PORTFOLIO EVALUATION RUBRIC—FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO FULL PROFESSOR

FACULTY NAME: _____ **DEPARTMENT:** _____ **DATE OF LAST PROMOTION:** _____

REVIEWER'S OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PORTFOLIO: ☐ **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS** ☐ **MEETS EXPECTATIONS** ☐ **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

SECTION 1 CRITERIA	Exceeds	Meets/ Yes	DNM/No	COMMENTS
Cover Page/Spine:				
Is there a cover page with name, current rank, department, division, and submission date?				
Does the info on the spine include name, department, rank applying for?				
Table of Contents:				
Is there a detailed table of contents? (Optional: laminated copy)				
Letter of Application:				
Is there a copy of the letter that was submitted to the chair of the department by October 1 indicating rank applying for?				
Opening Remarks:				
Do the opening remarks effectively set the stage/give context for the portfolio?				
Are length and readability appropriate?				
Letters of Recommendation:				
Are 7 sheet protectors provided?				
What do the letters currently included indicate about the candidate?				
Annual Faculty Performance Appraisals (reverse chronological order):				
Are all appraisals since last promotion provided (minimum of 3)?				
Do appraisals indicate consistent growth?				
Do appraisals effectively explain contributions?				
What do chair comments indicate about candidate?				
What do PRT comments indicate about candidate?				
Faculty Observation Reports (chair, PRT, or other):				
Is there one per year for each year since last promotion?				
Are any missing reports addressed by chair/PRT/candidate letters?				
What do reviewers' comments indicate about the candidate's teaching?				
Is there evidence of exemplary teaching and/or improvement?				
What is the reviewer's overall judgment of Section 1?				

Note: Associate Professors do exemplary work in **Teaching and Learning Activities,** and those activities often benefit students beyond their own classrooms. **Professional Activities** often consist of both **input and output,** continuing development of self while contributing to the development of other professionals. **Service** involves **active participation and significant contributions** to committees, task forces, etc. The candidate takes responsibility for moving the groups forward, **demonstrating leadership** not solely in position but in meaningful contributions within the groups. By the third year, the candidate should be engaging in behaviors expected of the next rank.

SECTION 2 CRITERIA	Exceeds	Meets/ Yes	DNM/No	COMMENTS
A. Teaching and Learning Activities				
Is there a clear discussion of the candidate's teaching philosophy (TP)?				
Are generalizations supported with concrete examples of how philosophy dictates teaching, assessment, and advising strategies?				
Does the narrative (which may be a part of the TP) address all of the documentation provided?				
Does the narrative/documentation cover both instruction and assessment (and advising, if this is a department expectation)?				
Is the documentation sufficient?				
Is all of the documentation the candidate's individual work, with explanations for any materials created by others?				
Does the documentation indicate competence and effectiveness?				
Is there evidence of the use of current methods/technology?				
(Optional) Does the candidate address student evaluations?				
What is the reviewer's overall judgment of this category?				
B. Professional Activities				
Does the category contain a sufficient number of professional development (learning) activities appropriate to the candidate's level?				
Does the category contain professional activities that benefit other professionals (presentations, publications, organizational memberships and roles, etc.) appropriate to the candidate's level?				
Are the activities adequately explained in the narrative (time commitment, impact, significance, etc.)?				
Are the activities adequately documented?				
What is the reviewer's overall judgment of this category?				
C. Service Activities				
Does the category contain a significant number of activities that serve the department, the division, the college, and/or the community?				
Are the activities appropriate in number, breadth, and depth for a candidate at this level?				
Does the narrative clearly explain the candidate's contributions, time commitment, and impact?				
Does the category reflect growth over the years?				
Are the activities adequately documented?				
What is the reviewer's overall judgment of this category?				

Other Comments: