Final Portfolio Rubric and Comments

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

Directions:

* This form is to be completed by the president or president’s designee and signed by the president.
* Any rubric scores of Unacceptable, Borderline or Commendable / Exemplary must be followed with comments offering evidence and/or explanation.
* If a faculty member receives a score of Unacceptable in any category and the president’s recommendation is for granting tenure, the final comments must include a justification.
* When completed, this form must be made available to all required parties in accordance with the timeline provided in the Tenure Manual.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Portfolio Checklist | | |
| Has the Portfolio Checklist been completed by the department chair? | **Yes** | **No** |
| Are all documents included? (If not, list any missing documents and the reason in the comments below.) | **Yes** | **No** |
| Comments: | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Description and Evaluation Instructions |
| **Document Description:** The argument for tenure, written as a formal letter addressed to the College President, represents the culmination of all the work accomplished over the five semester tenure process. Through the use of extensive and varied evidence, the argument should demonstrate competence in the Talents of Teaching as well as a pattern of ongoing growth. The argument should refer to and be supported by the required portfolio documents as well as artifacts selected for inclusion in the appendix.  **Evaluation Instructions:** To ensure that the argument for tenure sufficiently demonstrates competence in the Talents of Teaching, this rubric includes a separate section for each Talent. When evaluating competence in each Talent, refer to both the argument itself and the evidence and artifacts that support the argument. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Teaching and Learning | | | |
| **Summary of Talent:** CCC faculty members develop and use highly effective teaching strategies that meet students’ diverse needs and that promote the acquisition and application of knowledge, and the development of critical and creative thinking and problem-solving skills. They carefully design courses to meet learning outcomes, and promote students’ active participation in their own learning. They create an effective learning environment that fosters students’ intellectual curiosity, helps students to problem solve using discipline-specific thinking strategies, and encourages students to challenge sources and confront their own assumptions. | | | |
| Based on the evidence discussed in the argument for tenure, has this faculty member exhibited competence in this Talent? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive evidence from varied sources indicates that the faculty member has clearly exceeded expectations and demonstrated excellence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent. | **☐ Acceptable**  Consistent and substantial evidence indicates that the faculty member has reached competence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent as written above. | **☐ Borderline**  Evidence indicating the faculty member’s competence in this Talent is either limited or inconsistent. | **☐ Unacceptable**  There is not enough evidence to indicate that the faculty member has achieved competence in this Talent. |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive reflection and evidence of growth. | **☐ Acceptable**  Clear reflection and evidence of growth as needed. | **☐ Borderline**  Limited reflection or evidence of growth. | **☐ Unacceptable**  No evidence of growth or reflection. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Measuring Learning | | | |
| **Summary of Talent:** CCC faculty members employ a variety of formative and summative assessments to ensure that classroom instruction leads to student learning and the attainment of the student learning outcomes for the course. They carefully select and use a variety of appropriate assessment instruments, communicate clear assignment expectations and evaluation criteria, provide students ample and timely feedback, and evaluate and improve assessment activities and grading practices. | | | |
| Based on the evidence discussed in the argument for tenure, has this faculty member exhibited competence in this Talent? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive evidence from varied sources indicates that the faculty member has clearly exceeded expectations and demonstrated excellence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent. | **☐ Acceptable**  Consistent and substantial evidence indicates that the faculty member has reached competence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent as written above. | **☐ Borderline**  Evidence indicating the faculty member’s competence in this Talent is either limited or inconsistent. | **☐ Unacceptable**  There is not enough evidence to indicate that the faculty member has achieved competence in this Talent. |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive reflection and evidence of growth. | **☐ Acceptable**  Clear reflection and evidence of growth as needed. | **☐ Borderline**  Limited reflection or evidence of growth. | **☐ Unacceptable**  No evidence of growth or reflection. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Diversity, Inclusion, Respect, and Student Support | | | |
| **Summary of Talent:** CCC faculty members help students reach their academic, personal and career goals and foster a safe environment that respects the diversity of people and ideas by modeling respect for all students and conveying confidence in every student’s ability to learn. They employ approaches that take into account how learning is affected by students’ motivations, attitudes, perceptions, values and behaviors; and help students overcome obstacles by connecting them to appropriate resources. | | | |
| Based on the evidence discussed in the argument for tenure, has this faculty member exhibited competence in this Talent? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive evidence from varied sources indicates that the faculty member has clearly exceeded expectations and demonstrated excellence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent. | **☐ Acceptable**  Consistent and substantial evidence indicates that the faculty member has reached competence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent as written above. | **☐ Borderline**  Evidence indicating the faculty member’s competence in this Talent is either limited or inconsistent. | **☐ Unacceptable**  There is not enough evidence to indicate that the faculty member has achieved competence in this Talent. |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive reflection and evidence of growth. | **☐ Acceptable**  Clear reflection and evidence of growth as needed. | **☐ Borderline**  Limited reflection or evidence of growth. | **☐ Unacceptable**  No evidence of growth or reflection. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Academic Citizenship, Shared Governance, and Leadership | | | |
| **Summary of Talent:** CCC faculty members enrich the CCC community by participating actively in departmental, college and/or district committees and activities; they contribute to and provide leadership in their academic and professional communities, and promote collaboration and teamwork among members of these communities. CCC faculty members maintain leadership organizations that determine and maintain academic integrity and excellence and that participate in policy and curriculum development. | | | |
| Based on the evidence discussed in the argument for tenure, has this faculty member exhibited competence in this Talent? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive evidence from varied sources indicates that the faculty member has clearly exceeded expectations and demonstrated excellence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent. | **☐ Acceptable**  Consistent and substantial evidence indicates that the faculty member has reached competence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent as written above. | **☐ Borderline**  Evidence indicating the faculty member’s competence in this Talent is either limited or inconsistent. | **☐ Unacceptable**  There is not enough evidence to indicate that the faculty member has achieved competence in this Talent. |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive reflection and evidence of growth. | **☐ Acceptable**  Clear reflection and evidence of growth as needed. | **☐ Borderline**  Limited reflection or evidence of growth. | **☐ Unacceptable**  No evidence of growth or reflection. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Content Area Expertise and Lifelong Learning | | | |
| **Summary of Talent:** CCC faculty members demonstrate content-area expertise and continually grow intellectually by remaining current within their fields, expanding their content-area knowledge, studying teaching and learning, and engaging in self-evaluation and goal-setting. They engage in and model intellectual curiosity and express passion for their disciplines and for learning in general. | | | |
| Based on the evidence discussed in the argument for tenure, has this faculty member exhibited competence in this Talent? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Extensive evidence from varied sources indicates that the faculty member has clearly exceeded expectations and demonstrated excellence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent. | **☐ Acceptable**  Consistent and substantial evidence indicates that the faculty member has reached competence in all or almost all of the elements of this Talent as written above. | **☐ Borderline**  Evidence indicating the faculty member’s competence in this Talent is either limited or inconsistent. | **☐ Unacceptable**  There is not enough evidence to indicate that the faculty member has achieved competence in this Talent. |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**  (Not applicable.) | **☐ Acceptable**  Appropriate and detailed plan for continued growth and service. | **☐ Borderline**  Inappropriate or vague plan for continued growth and service. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Missing plan for continued growth and service. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Argument for Tenure: Any Needed Responses | | | |
| Has the faculty member satisfactorily addressed any concerns raised in other portions of the portfolio (department chair letter, observations, student evaluations, contextualized data report) and the Semester 3 portfolio? | **☐ Not Applicable** | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Curriculum Vitae | | |
| Does the curriculum vitae meet the expectations of the college and the department, if defined by departmental policy? | **Yes** | **No** |
| Comments: | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Syllabus with Explanation and Reflection | | | |
| **Document directions to faculty member:** The purpose of this document is to demonstrate an adequate understanding of the elements of the syllabus and a developing knowledge of course design. The syllabus included should be identical to the syllabus given to students for one of the courses taught by the tenure track faculty member either in the previous semester or the current semester, and should include all elements required by the college and the department. The syllabus need not be for the same course as the syllabus included in the previous portfolio, but should show growth based on feedback.  The explanation should show that the syllabus has been constructed thoughtfully to aid student learning. The reflection should demonstrate the tenure track faculty member’s ability to recognize the effects that elements of the syllabus have had on the classroom environment or student learning. It should also include a discussion of possible revisions the tenure track faculty member will make in the future, and why these revisions would enhance the syllabus. | | | |
| To what extent does the syllabus and explanation demonstrate an understanding of course design? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Syllabus and explanation demonstrate an advanced understanding of course design. | **☐ Acceptable**  Syllabus and explanation demonstrate an adequate understanding of course design. | **☐ Borderline**  Syllabus and explanation demonstrate a limited understanding of course design. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Syllabus and explanation fail to demonstrate understanding of course design. |
| Comments: | | | |
| To what extent does the reflection demonstrate that the faculty member recognizes the effect that elements of the syllabus have had on the classroom environment and student learning? | | | |
| ☐ **Commendable / Exemplary**  Reflection discusses specific aspects of the syllabus and describes the effect it has had on the classroom environment and student learning. The reflection includes a discussion of how the particular elements of the syllabus may be revised in the future and how the revision will enhance student learning. | ☐ **Acceptable**  Reflection discusses effects that the syllabus has had on the classroom environment and student learning, but lacks a level of specificity or offers weak examples. The discussion of how particular elements of the syllabus may be revised in the future and how the revision will enhance student learning lacks specific examples. | ☐ **Borderline**  Reflection indicates that the effects of the syllabus on the classroom environment and student learning have been considered, but there is a lack of depth and/or specific examples. The discussion of how particular elements of the syllabus may be revised is missing or lacks depth of thought. | ☐ **Unacceptable**  Reflection fails to demonstrate thoughtful consideration of the syllabus and its effects on student learning. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sample Assessment with Explanation and Reflection | | | |
| **Document directions to faculty member:** The purpose of this document is to illustrate the tenure track faculty member’s understanding of how to effectively measure student learning. The student directions or a description of how the assessment was used must be included with the assessment itself.  The explanation must identify the student learning outcomes to be measure and how the assessment would measure those outcomes. The reflection should include a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment, its ability to effectively measure student learning, and how the results were used to inform instruction. The tenure track faculty member should also discuss any changes to be made to the assessment in the future, and how those changes would enhance the assessment’s ability to accurately measure student learning. | | | |
| To what extent do the assessment and explanation demonstrate the ability to measure student learning outcomes? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Explanation clearly and accurately indicates how the assessment will address the intended student learning outcome(s); the explanation demonstrates advanced knowledge of assessment principles. | **☐ Acceptable**  Explanation clearly and accurately indicates how the assessment will address the intended student learning outcome(s); the explanation demonstrates basic knowledge of assessment principles. | **☐ Borderline**  Explanation attempts to indicate how the assessment will address the intended student learning outcome(s); however, the explanation is insufficient or demonstrates only limited knowledge of assessment principles. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Explanation fails to indicate how the assessment will address the intended student learning outcome(s); the assessment and/or explanation demonstrates minimal knowledge of assessment principles. |
| Comments: | | | |
| To what extent does the reflection demonstrate that the faculty member recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment, is able to use assessment to inform instruction? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Reflection identifies specific strengths and weaknesses of the assessment and its ability to measure the stated student learning outcomes. Specific examples of using the results of the assessments to inform teaching are provided. | **☐ Acceptable**  Reflection identifies strengths and weaknesses of the assessment as linked to the identified student learning outcomes. Examples of using the assessment to inform instruction are provided, but lack specificity. | **☐ Borderline**  Reflection identifies strengths and weaknesses of the assessment, but does not clearly link to student learning outcomes, or lacks specificity and depth. Examples are unclear. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Reflection fails to identify strengths and weaknesses of the assessment, or does not link to identified student learning outcomes. Examples of using assessment results to inform instruction are missing or lack specificity and depth. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classroom Observations | | | |
| **Observations Required:** Department Chair, Administrator, Two Tenured Faculty Members | | | |
| To what extent do the four classroom observations indicate effective classroom teaching? (If the observations vary significantly in their assessment of the faculty member’s teaching, include comments explaining these differences.) | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Observations consistently indicate great confidence in the faculty member’s classroom teaching; examples of exceptional teaching practices are provided in observation commentary. | **☐ Acceptable**  Observations consistently indicate confidence in the faculty member’s classroom teaching. | **☐ Borderline**  Observations do not consistently indicate confidence in the faculty member’s classroom teaching. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Two or more observers expressed significant, well-founded, concern with the faculty member’s classroom teaching; specific evidence supporting concerns is provided in observation commentary. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty Member Post-Observation Reflections | | | |
| **A faculty member post-observation reflection form is required for each formal observation.** | | | |
| To what extent do the post-observation reflection forms indicate that the faculty member is able to contextualize and describe the lesson observed, self-assess the success of the class session based on observable evidence, integrate feedback received, and plan next steps to improve instruction? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Each of the above elements is completed thoroughly; self-assessment makes significant reference to concrete evidence; reflection indicates an advanced understanding of feedback received and includes concrete next steps to integrate feedback and improve instruction. | **☐ Acceptable**  Each of the above elements is completed satisfactorily; self-assessment makes reference to concrete evidence; reflection indicates a satisfactory understanding of feedback received and includes concrete next steps to integrate feedback and improve instruction. | **☐ Borderline**  One or more of the above elements is weak or underdeveloped; self-assessment makes some reference to evidence; reflection indicates a limited understanding of feedback received; next steps may be vague or inadequately address the feedback received. | **☐ Unacceptable**  One or more of the above elements is weak or underdeveloped; self-assessment is not supported by evidence; reflection fails to indicate an understanding of feedback received; next steps are vague, inadequate, or missing. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of Student Evaluations from Semesters 4 and 5 | | | |
| Based on the department chair’s summary, to what extent do the student evaluations indicate effective classroom teaching? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Student evaluations are mostly positive and both ratings and comments indicate excellence in classroom teaching. | **☐ Acceptable**  Student evaluations are generally positive and indicate effective classroom teaching with only minor concerns noted. | **☐ Borderline**  Student evaluations fail to indicate effective classroom teaching and may raise substantial concerns. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Student evaluations fail to indicate effective classroom teaching and raise substantial concerns. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contextualized Data Report for Semesters 3 and 4 | | | |
| To what extent does the data report support the faculty member getting tenure? | | | |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**  (Not applicable.) | **☐ Acceptable**  The contextualized data report does not raise any concerns; anomalies, if any, are satisfactorily explained. | **☐ Borderline**  The contextualized data report includes concerns that are not satisfactorily explained. | **☐ Unacceptable**  The contextualized data report raises significant concerns. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Past Reviews | | | |
| Has the faculty member satisfactorily addressed concerns, if any, identified in previous portfolios? | | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** |
| Comments: | | | |
| Has the faculty member satisfactorily completed his/her action plan? | **☐ Not Applicable** | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall Presentation of Portfolio | | | |
| To what extent does the overall presentation, including writing, organization and ease of navigating, meet expectations? | | | |
| **☐ Commendable / Exemplary**  Excellent presentation that exceeds expectations. | **☐ Acceptable**  Polished, professional presentation; logical organization; easy to navigate. | **☐ Borderline**  Generally professional presentation with some weakness in tone, grammar, clarity, organization, or ease of navigation. | **☐ Unacceptable**  Unprofessional presentation with a significant weakness in tone, grammar, clarity, organization, or ease of navigation. |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Letter from the Department Chair | | |
| Does the department recommendation support granting the faculty member tenure? | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** |
| According to the chair, has the faculty member adhered to the published departmental procedures? | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** |
| Comments: | | |
| What additional issues or comments have been brought up by the department chair? | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final Recommendation and Comments | |
| Is a tenure contract recommended for this faculty member? | |
| **☐ Recommended** | **☐ Not Recommended** |
| Comments: | |

Name of college president:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: **Click here to enter a date.**