This report is a consolidation of the review panels' assessment of the Individualized Learning Plan. It is completed by the dean or the dean's designee. All panelists, including the dean, will "sign off" after reviewing the completed report. The report is then sent to the candidate and the TLA within two weeks of the panel review meeting.

***Complete the gray form fields below. Advance by using the “tab” key.***

* Only mark achievement levels “Acceptable” if they actually meet the criteria.
* Candidates are not required to improve sections assessed “Acceptable.”
* “Effective Presentation” achievement levels are assessed after each major section.
* **Dean sends the report to panelists for review and approval prior to sending the report to candidate.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty Candidate’s Name |  | Meeting Date |  |
| *In inserting the “Date Report Reviewed” by the panelists, the dean confirms that all panelists have reviewed*  *the report and approve of the evaluation and comments.* | | | |
| Dean’s Name |  | Date Report Reviewed |  |
| Panelist Name |  | Date Report Reviewed |  |
| Panelist Name |  | Date Report Reviewed |  |
| Panelist Name |  | Date Report Reviewed |  |
| Date Report Sent to Candidate and TLA | | |  |
| General Comments (if any): | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate’s Context | | Please Note: Beside the written ILP, the ILP review is an oral presentation. The candidate provides only the written ILP; no other portfolio artifacts are required at this time. | | |
|  |  | One | | comments / Recommendations for Improvement |
| Educational & Professional Background Included? | Offers insight into the relevant educational & professional background of the candidate, not an extensive resume | YES | NO |  |
| Candidate’s Workload Context Discussed? | Course titles, preps, labs, clinicals, coordinator positions, etc. | YES | NO |  |
| Candidates Professional Strengths Discussed? | Candidate describes in broad terms the skills, abilities & experiences brought to the position. | YES | NO |  |
| Candidate’s Professional Philosophy Discussed? | In 1-2 pages, candidate explains “how do I conduct my professional practice,” and “why do I choose that way.”  Examples to illustrate how the candidate’s philosophy is reflected in his/her practice are provided. | YES | NO |  |

**FACULTY LEARNING OUTCOME #1 (Action research)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #1** | | **Guidelines for Assessing the Faculty Learning Outcome** | | **Candidate supplies an FLO Statement and a research question.**  Only the FLO Statement is evaluated for achievement level.  Feedback is provided for the research question. | | | | | |
| guidelines | | | | One | | | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement | |
| ***Is the FLO Statement . . .*** | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Clearly connected to the candidate’s Needs Assessment?** | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **Describing a learning result related to improving student learning?**  *Explains what the faculty member will be able to do in terms of improving student learning, as applicable.* | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **Specific**?  *Addresses no more than one result/trait.* | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **Action-oriented?**  *Can the faculty member take action as a result of findings?* | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **Cognitively Appropriate?**  *Action verb identifies desired cognitive level of student & faculty learning.* | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **Clearly stated?**  *Meaning is clear to all disciplines.* | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **Assessable?**  *Are measurable results achievable?* | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **FLO #1** | | **Evaluation of FLO statement #1** | | **Check the appropriate achievement level.**  Outcome Statements must be “acceptable” before the candidate moves to the implementation phase. | | | | | |
| ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL | | | | One | | | | CRITERIA STATEMENT | |
| Incomplete / Not Yet Acceptable | | | |  | | | | FLO unclear, not assessable, does not relate to teaching & learning and/or the needs assessment. | |
| Acceptable | | | |  | | | | FLO clear, assessable, relates to teaching & learning and needs assessment. | |
| **FLO #1** | | **Feedback on FLO and PRoposed research design** | | **Plans are not evaluated for achievement level; however, feedback is needed for improvement.** | | | | | |
| guidelines | | | | One | | | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement | |
| Are the applicable Essential Competencies identified? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Are the conditions identified? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Are the four lenses addressed (self, students, colleagues, and experts)? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Is the student learning outcome stated? . | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Are the teaching strategies to achieve the stated outcome described? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Are the assessment strategies to achieve the stated outcome described? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Is the action research design described? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Are the products/evidence of learning identified? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| **FLO #1** | | **Guidelines for Feedback on the Action research question** | | **The research question is not evaluated for achievement level; however, feedback is needed for improvement**. (If more than one RQ, copy and paste this section.) | | | | | |
| guidelines | | | | One | | | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement | |
| ***Is the Research Question . . .***  (In some cases an FLO may have more than one RQ.) | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Clearly connected to the candidate’s FLO? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Significant and related to improving student learning? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Are the methods under the candidate’s control? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Feasible in terms of time, effort and available resources? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Clearly stated? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| Addressing no more than one result/trait? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |
| A question that can be answered by the data that will be collected? | | | | YES | | NO | |  | |

**FACULTY LEARNING OUTCOME #2**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #2** | **Guidelines for Assessing the Faculty Learning Outcome** |  | | |
| guidelines | | One | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
| ***Is the FLO Statement . . .*** | |  |  |  |
| **Clearly connected to the candidate’s Needs Assessment?** | | YES | NO |  |
| **Describing a learning result related to improving student learning?**  *Explains what the faculty member will be able to do in terms of improving student learning, as applicable.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Specific**?  *Addresses no more than one result/trait.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Action-oriented?**  *Can the faculty member take action as a result of findings?* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Cognitively Appropriate?**  *Action verb identifies desired cognitive level of student & faculty learning.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Clearly stated?**  *Meaning is clear to all disciplines.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Assessable?**  *Are measurable results achievable?* | | YES | NO |  |
| **FLO #2** | **Evaluation of FLO STATEMENT #2** | **Check the appropriate achievement level.**  Outcome Statements must be “acceptable” before the candidate moves to the implementation phase. | | |
| Incomplete / Not Yet Acceptable | |  | | FLO unclear, not assessable, does not relate to teaching & learning and/or the needs assessment. |
| Acceptable | |  | | FLO clear, assessable, relates to teaching & learning and needs assessment. |
| **FLO #2** | **feedback on FLO** | **Plans are not evaluated for achievement level; however, feedback is needed for improvement.** | | |
| guidelines | | One | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
| Are the applicable Essential Competencies identified? | | YES | NO |  |
| Are the conditions identified? | | YES | NO |  |
| Are the products/evidence of learning identified? | | YES | NO |  |

**FACULTY LEARNING OUTCOME #3**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #3** | **Guidelines for Assessing the Faculty Learning Outcome** |  | | |
| guidelines | | One | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
| ***Is the FLO Statement . . .*** | |  |  |  |
| **Clearly connected to the candidate’s Needs Assessment?** | | YES | NO |  |
| **Describing a learning result related to improving student learning?**  *Explains what the faculty member will be able to do in terms of improving student learning, as applicable.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Specific**?  *Addresses no more than one result/trait.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Action-oriented?**  *Can the faculty member take action as a result of findings?* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Cognitively Appropriate?**  *Action verb identifies desired cognitive level of student & faculty learning.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Clearly stated?**  *Meaning is clear to all disciplines.* | | YES | NO |  |
| **Assessable?**  *Are measurable results achievable?* | | YES | NO |  |
| **FLO #3** | **Evaluation of FLO STATEMENT #3** | **Check the appropriate achievement level.**  Outcome Statements must be “acceptable” before the candidate moves to the implementation phase. | | |
| Incomplete / Not Yet Acceptable | |  | | FLO unclear, not assessable, does not relate to teaching & learning and/or the needs assessment. |
| Acceptable | |  | | FLO clear, assessable, relates to teaching & learning and needs assessment. |
| **FLO #3** | **feedback on FLO** | **Plans are not evaluated for achievement level; however, feedback is needed for improvement.** | | |
| guidelines | | One | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
| Are the applicable Essential Competencies identified? | | YES | NO |  |
| Are the conditions identified? | | YES | NO |  |
| Are the products/evidence of learning identified? | | YES | NO |  |

If a FLO(s) statement is deemed *not yet acceptable,* the candidate is required to resubmit the revised FLO(s) statement to his or her dean within two weeks upon receiving the written review. The dean will ensure that the candidate makes the necessary revisions based on panel recommendations before final approval of the FLO(s) statement and communicates approval to the candidate and panel.

When an FLO Statement receives an “acceptable or “exemplary” rating, the candidate has been approved to develop the learning outcome for the portfolio work.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PRofessional Development** | | | |
| Feedback | One | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
| Are the professional development efforts/plans for the ILP identified? | YES | NO |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effective Presentation of the Entire ILP** | | | | |
| guidelines | | One | | Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
| Incomplete / Not Yet Acceptable | Not written clearly or coherently; not presented & edited professionally. | YES | NO |  |
| Acceptable | Written clearly and coherently; presented & edited professionally. | YES | NO |  |
| Exemplary | Acceptable and polished presentation. | YES | NO |  |

|  |
| --- |
| *Please note:*  Candidates will explain their understanding of each Essential Competency in general terms and give examples from their practices and/or their FLO ideas. Since candidates will not have begun to implement their FLOs, any examples from their FLO ideas will be conceptualizations. Candidates should be able to describe how they plan to add depth and specificity to their understanding of the Essential Competencies as they work on their FLOs and complete their portfolios. |

ESSENTIAL COMPETENCIES OF A VALENCIA EDUCATOR

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Essential Competency | Exemplary | Acceptable | Not Yet Acceptable | Strengths/ Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | *Candidate has gained comprehension-level understanding of the Essential Competency and can relate this understanding to classroom / professional practice.* | *Candidate has gained comprehension-level understanding of the Essential Competency.* | *Candidate has not yet gained comprehension-level understanding of the Essential Competency.* |  |
| Assessment as a Tool for Learning |  |  |  |  |
| Inclusion & Diversity |  |  |  |  |
| Learning-centered Teaching Strategies |  |  |  |  |
| LifeMap |  |  |  |  |
| Outcomes-based Practice |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Commitment |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarship of Teaching & Learning |  |  |  |  |