Semester 1 Portfolio Rubric and Recommendation with Rationale

This rubric is to be completed by the president or president’s designee. The recommendation with rationale is to be completed and signed by the president. The rubric may only be completed by an administrator who has attended the relevant training and norming. Rubric scores are to be determined on the basis of the rubric as written. Any concerns with the rubric itself should be discussed in the Tenure Process Report Part 1, completed annually by each college. Once completed, this form must be made available to all required parties in accordance with the timeline provided in the Tenure Manual or as specified by District Office.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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 (if needed):** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Letter from Tenure-track Faculty Member to President | | |
| Does the letter introduce and provide appropriate context for the portfolio? | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Semester 1 Procedure Checklist | | |
| Is the Semester 1 Checklist included with all required signatures? | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Curriculum Vitae | | |
| Does the curriculum vitae include all required elements? | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):** | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Syllabus with Explanation | | | | | |
| **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 at the beginning of the semester for one of the courses currently taught by the tenure track faculty member, and should include all elements required by the college and the department. The explanation should show that the syllabus has been constructed thoughtfully to aid student learning and include a brief discussion of how certain elements developed from past experience or a brief discussion of which elements seem to be working well or may need revision in the future. | | | | | |
| Does the syllabus include major elements to allow students to navigate the course (e.g., course number, faculty contact information, office hours, official course description, and ADW policy)? If “no” is marked, explain below. | | | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):** | | | | | |
| To what extent does the explanation demonstrate that the syllabus has been constructed thoughtfully to aid student learning? | | | | | |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**  Explanation shows that major elements of the syllabus have been designed with careful consideration, discusses how past experiences influenced the syllabus design, and details how and why the syllabus may be changed in the future to better promote student learning. | **Acceptable**  Explanation shows that major elements of the syllabus have been designed with careful consideration and provides a brief discussion of how certain elements developed from past experience or a brief discussion of which elements seem to be working well or may need revision in the future. | **Borderline**  Explanation shows a developing understanding of syllabus design, but fails to describe how major elements of the course are designed to aid student learning or fails to show how the syllabus has or will improve based on the faculty member’s experiences. | **Unacceptable**  Explanation fails to demonstrate thoughtful syllabus design. | | |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:** | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sample Assessment with Explanation | | | |
| **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 outcomes. 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 measured and how the assessment measures those outcomes as well as a brief discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment. | | | |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classroom Observations | | | |
| **Observations Required:** Department Chair and Administrator | | | |
| To what extent do the two 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**  Both observations are positive and indicate great confidence in the faculty member’s classroom teaching; examples of exceptional teaching practices are provided in observation commentary. | **Acceptable**  Both observations indicate that the faculty member is meeting expectations, although there may be some areas identified for special focus. | **Borderline**  One or both observations indicate significant concern with the faculty member’s classroom teaching. | **Unacceptable**  Both observations indicate significant concerns with the faculty member’s classroom teaching. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of Student Evaluations from Semester 1 | | | |
| Based on the department chair’s summary, to what extent do the student evaluations indicate effective classroom teaching? | | | |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**  Student evaluations 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. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comprehensive Self-Evaluation and Reflection | | | |
| **Document directions to faculty member:** This document, completed by the tenure track faculty member, synthesizes all of the information about the faculty member’s own effectiveness over the course of the semester. The document should provide a comprehensive, evidence-based self-evaluation and reflection of strengths and areas of growth. The document *must* draw upon and directly reference the classroom evaluations and the summary of student evaluations. Mentor feedback should inform the self-evaluation, but does not need to be directly referenced. The document may also draw upon instructor-made surveys, classroom assessment techniques, discussions with administrators or colleagues, syllabus and/or assessment reflections, and any other relevant sources of feedback. | | | |
| To what extent does the document indicate the faculty member’s ability to use evidence to form an accurate and thoughtful evaluation of his or her performance and respond to feedback appropriately? | | | |
| **Commendable / Exemplary**  Document effectively synthesizes evidence from all required sources as well as some additional sources (e.g., student surveys, classroom assessment techniques, etc.) to create a well-supported and nuanced self-evaluation that demonstrates careful reflection and clear commitment to continued growth through articulation of concrete next steps for future professional development. | **Acceptable**  Document draws on evidence from at least the classroom observation feedback and the student evaluation summary to create a well-supported self-evaluation that demonstrates thoughtful reflection, and ideas for future professional development. | **Borderline**  Document is somewhat underdeveloped due to limited use of evidence as support, an underdeveloped self-evaluation, little demonstration of reflection, or inadequate discussion of ideas for future professional development. | **Unacceptable**  Document is significantly underdeveloped due to failure to use evidence, inadequate self-evaluation, lack of demonstration of reflection, or lack of reference to future professional development. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:** | | | |

Recommendation with Rationale

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Departmental Recommendation | | | |
| Please review the department chair’s letter and answer the following questions: | | | |
| Does the department chair support granting the faculty member contract renewal? | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** | **☐ Not included** |
| Did the departmental vote support granting the faculty member contract renewal? | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** | **☐ Not included** |
| According to the chair, has the faculty member adhered to the published departmental procedures? | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** | **☐ Not included** |
| **If any of the above is not included in the department chair letter, please explain:** | | | |
| **Comments (include any additional issues or comments brought up by the department chair):** | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| President’s Recommendation and Rationale | | |
| Once the portfolio rubric is completed and the departmental recommendation is finalized, indicate the president’s recommendation and summarize the reasons that support the decision. Please include a discussion of any additional items not explicitly addressed in the rubric that impacted the recommendation. If an action plan is recommended, explain the reasons for the action plan and the expectations of the faculty member. | | |
| Is a contract renewal recommended for this faculty member? | | |
| **☐ Recommended** | **☐ Recommended with Action Plan** | **☐ Not Recommended** |
| **Rationale for recommendation:** | | |

Name of college president:

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