

Rank and Promotion Portfolio Scoring Instructions



Instructions for Reviewer:

All committee members must score all portfolio sections using this rubric before the first meeting of the Rank and Promotion Committee. Give each section of the promotion portfolio a score of 1, 2, or 3. The rubric descriptions should be used to guide assessment, but committee members should also rely on their own professional judgment. Consider whether each portfolio section demonstrates that the faculty member has excelled at the requirements of our shared profession.

Bear in mind that different disciplines have different requirements and expectations and do not expect professional excellence to look identical in faculty with different areas of expertise. The applicant's department chair and the RPC's subject-matter expert will provide guidance regarding the discipline's expectations.

All scores below a 3 must receive written feedback explaining the score. This feedback should be formative and intended to help the applicant revise or redo the portfolio so that a future application will result in promotion.

If the applicant is requesting promotion to Full Professor, expectations should be higher than for Associate Professor. "Higher expectations" may mean that the length of the narrative and the amount of evidence is on the higher side of the acceptable range (although no portfolio should be expected to **exceed** the maximum range) and/ or that the quality of the narrative and evidence are greater.

Scoring:

The decision of the committee members shall be based solely upon the content of the portfolio.. Members of the RPC will score each of the four components of the portfolio on a scale of 1-3.

A score of 1 indicates that a component is unacceptable.

A score of 2 indicates that revision is needed.

A score of 3 indicates that the component is satisfactory.

After each member of the RPC scores the portfolio, the whole committee should meet once to discuss their scores before finalizing them. All portfolio sections must receive a finalized score before a section may be returned to the application for revision. To determine a candidate's total score for each component, the department chair will add all seven reviewers' scores for that component.

Rank and Promotion Portfolio Scoring Instructions

Score	Determination
7-11	Fail
12-18	Needs revision
19-21	Pass

If a candidate receives a score of 19 or above on each of the four portfolio components, the RPC will recommend promotion.

If a candidate receives a score of 12-18 for **one** component **and the other three portfolio components receive 19 or above**, the candidate will have the opportunity to revise the single non-passing component. The candidate's department chair shall inform the candidate of the committee's decision within three (3) business days. The candidate shall be provided with the committee's feedback and must submit revisions to the candidate's department chair no later than ten (10) business days after receiving the committee's feedback. The RPC shall only accept revisions made to the single component in question. All members of the RPC must score the revised section of the portfolio before the final committee meeting. If the RPC's review of a revised portfolio component results in a score of "needs revision" or "fail," promotion shall not be recommended. Revisions received after the 10th day shall not be considered.

If a candidate receives a score of 12-18 in **two or more portfolio components** or a score below 12 for one or more component(s), the RPC will recommend that promotion not be awarded.

Rank and Promotion Scoring Rubric

Teaching Philosophy:		
<p>In 250 to 750 words, describe your teaching philosophy. A teaching philosophy should describe the values and goals that motivate your teaching, provide evidence that you put those values and goals into practice, and establish the standards by which you evaluate the quality of your teaching. Include in your response how your philosophy aligns with the college’s mission and any development or changes since last rank.</p> <p>Provide up to three (3) pieces of evidence of support.</p>		
<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 1:</p> <p>The teaching philosophy is absent, too short, or lacks specificity or coherence.</p> <p>The teaching philosophy does not clearly align with COM’s Mission.</p> <p>The teaching philosophy does not attempt to articulate the values and goals that motivate the applicant’s teaching practice.</p> <p>Supporting evidence may be absent, poorly selected, or poorly explained. The section exceeds the maximum length by more than 100 words.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 2:</p> <p>The teaching philosophy is long enough but may be poorly developed, hard to understand, or not clearly aligned with the college’s mission.</p> <p>The teaching philosophy does not clearly articulate the values and goals that motivate the applicant’s teaching practice.</p> <p>The supporting evidence provided may not adequately demonstrate that the faculty member puts their teaching philosophy into practice.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 3:</p> <p>The teaching philosophy is clear, coherent, and aligned with COM’s Mission.</p> <p>Supporting evidence is well-chosen and of high quality. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member puts their teaching philosophy into practice.</p>

Score: _____

<p>Explanation of score (required for scores under 3)</p>

Rank and Promotion Scoring Rubric

Teaching Effectiveness		
<p>In 500-1000 words, describe how you plan, prepare, and implement effective instruction. Describe how you have used student evaluations/feedback, annual performance evaluations, assessment, observation, and/or professional development activities to improve instruction. Focus should be on changes since last rank.</p> <p>Provide 3 to 10 pieces of evidence as support, including at least one syllabus and course calendar, a sample of formal student evaluations that adequately represents the time since last promotion and includes no more than one course’s evaluation per semester,* and at least one course observation report from the applicant’s supervisor.</p> <p>*Course evaluations count as one piece of evidence, regardless of how many are included.</p>		
<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 1:</p> <p>Description of teaching effectiveness is absent, too short, or lacks specificity or coherence.</p> <p>Description of teaching effectiveness does not explain how the applicant has improved instruction since the last rank, or the description is vague or superficial.</p> <p>Supporting evidence may be absent, poorly selected, or poorly explained.</p> <p>The section exceeds the maximum length by more than 100 words.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 2:</p> <p>Description of teaching effectiveness is long enough but may be poorly developed or hard to understand for an interdisciplinary audience (i.e., the description may not explain clearly enough why the improvements to instruction have in fact been improvements.)</p> <p>The supporting evidence provided may not adequately demonstrate that the faculty member’s descriptions of teaching effectiveness are accurate or that improvement has taken place. One or more of the required types of evidence may be absent (syllabus and course calendar, student evaluations, and/or classroom observation by supervisor).</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 3:</p> <p>The description of teaching effectiveness clearly explains to an interdisciplinary audience how the applicant plans, prepares, and implements effective instruction.</p> <p>The description of teaching effectiveness shows that the faculty member reflects on feedback, evaluations, assessment, and/or professional development and attempts to improve their teaching based on that reflection.</p> <p>Supporting evidence is well-chosen and of high quality. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member teaches effectively and strives for continuous improvement.</p>

Score: _____

Explanation of score (required for scores under 3)

Rank and Promotion Scoring Rubric

Service to College of the Mainland:		
In 500-1000 words, describe service to College of the Mainland and the community.		
Provide 3 to 10 pieces of evidence as support.		
<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 1:</p> <p>Description of college and community service is absent, too short, or lacks specificity or coherence.</p> <p>Supporting evidence may be absent, poorly selected, or poorly explained.</p> <p>The section exceeds the maximum length by more than 100 words.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 2:</p> <p>The description of college and community service is long enough but may be poorly developed or hard to understand.</p> <p>The supporting evidence provided may not adequately demonstrate that the applicant has taken an active role in college and community service.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 3:</p> <p>The description of service is clear, coherent, and thoroughly explains how the applicant has taken an active role in service to the college and community.</p> <p>Supporting evidence is well-chosen and of high quality. The evidence demonstrates that the applicant has taken an active role in college and community service.</p>

Score: _____

Explanation of score (required for scores under 3)

Rank and Promotion Scoring Rubric

<p>Professional Development:</p> <p>In 500-1000 words, describe professional development activities that have helped improve your instruction, college, or community service, and/or knowledge and skill in relevant areas of expertise.</p> <p>Provide 3 to 10 pieces of evidence as support. Focus should be on development since last rank.</p>		
<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 1:</p> <p>Description of professional development is absent, too short, or lacks specificity or coherence.</p> <p>The description does not explain how the professional-development activities improved the applicant’s teaching, college or community service, or knowledge and skill in relevant areas of expertise.</p> <p>Supporting evidence may be absent, poorly selected, or too old.</p> <p>The section exceeds the maximum length by more than 100 words.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 2:</p> <p>The description of professional development is long enough but may be poorly developed or hard to understand for an interdisciplinary audience (i.e., the description may not explain why the professional-development activities chosen are relevant to the applicant’s area of expertise.)</p> <p>The description may not clearly explain how the PD activities improved the applicant’s teaching, college or community service, or knowledge and skills.</p> <p>The supporting evidence provided may not adequately demonstrate that the faculty member engaged actively in the PD activity and made use of what they learned.</p>	<p>Possible Characteristics of a portfolio deserving a score of 3:</p> <p>The description of professional development activities clearly explains to an interdisciplinary audience why the activities were relevant and how they improved the applicant’s teaching, college or community service, or knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Supporting evidence is well-chosen and of high quality. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member actively engaged in professional development and applied what they learned.</p>

Score: _____

Explanation of score (required for scores under 3)