

## RTP PORTFOLIO EVALUATION

### FORMAT FOR PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES AND ADMINISTRATORS

#### A. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness for retention, tenure and/or promotion is based upon the criteria established in the campus Policy on Retention and Tenure (APM 325) and the campus Policy on Promotion (APM 327). In 1994, the Academic Senate adopted the probationary plan process (APM 324) to give probationary faculty a clearer idea of the expectations for retention and tenure made specific to them. In 1997, the campus adopted the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee (APM 321). Supporting documentation should be evaluated in light of all the aforementioned documents. Documentation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching should be found primarily in **Section 8** of the RTP File.

Strong evidence of teaching effectiveness is a precondition for the granting of tenure and/or the award of promotion.

Assessments should be prepared in light of the following description of the Scholarship of Teaching as contained in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee (APM 321).

#### “Scholarship of Teaching

Demonstrate thorough understanding and current knowledge through

- clearly defined student learning objectives
- appropriate learning exercises
- prepared exercise packets
- samples of student exams and essays
- designed course materials
- creation of course software
- published research in teaching and learning
- teaching portfolio analysis”

#### EVALUATION

**For Retention and Tenure Candidates:** Quote the pertinent language from the probationary plan and analyze the stated expectations of the plan for teaching effectiveness using documentation from Section 8 of the file (or lack thereof when documentation is not present) showing how the candidate is / is not meeting the stated expectations of the probationary plan in this area. As appropriate, assessments should reference the scholarship of teaching as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

**For Tenured Promotion Candidates:** Quote the pertinent criteria as stated in the campus Policy on Promotion (APM 327) and analyze how the candidate has met / not met each element contained in the criteria for promotion related to teaching effectiveness based on the documentation from Section 8 of the file (or lack thereof when documentation is not present). As appropriate, assessments should reference the scholarship of teaching as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

#### AREAS TARGETED FOR IMPROVEMENT

**For Retention and Tenure Candidates:** As appropriate, itemize goals and specific steps to be taken to improve performance on each aspect of the probationary plan dealing with teaching effectiveness. As appropriate, steps should reference the scholarship of teaching as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

**For Tenured Promotion Candidates:** As appropriate and using each element contained in the campus criteria for promotion, itemize goals and specific steps to be taken to improve performance on each criteria addressing teaching effectiveness. As appropriate, steps should reference the scholarship of teaching as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

#### **CRITERIA TO EVALUATE IMPROVEMENT**

**Retention and Tenure Candidates:** As appropriate, outline specific measures to be used in evaluating the expected improvement.

**Tenured Promotion Candidates:** As appropriate, outline specific measures to be used in evaluating the expected improvement.

**ONLY MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THE RTP FILE SHALL BE CONSIDERED.**

(Revised 6/02)

## **B. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

The evaluation of professional growth and scholarly activity for retention, tenure and/or promotion is based upon the criteria established in the campus Policy on Retention and Tenure (APM 325) and the campus Policy on Promotion (APM 327). In 1994, the Academic Senate adopted the probationary plan process (APM 324) to give probationary faculty a clearer idea of expectations for retention and tenure made specific to them. In 1997, the campus adopted the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee (APM 321). Supporting documentation should be reviewed in light of all the aforementioned documents. Documentation of the candidate's performance in the area of professional growth and scholarly activity should be found primarily in **Section 9** of the RTP File.

Assessments should be prepared in light of the following definitions of scholarship as contained in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee (APM 321).

### **“Scholarship of Application**

Using knowledge to address demanding, substantive human problems by

- conducting applied research and evaluation
- providing technical assistance
- developing new products, practices, clinical procedures, new artistic works
- consultation with community organizations
- performing clinical service
- promoting experiential learning and professional development

### **Scholarship of Integration**

Make connections across/within disciplines by

- designing new courses
- writing textbooks
- developing videocassettes and television programs
- writing for nonspecialists
- sponsoring colloquia and forums
- preparing cross-disciplinary seminars
- shaping a core curriculum
- preparing quality computer software
- integration of professional experiences in courses

### **Scholarship of Discovery**

Critically evaluated and professionally recognized

- journal articles
- monographs
- proceedings
- poems
- stories
- artistic creations
- awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work
- public performances
- published books
- public presentations”

## **EVALUATION**

**For Retention and Tenure Candidates:** Quote the pertinent language from the probationary plan and analyze the stated expectations of the plan for professional growth and scholarly activity using documentation from **Section 9** of the file (or lack thereof when documentation is not present) showing how the candidate is / is not meeting the stated expectations of the probationary plan in this area. As appropriate, assessments should reference the scholarship of

application, integration or discovery as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

**For Tenured Promotion Candidates:** Quote the pertinent criteria as stated in the campus Policy on Promotion (APM 327) and analyze how the candidate has met / not met the criteria for promotion related to professional growth and scholarly activity based on the documentation from **Section 9** of the file (or lack thereof when documentation is not present). As appropriate, assessments should reference the scholarship of application, integration or discovery as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

#### **AREAS TARGETED FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**For Retention and Tenure Candidates:** As appropriate, itemize goals and specific steps to be taken to improve performance on each aspect of the probationary plan dealing with professional growth and scholarly activity. As appropriate, the steps should reference the scholarship of application, integration or discovery as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

**For Tenured Promotion Candidates:** As appropriate and using the campus criteria for promotion, itemize goals and specific steps to be taken to improve performance in the criteria addressing professional growth and scholarly activity. As appropriate, the steps should reference the scholarship of application, integration or discovery as described in the Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee.

#### **CRITERIA TO EVALUATE IMPROVEMENT**

**Retention and Tenure Candidates:** As appropriate, outline specific measures to be used in evaluating the expected improvement.

**Tenured Promotion Candidates:** As appropriate, outline specific measures to be used in evaluating the expected improvement.

**ONLY MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THE RTP FILE SHALL BE CONSIDERED.**

(Revised 6/02)

## **UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE AND OVERALL EVALUATION OF PROGRESS**

The evaluation of university and public service for retention, tenure and/or promotion is based upon the criteria established in the campus Policy on Retention and Tenure (APM 325) and the campus Policy on Promotion (APM 327). In 1994, the Academic Senate adopted the probationary plan process (APM 324) to give probationary faculty a clearer idea of expectations for retention and tenure made specific to them. Supporting documentation should be reviewed in light of all the aforementioned documents. Documentation of the candidate's performance in the area of professional growth and scholarly activity should be found primarily in **Section 10** of the RTP File.

### **EVALUATION**

**For Retention and Tenure Candidates:** Quote the pertinent language from the probationary plan and analyze the stated expectations of the plan for university and public service using documentation from **Section 10** of the file (or lack thereof when documentation is not present) showing how the candidate is / is not meeting the stated expectations of the probationary plan in this area.

**For Tenured Promotion Candidates:** Quote the pertinent criteria as stated in the campus Policy on Promotion (APM 327) and analyze how the candidate has met / not met the criteria for promotion related to university and public service based on the documentation from **Section 10** of the file (or lack thereof when documentation is not present).

### **AREAS TARGETED FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**Retention and Tenure Candidates:** As appropriate, itemize goals and specific steps to be taken to improve performance on each aspect of the probationary plan dealing with university and public service.

**Tenured Promotion Candidates:** As appropriate and using the campus criteria for promotion, itemize goals and specific steps to be taken to improve performance on each element of the criteria addressing university and public service.

### **CRITERIA TO EVALUATE IMPROVEMENT**

**Retention and Tenure Candidates:** As appropriate, outline specific measures to be used in evaluating the expected improvement.

**Tenured Promotion Candidates:** As appropriate, outline specific measures to be used in evaluating the expected improvement.

**ONLY MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THE RTP FILE SHALL BE CONSIDERED.**

### **D. OVERALL EVALUATION OF PROGRESS**

Provide a **specific recommendation** and a summary of the overall evaluation of the candidate for retention, tenure, and/or promotion as indicated by the evaluations for each area.

**ONLY MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THE RTP FILE SHALL BE CONSIDERED.**

(Revised 6/05)