

## PORTFOLIO EVALUATION RUBRIC—FROM INSTRUCTOR TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (WITH TENURE)

*The questions below are intended to guide the reviewer; they are not a checklist. Neither the inclusion of every item nor the exclusion of any item is grounds for automatic approval or denial.*

FACULTY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF HIRE/LAST PROMOTION: \_\_\_\_\_

SECTION 1	COMMENTS
<b>Cover Page/Spine:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a cover page with name, current rank, department, division, and submission date?</li> <li>Traditional: Does spine include name, department, and rank applying for?</li> </ul>	
<b>Table of Contents:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a detailed table of contents?</li> </ul>	
<b>Letter of Application:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a copy of the letter that was submitted to the chair of the department by October 1 indicating rank applying for?</li> </ul>	
<b>Opening Remarks:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the opening remarks effectively set the stage/give context for the portfolio?</li> <li>Are length and readability appropriate?</li> </ul>	
<b>Letters of Recommendation:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What do the letters currently included indicate about the candidate?</li> </ul>	
<b>Annual Faculty Performance Appraisals (reverse chronological order):</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are all appraisals since last promotion provided (minimum of 3)?</li> <li>Do appraisals indicate growth over the years?</li> <li>Do appraisals effectively explain contributions?</li> <li>What do chair comments indicate about candidate?</li> <li>What do PRT comments indicate about candidate?</li> <li>Are any irregularities explained?</li> </ul>	
<b>Faculty Observation Reports (chair, PRT, or other; traditional or online):</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Year 1: first semester (2 consecutive classes), second semester (1)</li> <li>Year 2: two observations</li> <li>Year 3: two observations</li> <li>Year 4: one completed by portfolio deadline</li> <li>What do reviewers' comments indicate about the candidate's teaching?</li> <li>Is there evidence of exemplary teaching and/or improvement?</li> <li>Are any missing reports explained?</li> </ul>	
<b>What is the reviewer's overall judgment of Section 1?</b>	

At the instructor level, significantly more than one-third of total effort may be allocated to **teaching, assessment, and advising duties**. **Professional** and **Service Activities** are often **learning-focused** (e.g., professional development and involvement in service activities that enable the Instructor to learn more about college resources, issues, and initiatives). By the third year, to demonstrate growth and exceed expectations, the candidate should be engaging in behaviors expected of the next rank.

SECTION 2	COMMENTS
<b>Teaching and Learning Activities</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a clear discussion of the candidate’s teaching philosophy?</li> <li>• Are generalizations supported with concrete examples of how philosophy dictates teaching, assessment, and advising strategies?</li> <li>• Does the narrative (which may separate from or integrated into the Teaching Philosophy) address all of the documentation provided?</li> <li>• Does the narrative/documentation cover both instruction and assessment (and advising, if this is a department expectation)?</li> <li>• Is the documentation sufficient?</li> <li>• Is all of the documentation the candidate’s individual work, with explanations for any materials created by others?</li> <li>• Does the documentation indicate competence and effectiveness?</li> <li>• Is there evidence of the use of current methods/technology in pedagogy and content?</li> <li>• (Optional) If the candidate includes student evaluations, what do they indicate?</li> </ul>	
<b>Professional Activities</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the category contain a sufficient number of professional development (learning) activities (pedagogical, technological, content area, recertification, etc.) appropriate to the candidate’s level?</li> <li>• Does the category contain professional activities that benefit other professionals (presentations, publications, organizational memberships and roles, etc.) appropriate to the candidate’s level?</li> <li>• Are the activities adequately explained in the narrative (time commitment, impact, significance, etc.)?</li> <li>• Are the activities adequately documented?</li> </ul>	
<b>Service Activities</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the category contain a sufficient number of activities distributed over one or more of these areas: the department, the division, the college, or the community?</li> <li>• Are the activities appropriate in number, breadth, and depth for a candidate at this level?</li> <li>• Does the narrative clearly explain the candidate’s contributions, time commitment, and impact?</li> <li>• Does the category reflect growth over the years?</li> <li>• Are the activities adequately documented?</li> </ul>	
<b>Presentation</b> Is the portfolio professionally presented, clear, and easy to follow?	

**REVIEWER’S OVERALL EVALUATION:**