California State University, Long Beach

# 2024-2025 Periodic “Mini” Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

## College of Education Department Peer Committee’s Review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EMPLOYEE’S NAME** | \*\*Click to enter Employee Name |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DEPARTMENT** | \*\*Click to enter Department Name |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COMMITTEE MEMBERS** | \*\*Click to enter all Committee Member Names |

**The employee will be evaluated by the DEPARTMENT PEER COMMITTEE in the following areas:**

|  |
| --- |
| **INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONALLY-RELATED ACTIVITIES** The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s instruction and instructionally-related activities during the period under review. Committee members shall consider all material submitted in the RTP file including the narrative, PDS, and supplementary file(s).  Committee members shall reference the [University](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/content_faculty-resources-support_ps09-10_2016-10-24.pdf) and [College of Education](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/ced_2018_rtp_policy.pdf) RTP policies available on the [Faculty Affairs website](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp-policies) for specific expectations to ensure alignment with the policies. Committee members shall reference College of Education RTP policy section 6.0 Reappointment and Promotion Level Criteria, beginning on page 15, when evaluating the minimum expectations for the candidate’s periodic mini review. |
| **Provide a holistic evaluation of the following:**   * The candidate’s instructional philosophy and its alignment with their discipline and the needs of their students. * How the candidate’s philosophy translates into effective, high-quality teaching. * Effectiveness of differentiated instructional practices and course materials in supporting student learning outcomes. * Use of appropriate assessment methods. * Evidence of student learning. * The candidate’s reflection on students’ responses to their instruction, including Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) data and additional sources of information provided in the supplementary materials. * Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness. * The candidate’s instructionally-related activities including teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom that fulfill the College of Education’s vision and mission.   **Highlight the candidate’s key accomplishments for this section and any recommendations or suggestions.**  **Limit word count for this entire section to 250 – 500 words.** **Due to COVID-19, Spring 2020 SPOT summaries are not required for submission. Spring 2020 SPOT summaries may not be considered in an evaluation unless a candidate explicitly chooses to include the SPOT summaries in their materials.** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |
| --- |
| **RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA)** The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA) during the period of review. Committee members shall consider all material submitted in the RTP file including the narrative, PDS, and supplementary file.  Committee members shall reference the [University](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/content_faculty-resources-support_ps09-10_2016-10-24.pdf) and [College of Education](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/ced_2018_rtp_policy.pdf) RTP policies available on the [Faculty Affairs website](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp-policies) for specific expectations to ensure alignment with the policies. Committee members shall reference College of Education RTP policy section 6.0 Reappointment and Promotion Level Criteria, beginning on page 15, when evaluating the minimum expectations for the candidate’s periodic mini review. |
| **Provide a holistic evaluation of the following:**   * The extent to which the candidate’s RSCA reflects quality contributions to the advancement, application, and/or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies, and the College of Education’s mission. * The extent to which the candidate is participating in a variety of highly valued and valued scholarly and creative activities, including research that leads to peer-reviewed publications. * The extent to which the candidate’s RSCA reflects intellectual and professional growth over time.   **Highlight the candidate’s key accomplishments for this section and any recommendations or suggestions.**  **Limit word count for this entire section to 250 – 500 words.** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |
| --- |
| **SERVICE** The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community (as appropriate based on rank per the CED RTP policy). Committee members shall consider all material submitted in the RTP file including the narrative, PDS, and supplementary file.  Committee members shall reference the [University](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/content_faculty-resources-support_ps09-10_2016-10-24.pdf) and [College of Education](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/document/ced_2018_rtp_policy.pdf) RTP policies available on the [Faculty Affairs website](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion-rtp-policies) for specific expectations to ensure alignment with the policies. Committee members shall reference College of Education RTP policy section 6.0 Reappointment and Promotion Level Criteria, beginning on page 15, when evaluating the minimum expectations for the candidate’s periodic mini review. |
| **Provide a holistic evaluation of the following:**  The quality and degree of the candidate’s service at the level(s) of service appropriate to the review level criteria (e.g., Assistant, Associate, Full Professor), which may include the following areas:   1. The department 2. The college 3. The university 4. The profession 5. The community   **Highlight the candidate’s key accomplishments for this section and any recommendations or suggestions.**  **Limit word count for this entire section to 250 – 500 words.** |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL COMMENTS**  Provide overall comments and any recommendations or suggestions for improvement. |
| \*\*Click to enter text |

**I, Department Peer Review Committee Chair** \*\*Click to enter full name, **certify the members of the committee have collectively completed this review on** \*\*Click to select date.