Final 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):** | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 discussion of this talent, has this faculty member exhibited reflection and evidence of growth? | | | |
| **☐ 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. |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 discussion of this talent, has this faculty member exhibited reflection and evidence of growth? | | | |
| **☐ 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. |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 discussion of this talent, has this faculty member exhibited reflection and evidence of growth? | | | |
| **☐ 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. |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 discussion of this talent, has this faculty member exhibited reflection and evidence of growth? | | | |
| **☐ 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. |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 discussion of this talent, has this faculty member exhibited appropriate and detailed plan for continued growth and service? | | | |
| **☐ 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. |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| Explanation for rating: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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:** | | | |
| To what extent does the reflection demonstrate that the faculty member recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment, and is able to use the 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:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |
| **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:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |
| **Explanation for rating:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Past Reviews | | | |
| Has the faculty member satisfactorily addressed concerns, if any, identified in previous portfolios? | | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** |
| **Comments (if needed):** | | | |
| Has the faculty member satisfactorily completed his/her action plan? | **☐ Not 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 tenure? | **☐ Yes** | **☐ No** | **☐ Not included** |
| Did the departmental vote support granting the faculty member tenure? | **☐ 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 (if needed):** | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| President’s Final Recommendation and Rationale | | |
| Once the portfolio rubric is completed and the departmental recommendation is finalized, indicate the president’s final 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 extension is recommended, explain the reasons for the extension and the expectations of the faculty member. | | |
| Is a tenure contract recommended for this faculty member? | | |
| **☐ Recommended** | **☐ Extension Recommended** | **☐ Not Recommended** |
| **Rationale for recommendation:** | | |

Name of college president:

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