* Top of Form

This report is a consolidation of the review panel's assessment of the year-2 portfolio. 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.

Bottom of Form

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty Candidate’s Name |  | Meeting Date |  |
| 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): | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Background and Documentation from Year-1  These are not assessed; however, they must be included in the Year-2 portfolio. | | |
| YES | NO | Educational & Professional Background (Brief Resume) |
| YES | NO | ILP Report |
| Updated Transcripts | | |
| YES | NO | Professional Development Transcripts |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Professional Philosophy***  *The candidate explains how and why he/she conducts his/her professional practice. Evidence of philosophy should align with the portfolio work (departmental assignments notwithstanding).* | | | |
| *One* | *Achievement Level* | *Criteria Statement* | *Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement* |
|  | *Incomplete /*  *Not Yet Acceptable* | *Philosophy not clearly stated or does not support teaching and learning* |  |
|  | *Acceptable* | *Philosophy clearly stated and supports teaching & learning; portfolio work aligns with aspects of the philosophy* |
|  | *Exemplary* | *Acceptable + insightful* |
| ***Effective Presentation of Entire ILP*** | | | |
| *One* | *Achievement Level* | *Criteria Statement* | *Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement* |
|  | *Incomplete /*  *Not Yet Acceptable* | *Not written clearly or coherently; not presented and edited professionally* |  |
|  | *Acceptable* | *Written clearly and coherently; presented and edited professionally* |
|  | *Exemplary* | *Acceptable + polished presentation* |

**FACULTY LEARNING OUTCOME #1: Action Research Project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #1** | **Clear Goals**  Abstract: Clear and concise summary of project’s purpose, methods, and results  Research Question included and aligned with the FLO | | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | 1 | Abstract not clearly stated | | | |  |
| 2 | RQ is not clearly stated and/or does not relate to student learning. | | | |
|  | Acceptable | | 1 | Abstract includes purpose, methods, and results of project | | | |
| 2 | RQ is clearly stated and relates to student learning and aligned with FLO | | | |
|  | Exemplary | | 1 | Acceptable + clearly articulated and concise | | | |
| 2 | RQ is polished and aligned with FLO | | | |
| **FLO #1** | **Adequate Preparation for ARP**  Discussion of candidate's reflection (Self-perspective) and consultation with others (Student, Colleague, and Expert perspectives) that helped prepare him/her for this project. See the [Action Research Elements](http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/development/programs/tla/actionResearch/elementsadequatepreparation.cfm) for relevant questions candidates address in each perspective. | | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Discussion of four perspectives (student, colleague, expert, and self) insufficient to document relevant information; one or more perspectives missing | | | | |  |
|  | Acceptable | | Documents the relevant information from four perspectives in relation to the question | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + integrates and synthesizes the relevant information | | | | |
| **FLO #1** | **Appropriate Methods for ARP**   1. Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 2. Performance Indicators 3. Teaching Strategies of SLO 4. Assessment Strategies of SLO 5. Action Research Methodology Design | | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | | | Comments on Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | 1 | SLO not results-oriented, not clearly written nor measurable | | | |  |
| 2 | Indicators do not identify the incremental traits of mastery | | | |
| 3 | Strategies not appropriate for achieving the SLO | | | |
| 4 | Assessment(s) do not adequately measure the identified indicators | | | |
| 5 | The AR methodology design may not be replicable and does not provide feedback that informs your practice | | | |
|  | Acceptable | | 1 | SLO results-oriented, clearly written & measurable | | | |  |
| 2 | Indicators identify the incremental traits of mastery | | | |
| 3 | Teaching strategies appropriate for achieving the SLO | | | |
| 4 | Assessment(s) measure the identified indicators; some formative & summative assessment tools evident | | | |
| 5 | The AR methodology design is replicable and provides feedback that  informs your practice | | | |
|  | Exemplary | | 1 | SLO results-oriented, clearly written, measurable, and critical to teaching and learning | | | |  |
| 2 | Indicators clearly identify the incremental traits of mastery and sequenced for optimum learning | | | |
| 3 | Teaching strategies appropriate for achieving the SLO; follows the rigors of the discipline | | | |
| 4 | Assessment(s) measure the identified indicators; comprehensive set of formative and summative assessment tools evident | | | |
| 5 | The AR methodology design is replicable and provides feedback that informs your practice; feedback informs you in areas you were seeking to improve | | | |
| **FLO #1** | **Significant Results for ARP**  *Project Results*   * Evidence (supporting artifacts) sufficient to demonstrate the achievement of the FLO * Explanation of the evidence (supporting artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has learned, achieved, or accomplished the FLO * Student work/feedback, if applicable, documents the achievement of the goals of the FLO (not necessarily relevant to all FLOs) | | | | | | | |
|  | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | | | Comments on Strengths / Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Results are not analyzed in relation to the original question | | | | |  |
|  | Acceptable | | Results are analyzed in relation to the original question | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + description of how results will inform your practice and impact student learning are included | | | | |
| **FLO #1** | **General Reflection on the ARP**  In general, candidate reflects on what was learned while completing the Action Research Project and how this might improve future work. | | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | AR project is only summarized or reviewed | | | | |  |
|  | Acceptable | | Reflection relates students’ and candidate’s learning to the research project and includes plan for improvement | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + insightful analysis with clear plans for revision | | | | |
| **FLO #1** | **Critical Evaluation of Each Essential Competency in ARP**   * Explanation of how the methods used to demonstrate this Essential Competency in this FLO aided student learning and helped the candidate to become a better counselor, teacher, or librarian * Explanation of how the methods used in demonstrating this Essential Competency might be improved * References to candidate's general practice outside the portfolio should be omitted * Approximately 1/2 page to 1 page for each specified Essential Competency | | | | | | | |
| Competencies | | Check  Competencies  Demonstrated in this FLO | Incomplete/ Not Yet Acceptable | | Acceptable | Exemplary | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | | Assess only the checked competencies | Insufficient critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate this Essential Competency in this FLO: little or no discussion of possible improvements | | Competent critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate the selected indicators of this Essential Competency in this FLO; sufficient discussion of possible improvements | Acceptable + insightful discussion of possible improvements | |  |
| Assessment | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Inclusion and Diversity | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| L-C Teaching Strategies | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| LIfemap | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Outcomes-based Practice | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Professional Commitment | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| SoTL | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| **FLO**  **# 1** | **Effective Presentation of Entire FLO** | | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | |
|  | Not Yet Acceptable | | Not written clearly or coherently; not presented and edited professionally | | | |  | |
|  | Acceptable | | Written clearly and coherently; presented and edited professionally; uploaded in ARP builder | | | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + polished presentation | | | |

**FACULTY LEARNING OUTCOME #2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #2** | **Adequate Preparation**  **Faculty Learning Outcome statement**  Explanation of what the candidate did to prepare to achieve the FLO (workshops, books, articles, conversations, etc.) | | |
| One | Achievement Level | Criteria Statement | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | FLO not stated; preparation to achieve the FLO is not present, relevant or not clearly described |  |
|  | Acceptable | FLO stated; preparation to achieve the FLO is present, relevant, clearly described & adequate to achieve the FLO |
|  | Exemplary | Acceptable + indicates and synthesizes the relevant scholarship/pedagogy |
| **FLO #2** | **Appropriate Methods**  **Methodology(ies) clearly described and appropriate for achieving FLO**  Specific teaching methods, student learning activities, and assessment methods described (if applicable); procedures/steps followed to achieve FLO explained, etc. | | |
| One | Achievement Level | Criteria Statement | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | Methodology(ies) is inappropriate for achieving the FLO; description unclear; or assessment plan not present or adequate |  |
|  | Acceptable | Methodology(ies) is appropriate for achieving the FLO; description is clear; and assessment plan is adequate to gauge the effectiveness of the FLO |
|  | Exemplary | Acceptable + methodology(ies)follows the rigors of the discipline and assessment plan is comprehensive |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #2** | **Significant Results**   * Evidence (supporting artifacts) sufficient to demonstrate the achievement of the FLO * Explanation of the evidence (supporting artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has achieved the FLO * Student work/feedback, if applicable, documents the achievement of the goals of the FLO (not necessarily relevant to all FLOs) | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | | |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Evidence (artifacts) is insufficient to demonstrate FLO or not clearly explained; little or no evidence of student feedback/work, if applicable | |  | | |
|  | Acceptable | | Evidence (artifacts) is sufficient to demonstrate FLO and clearly explained: includes student feedback/work, if applicable | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + results insightfully explained; opens additional questions for further exploration, if applicable | |
| **FLO #2** | **GENERAL REFLECTION**  In general, candidate reflects on what was learned while completing the FLO and how this might improve future work (approximately 1/2 page to 1 page for the reflection). | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | | |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Insufficient reflection on what was learned while completing this FLO: little or no discussion of possible improvements | |  | | |
|  | Acceptable | | Competent reflection on what was learned while completing this FLO: sufficient discussion of possible improvements | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + insightful analysis with clear plans for revision | |
| **FLO #2** | **Reflective Critique: Critical ANaLYSIS OF Each CHECKED Competency**   * Explanation of how the methods used to demonstrate this Essential Competency in this FLO aided student learning and helped the candidate to become a better counselor, teacher, or librarian * Explanation of how the methods used in demonstrating this Essential Competency might be improved. * References to candidate's general practice outside the portfolio should be omitted * Approximately 1/2 page to 1 page for each specified Essential Competency | | | | | | |
| Competencies | | Check  Competencies  Demonstrated in this FLO | Incomplete/ Not Yet Acceptable | Acceptable | Exemplary | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | | Assess only the checked competencies | Insufficient critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate this Essential Competency in this FLO: little or no discussion of possible improvements | Competent critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate the selected indicators of this Essential Competency in this FLO; sufficient discussion of possible improvements | Acceptable + insightful discussion of possible improvements | |  |
| Assessment | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Inclusion and Diversity | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| L-C Teaching Strategies | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| LIfemap | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Outcomes-based Practice | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Professional Commitment | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| SoTL | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **FLO**  **# 2** | **Effective Presentation of Entire FLO** | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | |
|  | Not Yet Acceptable | | Not written clearly or coherently; not presented and edited professionally | | |  | |
|  | Acceptable | | Written clearly and coherently; presented and edited professionally | | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + polished presentation | | |

**FACULTY LEARNING OUTCOME #3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLO #3** | **Adequate Preparation**  **Faculty Learning Outcome statement**  Explanation of what the candidate did to prepare to achieve the FLO (workshops, books, articles, conversations, etc.) | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | | |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | FLO not stated; preparation to achieve the FLO is not present, relevant or not clearly described | |  | | |
|  | Acceptable | | FLO stated; preparation to achieve the FLO is present, relevant, clearly described & adequate to achieve the FLO | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + indicates and synthesizes the relevant scholarship/pedagogy | |
| **FLO #3** | **Appropriate Methods**  **Methodology(ies) clearly described and appropriate for achieving FLO**  Specific teaching methods, student learning activities, and assessment methods described (if applicable); procedures/steps followed to achieve FLO explained, etc. | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | | |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Methodology(ies) is inappropriate for achieving the FLO; description unclear; or assessment plan not present or adequate | |  | | |
|  | Acceptable | | Methodology(ies) is appropriate for achieving the FLO; description is clear; and assessment plan is adequate to gauge the effectiveness of the FLO | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + methodology(ies)follows the rigors of the discipline and assessment plan is comprehensive | |
| **FLO #3** | **Significant Results**   * Evidence (supporting artifacts) sufficient to demonstrate the achievement of the FLO * Explanation of the evidence (supporting artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has achieved the FLO * Student work/feedback, if applicable, documents the achievement of the goals of the FLO (not necessarily relevant to all FLOs) | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | | |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Evidence (artifacts) is insufficient to demonstrate FLO or not clearly explained; little or no evidence of student feedback/work, if applicable | |  | | |
|  | Acceptable | | Evidence (artifacts) is sufficient to demonstrate FLO and clearly explained: includes student feedback/work, if applicable | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + results insightfully explained; opens additional questions for further exploration, if applicable | |
| **FLO #3** | **GENERAL REFLECTION**  In general, candidate reflects on what was learned while completing the FLO and how this might improve future work (approximately 1/2 page to 1 page for the reflection). | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | | |
|  | Incomplete /  Not Yet Acceptable | | Insufficient reflection on what was learned while completing this FLO: little or no discussion of possible improvements | |  | | |
|  | Acceptable | | Competent reflection on what was learned while completing this FLO: sufficient discussion of possible improvements | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + insightful analysis with clear plans for revision | |
| **FLO #3** | **Reflective Critique: Critical ANaLYSIS OF Each CHECKED Competency**   * Explanation of how the methods used to demonstrate this Essential Competency in this FLO aided student learning and helped the candidate to become a better counselor, teacher, or librarian * Explanation of how the methods used in demonstrating this Essential Competency might be improved. * References to candidate's general practice outside the portfolio should be omitted * Approximately 1/2 page to 1 page for each specified Essential Competency | | | | | | |
| Competencies | | Check  Competencies  Demonstrated in this FLO | Incomplete/ Not Yet Acceptable | Acceptable | Exemplary | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | | Assess only the checked competencies | Insufficient critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate this Essential Competency in this FLO: little or no discussion of possible improvements | Competent critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate the selected indicators of this Essential Competency in this FLO; sufficient discussion of possible improvements | Acceptable + insightful discussion of possible improvements | |  |
| Assessment | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Inclusion and Diversity | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| L-C Teaching Strategies | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| LIfemap | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Outcomes-based Practice | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Professional Commitment | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| SoTL | |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **FLO**  **# 3** | **Effective Presentation of Entire FLO** | | | | | | |
| One | Achievement Level | | Criteria Statement | | | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement | |
|  | Not Yet Acceptable | | Not written clearly or coherently; not presented and edited professionally | | |  | |
|  | Acceptable | | Written clearly and coherently; presented and edited professionally | | |
|  | Exemplary | | Acceptable + polished presentation | | |

**Essential Competency demonstration for entire portfolio**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **confirm that each of the 7 essental competencies was demonstrated by the candidate in written reflection within the portfolio, either inside the FLOs or in a separate section.** | | |
| Assessment | Yes | No |
| Inclusion and Diversity | Yes | No |
| L-C Teaching Strategies | Yes | No |
| LIfemap | Yes | No |
| Outcomes-based Practice | Yes | No |
| Professional Commitment | Yes | No |
| SoTL | Yes | No |

**Competency Demonstrated Outside the FLOs (IF applicable)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Essential Competency Demonstrated Outside FLOs**   * Candidate discusses the preparation and process undertaken to address the specified Essential Competency in the candidate’s practice. * Candidate provides evidence (supporting artifacts) sufficient to demonstrate growth in the specified Essential Competency, including student work if applicable. * Candidate provides critical evaluation of the methods and the results of this evidence.   + - * + Explanation of how the methods used to demonstrate the Essential Competency aided student learning and/or helped the candidate to become a better counselor, teacher, or librarian.         + Explanation of how the methods used in demonstrating this Essential Competency might be improved. | | |
| One | Achievement Level | Criteria Statement | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Incomplete/Not Yet Acceptable | * Insufficient discussion of the preparation and process undertaken to demonstrate the specified Essential Competency * Insufficient evidence to document demonstration of the specified Essential Competency * Insufficient critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate the Essential Competency * Little or no discussion of possible improvements |  |
|  | Acceptable | * Competent discussion of the preparation and process undertaken to demonstrate the specified Essential Competency * Sufficient evidence to document demonstration of the specified Essential Competency * Competent critical evaluation of methods and results used to demonstrate the Essential Competency * Sufficient discussion of possible improvements |
|  | Exemplary | Acceptable + insightful discussion of preparation, process, evidence, and possible improvements |
| **Effective Presentation for Competency Demonstrated Outside the FLOs** | | |  |
| One | Achievement Level | Criteria Statement | Comments on Strengths/Recommendations for Improvement |
|  | Not Yet Acceptable | Not written clearly or coherently; not presented and edited professionally |  |
|  | Acceptable | Written clearly and coherently; presented and edited professionally |
|  | Exemplary | Acceptable + polished presentation |