Semester 3 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 2 Procedure Checklist |
| Is the Semester 2 Procedure Checklist included with all required signatures? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Semester 3 Procedure Checklist |
| Is the Semester 3 Procedure 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):**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Teaching and Service Philosophy and Evidence of Application |
| **Directions to faculty member:** The teaching and service philosophy is one of the culminating documents created in the Second Semester Seminar and its purpose is to demonstrate how the tenure track faculty member’s practice is guided by theory. As such, it should exhibit knowledge of learning theory and offer a thoughtful reflection on the theories that guide one’s own teaching practices. A discussion of the role and responsibilities of full time faculty outside the classroom should also be provided, showing a holistic view of how full time faculty members support the mission of the institution. The document should also include a reflection on how one’s philosophy directs one’s actions both inside and outside the classroom with reference to examples. |
| To what extent does the Teaching and Service Philosophy demonstrate depth of thought and knowledge of theory? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Teaching and Service Philosophy demonstrates excellent depth of thought and knowledge of educational theory. | [ ] **Acceptable**Teaching and Service Philosophy demonstrates adequate depth of thought and knowledge of educational theory. | [ ] **Borderline**Teaching and Service Philosophy demonstrates limited depth of thought and knowledge of educational theory. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Teaching and Service Philosophy demonstrates little depth of thought or knowledge of educational theory. |
| To what extent does the Teaching and Service Philosophy demonstrate the ability to connect theory and practice? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Reflection clearly connects theory to practice supported with sophisticated examples. | [ ] **Acceptable**Reflection connects theory to practice supported with examples. | [ ] **Borderline**Reflection demonstrates a weak connection between theory and practice.  | [ ] **Unacceptable**Reflection does not demonstrate a connection between theory and practice. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Course Syllabus with Explanation of Course Design |
| **Document directions given to faculty member:** The purpose of this document is to demonstrate 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 does not need to be for the same course as the syllabus included in the previous portfolio(s).The explanation should show that the course has been designed thoughtfully to aid student learning. The explanation should demonstrate the tenure track faculty member’s ability to recognize the effects that the course design has had on student learning through the explication of specific, detailed, and relevant examples. The explanation should also include a discussion of possible revisions the tenure track faculty member will make in the future, and why these revisions would improve the course design and increase student learning. |
| To what extent does the explanation demonstrate that the course was designed to effectively foster student learning? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Syllabus and explanation demonstrate an advanced understanding of course design. Explanation discusses specific aspects of the course design illustrated via the syllabus and other examples provided. The explanation discusses the desired impact on student learning through the discussion of specific, detailed and relevant examples. The explanation includes a discussion of how the course design may be revised in the future and how the revision will enhance student learning. | [ ] **Acceptable**Syllabus and explanation demonstrate an adequate understanding of course design. Explanation discusses specific aspects of the course design illustrated via the syllabus and other examples provided. The explanation discusses the desired impact on student learning, but may lack sufficient specific, detailed and relevant examples. The discussion of how particular elements of the course design may be revised in the future and how the revision will enhance student learning may be incomplete or lack specific examples. | [ ] **Borderline**Syllabus and explanation demonstrate a limited understanding of course design. Explanation indicates that the effects of the course design on student learning have been considered, but there is a lack of depth; examples may be vague, irrelevant or absent. The discussion of how particular elements of the syllabus may be revised is missing or lacks depth of thought. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Syllabus and explanation fail to demonstrate understanding of course design. Explanation fails to demonstrate how the course was designed to effectively foster student learning. |
| **Explanation for rating and feedback for faculty member:**      |

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

|  |
| --- |
| 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 are positive and indicate great confidence in the faculty member’s classroom teaching; examples of exceptional teaching practices are provided in observation commentary. | [ ] **Acceptable**Observations indicate that the faculty member is consistently meeting expectations, although there may be some areas identified for special focus. | [ ] **Borderline**Observations do not indicate that the faculty member is consistently meeting expectations. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Two or more observers 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 Semesters 2 and 3 |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Contextualized Data Report for Semesters 1 and 2 |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Comprehensive Self-Evaluation and Reflection |
| **Document directions to faculty member:** This document, completed by the tenure track faculty member, synthesizes all of the information received regarding teaching effectiveness throughout the first year. 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 observations, the summary of student evaluations, and the contextualized data report. 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/assessment reflections, or any other relevant sources of feedback. The Semester 3 comprehensive self-evaluation and reflection must also refer back to the self-evaluation and reflection completed for the Semester 1 portfolio, noting progress and growth. *This Comprehensive Self-Evaluation and Reflection should demonstrate the tenure track faculty member’s ability to engage in critical reflection in more depth than in the previous portfolio.* |
| 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, the student evaluation summary, and the contextualized data report 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:**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Approved ILSP with Signatures |
| Is the ILSP included with signatures from both the department chair and administrative designee? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Semester 2 Review Report |
| Is the Semester 2 Review Report included with all required signatures?  | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| If applicable, has faculty member addressed concerns from the Semester 2 Review Report? (If the faculty member had an action plan based on the Semester 2 Review Report, comment on progress below.) | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):**      |

|  |
| --- |
| ILSP Progress Report with Supporting Artifacts |
| Has the faculty member demonstrated sufficient progress on the ILSP and offered appropriate documentation as specified in the ILSP? |
| [ ] **Commendable / Exemplary**Progress report and artifacts demonstrate excellent progress on the ILSP. | [ ] **Acceptable**Progress report and artifacts show that the ILSP is progressing as expected. | [ ] **Borderline**Progress report and artifacts show that the ILSP has not progressed as much as expected. | [ ] **Unacceptable**Progress report and artifacts show that the progress on the ILSP is far below expectations. |
| **Explanation for rating:**      |

|  |
| --- |
| Semester 1 Portfolio Rubric and Any Needed Responses |
| Is the Semester 1 Portfolio Rubric included? | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| Does this portfolio satisfactorily address concerns, if any, identified in the Semester 1 Portfolio Rubric? (This would include demonstration of satisfactory progress on his/her action plan, if applicable.) | [ ] **Yes** | [ ] **No** |
| **Comments (if needed):**      |

|  |
| --- |
| 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:**      |

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.**