are required, of which, at least one must address faculty learning and at least one must address faculty service. Note that the total faculty outcomes must result in a reasonable and realistic amount of work for the faculty member to complete in the time allotted.

**If the faculty member plans to complete more than four outcomes, additional space for faculty outcomes is at the end of this form.**

|  |
| --- |
| ILSP Workload |
| When considered together, do the ILSP outcomes represent a significant yet realistic amount of work for the faculty member to complete during the tenure process? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| ILSP Approval |
| When considered together, do the faculty outcomes adequately address the tenure-track faculty member’s areas for growth so that she or he will have the foundation for an effective argument for tenure upon completion of the ILSP? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| Comments: |

Faculty members can begin working on approved outcomes even if the entire ILSP has not yet been approved.

|  |
| --- |
| Overall Presentation of the ILSP |
| To what extent does the overall presentation, including the quality of writing, meet expectations? |
| [ ] **Acceptable**Written clearly and coherently; presented and edited professionally. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Not written clearly or coherently; not presented and edited professionally. |
| Comments: |

The presentation of the ILSP must be deemed “Acceptable” by the time it is included in the Semester 3 Portfolio.

# Draft of Teaching and Service Philosophy

|  |
| --- |
| Draft of Teaching and Service Philosophy |
| Was the Teaching and Service Philosophy presented and discussed? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| Is the faculty member prepared to move forward with necessary revisions, if any, as well as application of the philosophy? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| Comments: |

# Oral Presentation of the Talents of Teaching

During the Semester 2 Review, the faculty member articulates her or his understanding of each of the Talents of Teaching. This presentation determines if the faculty member has the level of understanding of each Talent necessary to work towards completing the final portfolio. If a faculty member does not demonstrate an acceptable level of understanding of any of the Talents, the TAP leader, department chair and mentor must help the faculty member develop a better understanding, because adequate completion of the final portfolio will depend on a thorough understanding of the Talents.

Please note:

Faculty members will explain their understanding of each Talent of Teaching in general terms and give examples. Faculty members should be able to describe how they plan to add depth and specificity to their understanding of the Talents of Teaching as they work on their ILSP and complete their portfolios.

In the table below, use the following ratings.

Exemplary: Faculty member has gained a thorough understanding of the Talent and can relate this understanding to classroom / professional practice.

Acceptable: Faculty member has an adequate understanding of the Talent.

Not Yet Acceptable: Faculty member has some misconceptions or gaps in understanding the Talent.

|  |
| --- |
| Talents of Teaching |
| How well does the faculty member demonstrate understanding of each of the Talents of Teaching? |
| Teaching and Learning | [ ] **Exemplary** | [ ] **Acceptable** | [ ] **Not Yet Acceptable** |
| Measuring Learning | [ ] **Exemplary** | [ ] **Acceptable** | [ ] **Not Yet Acceptable** |
| Diversity, Inclusion, Respect, and Student Support | [ ] **Exemplary** | [ ] **Acceptable** | [ ] **Not Yet Acceptable** |
| Academic Citizenship, Shared Governance, and Leadership | [ ] **Exemplary** | [ ] **Acceptable** | [ ] **Not Yet Acceptable** |
| Content Expertise and Lifelong Learning | [ ] **Exemplary** | [ ] **Acceptable** | [ ] **Not Yet Acceptable** |
| Comments, including explanations of “Not Yet Acceptable,” if any: |

# Overall Summary of Tenure Process to Date

|  |
| --- |
| Identify any significant strengths or deficits. If an action plan is needed, indicate here and submit separately. |

# Signatures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenure-track Faculty Member | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TAP Leader | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Department Chair | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dean | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Vice-president | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| President | Signature | Date Signed |
|  |  |  |

# Optional Additional Outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Outcome # 5 |
| Outcome is stated clearly. |[ ]
| Rationale for the outcome is sufficient (e.g., outcome addresses one or more of the faculty member’s identified areas for growth and/or provides meaningful service to the department, college or district). |[ ]
| One or more of the Talents of Teaching addressed by the outcome such that the outcome will help to build an effective argument for tenure. |[ ]
| Appropriate resources are identified. |[ ]
| Implementation plan is clear, realistic, and appropriate. |[ ]
| Products/evidence identified will sufficiently indicate effective application of learning (for a learning outcome) and/or contribution of meaningful service (for a service outcome).  |[ ]
| [ ] **Approved** | [ ] **Not yet approved** | [ ] **Rejected** |
| Overall comments with any needed revisions clearly explained: |

|  |
| --- |
| Faculty Outcome # 6 |
| Outcome is stated clearly. |[ ]
| Rationale for the outcome is sufficient (e.g., outcome addresses one or more of the faculty member’s identified areas for growth and/or provides meaningful service to the department, college or district). |[ ]
| One or more of the Talents of Teaching addressed by the outcome such that the outcome will help to build an effective argument for tenure. |[ ]
| Appropriate resources are identified. |[ ]
| Implementation plan is clear, realistic, and appropriate. |[ ]
| Products/evidence identified will sufficiently indicate effective application of learning (for a learning outcome) and/or contribution of meaningful service (for a service outcome).  |[ ]
| [ ] **Approved** | [ ] **Not yet approved** | [ ] **Rejected** |
| Overall comments with any needed revisions clearly explained: |