



Year-1 ILP Review Panel Report

Faculty Candidate's Name: _____Albert Groccia

Dean's Name: Tim Grogan

Review Date: __April 27, 2007_____ Date Report Sent to Candidate: May 1, 2007

Assessments based on the criteria and standards outlined in Valencia Portfolio Evaluation Rubric

(Please Note: This is a verbal presentation, not written in Year-1)

I. Clear Goals/Effective Preparation

A. Candidate's Workload Context Discussed? Yes

Panel's Comments:

B. Candidate's Philosophy Discussed? Yes

Is the philosophy

- Clearly stated?
- Supportive of teaching & learning?
- Evident in the Learning Outcomes?

What are the strengths of the Philosophy? **That "Values" comes through clearly.**

What specific recommendations do you have to help the candidate improve the philosophy statement? **Edit/proofreading (T. Nater and others offered help); think further, perhaps deeper, on the "why" as opposed to the "what you do" and "what results you want" parts. For example, why are you including the quadratic formula in your lessons if it's okay that they forget it later? Why do you want them to remember you cared about them? Is there a difference between "teaching about math" and "teaching math"?**

C. Learning Outcome #1 Discussed? Yes

- ✓ *What the faculty candidate wants to learn, achieve, or accomplish.*
- ✓ *What the faculty candidate wants to learn, achieve, or accomplish (workshops, books, articles, conversations, etc.).*

Is the Learning Outcome

- Clearly stated?
- Related to teaching and learning?
- Assessable?

What are the strengths of LO#1? **Great idea – and big – that could truly have a large positive affect on student learning.**

What specific recommendations do you have to help the candidate improve LO#1?
The Panel confirmed that student learning will be measured in LO#1. Suggestions include: will the notes packet be too thick to be useful? Perhaps some printing by students; perhaps distribute in sections – parts of the packet are given out at different times; perhaps the State Exam could be split into parts as well, distributed in different parts of the note packet; the Panel does not need for the entire notes packet to be completed – reviewing sections which show mastery of the Essential Competencies as given in the ILP is sufficient; the Panel need not have a hard paper copy, a CD or other electronic copy is sufficient (and perhaps preferred depending on the final size of the notes)

D. Learning Outcome #2 Discussed? Yes

- ✓ *What the faculty candidate wants to learn, achieve, or accomplish.*
- ✓ *What the faculty candidate wants to learn, achieve, or accomplish (workshops, books, articles, conversations, etc.).*

Is the Learning Outcome

- Clearly stated?
- Related to teaching and learning?
- Assessable?

What are the strengths of LO#2? **Very good “intentional” project – using theory and practice in specific thoughtful ways to increase student performance in math and confidence in themselves.**

What specific recommendations do you have to help the candidate improve LO#2?
The Panel confirmed that student learning will be measure in LO#2. Suggestions include: piloting pieces, rather than the entire notes packet, is sufficient; using data from Prof. Groccia's sections is sufficient – it is not necessary for other faculty to use the notes nor to collect data from other faculty sections; if other faculty are used, one is sufficient; Prof. Groccia should pilot the notes himself before sharing them with other faculty; look for funding sources other than the bookstore to pay for printing the notes.

D. Learning Outcome #3 Discussed? Yes

- ✓ *What the faculty candidate wants to learn, achieve, or accomplish.*
- ✓ *What the faculty candidate wants to learn, achieve, or accomplish (workshops, books, articles, conversations, etc.).*

Is the Learning Outcome

- Clearly stated?
- Related to teaching and learning?
- Assessable?

What are the strengths of LO#3? **Useful and directly applicable to LO#1.**

What specific recommendations do you have to help the candidate improve LO#3?
None.

Please note: Some ILP's contain more than 3 learning outcomes; adjust report to accommodate.

E. Professional Development Efforts/Plans Described? Yes

Professional development efforts and plans are

- Relevant
- Clearly described
- Adequate to achieve the LOs

Panel's Comments:

Overall (not just here in Section E.), the Panel was impressed by the size and scope of Prof. Groccia's ILP and by his enthusiasm to achieve even more. The Panel reinforced that he should certainly pursue his passion – these large goals – as well as that he can submit smaller pieces of them and still meet the requirements within his ILP. Don't set your sights lower, but don't feel that if the highest level isn't reached that you will have "failed" in your ILP.

II. Effective Preparation/Essential Competencies

(This is a verbal presentation, not written in Year-1)

The Panel did not specifically rate each of the Competency areas, but rather assessed Prof. Groccia's ILP as being suitable to show each, that Prof. Groccia had a clear grasp of how he would be demonstrating his understanding of each, and that he was on track (on plan) to do so. The Panel unanimously concluded that Prof. Groccia is well prepared to succeed in each area via his LO's. Therefore each area is "Not Yet Acceptable" not because of any weakness, but because the true demonstration is expected to appear in the artifacts Prof. Groccia presents in the Year Two and/or Year Three panel meetings.

Please note: Indicators provide examples of how competencies can be demonstrated in a Learning Outcome. While all competencies need to be demonstrated in the portfolio, all indicators for each competency do not need to be demonstrated.

Exemplary: *Candidate has gained comprehension-level understanding of the Essential Competency and can relate this understanding to his or her classroom/professional practice.*

Acceptable: *Candidate has gained comprehension-level understanding of the Essential Competency.*

Not Yet Acceptable:
Candidate has not yet gained comprehension-level understanding of the Essential Competency.

A. Candidate's Understanding of Learning-centered Teaching & Learning Strategies

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

B. Candidate's Understanding of Valencia's Core Competencies for Students (TVCA)

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

C. Candidate's Understanding of Assessment

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

D. Candidate's Understanding of Inclusion and Diversity

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

E. Candidate's Understanding of LifeMap

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

F. Candidate's Understanding of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

G. Candidate's Understanding of Professional Commitment

Exemplary Acceptable Not Yet Acceptable

Panel's Comments on strengths:

If not rated exemplary, in what aspect/area of this Essential Competency does the candidate need to deepen his/her understanding?

ILP Review Panel Membership

Dean: Tim Grogan
Campus: Osceola
Division: Math, Science, Psychology
Department: Mathematics

Tenured Faculty Panelist: Deborah Howard
Campus: East
Discipline: Mathematics

Tenured Faculty Panelist: Teresa Nater
Campus: Osceola
Discipline: English

Tenured Faculty Panelist: Leila Sisson
Campus: Osceola
Discipline: Mathematics