Merritt Writing Program Procedures for Evaluating and Reappointing Unit 18 Lecturers

May 1, 2010

I. The Academic Review Committee (ARC)

(A.) Committee Charge

The Academic Review Committee (ARC, a subcommittee of the MWP Personnel Committee) periodically assesses the demonstrated teaching excellence of Non-Senate Faculty (NSF) lecturers in the Merritt Writing Program (MWP). The specific responsibilities of ARC are (1) to conduct formative, confidential assessment for optional Preliminary Reviews, and generate reports that only the candidate under review receives; and (2) to conduct Third-Year and Sixth-Year Reviews as formative and summative assessments of demonstrated teaching excellence, and submit reports to the candidates under review as well as to the MWP Director.[1] Additionally, ARC makes recommendations to the MWP Director regarding merit pay increase adjustments in the Third-Year and Sixth-Year Reviews.

ARC's review process does *not* confirm or deny a candidate for reappointment (before the sixth year) or for Initial Continuing Appointment (after the sixth year). In Year Three the MWP Director drafts a separate evaluation that considers the recommendation of ARC and that confirms or denies a candidate's reappointment. That evaluation is sent to each candidate and becomes part of the candidate's permanent employment record. In Year Six the MWP Director's evaluation summarizes the ARC recommendation as part of an appraisal of demonstrated teaching excellence. ARC Sixth-Year Review reports are also forwarded to the Dean(s) of the appropriate school(s) in which candidates teach, to other university reviewers that oversee Academic Personnel appointments, and to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, who makes the final decision to reappoint a candidate.

The assessment procedures and subsequent reports for the optional Preliminary Review and required Third-Year and Sixth-Year Reviews comply with regulations established by the university in its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the American Federation of Teachers union and Unit 18 lecturers. Evaluation criteria are based on "demonstrated excellence in the field and in teaching, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties which may include University co-curricular and community service." (MOU, p.12) These criteria inform the MWP's review process for continuing appointments and associated merit increases in salary. As part of this process, MWP reviewers attend to direct evidence of teaching excellence such as student attainment of learning outcomes and an instructor's annotated evaluation of student writing as well as indirect measures of teaching such as student-course evaluations, peer observations, and support of curricular and/or co-curricular initiatives.

---

[1] *Formative assessment* is peer feedback designed for self-reflection and professional development purposes. *Summative assessment* is a formal and final evaluation of competence.

Preliminary review is optional, and reviewed by ARC only to provide formative feedback. For Third- and Sixth-Year reviews, each candidate submits to the ARC chair a summary record of teaching excellence represented in a teaching portfolio that ARC members and the MWP Director independently review. Following committee review, the ARC chair forwards to the MWP director each candidate's portfolio with an accompanying committee recommendation that addresses the candidate's application for a continuing appointment. This review is summative and supplements the MWP Director's assessment. Specific details of this review process are noted in the following sections of this document.

(B.) Committee Membership

ARC consists of MWP Assistant Directors (ex officio) and a minimum of three and maximum of nine members elected each year by MWP lecturers. The number of participating members will be contingent on anticipated committee workload.

Since ARC provides formative assessment for the optional Preliminary Review, and formative and summative assessment for the Third- and Sixth-Year Reviews, the committee members will have post-six continuing appointment status, or the nearest equivalent in length of continuous MWP employment. ARC members are responsible for making merit increase recommendations to the MWP Director. The most experienced members of the committee, those with prior experience as an ARC member, or those who are near the conclusion of their committee service, may serve as pre-assessment mentors to candidates for Sixth-Year reviews. As many as three members of ARC will provide pre-assessment mentoring. ARC mentors to candidates for Sixth-Year reviews will be the most experienced members of the committee, including those who have previously served on ARC and those who are near the conclusion of service. (Pre-assessment is intended to answer questions about compliance and provide candidates with abbreviated, informal feedback. To qualify for ARC pre-assessment, a candidate must contact the chair of ARC at least one month before a final teaching portfolio is due.)

ARC members should have more than four continuous semesters of employment in the MWP, preferably with at least two of those semesters serving on the Personnel Committee. Service on ARC will begin on July 1 and end on June 30 for any member with an annual contract. Ideally and when possible, lecturers with Security of Employment or Continuing Appointment status are preferred as committee members.

Any Unit 18 lecturer with at least a 40% annual appointment[2] in the MWP is eligible (1) to participate, with voice and vote, in evaluation and reappointment proceedings of MWP colleagues, and (2) to nominate and elect members (by majority vote) to serve on ARC. Only a full-time lecturer is eligible to chair ARC or chair a review subcommittee. Full-time is defined as someone with an annual contract who teaches five courses, or the equivalent of five courses with an officially approved release from one or more of those five courses. Membership on ARC is initially restricted to MWP faculty. When an insufficient number of internal candidates receives majority endorsements, the MWP Director will nominate additional candidates for majority endorsement. If ARC does not have sufficient membership by these means, the Director

[2] Unit 18 lecturers who teach writing full-time have a five course annual workload. A 40% appointment (two courses annually) is the near equivalent of a half-time position.

will appoint internal MWP members or external members. The Director is not eligible to serve on ARC.

II. ARC Review Process

At intervals designated in Section III below, ARC reviews MWP lecturers who are Non-Senate Faculty and who are eligible for reappointment or merit increase, including those eligible for a review to determine an Initial Continuing Appointment (or "Post-Six status"). ARC's evaluation of the Pre-Six MWP lecturer's performance addresses the lecturer's teaching excellence as specified in the MOU, Article 7b, Section D:

http://www.ucop.edu/atyourservice/employees/policies_employee_labor_relations/collective_bargaining_units/nonsenateinstructional_nsi/mou/article7b.html

In Section D, the criteria for review focus on evidence of teaching excellence. Additionally, reviewers should attend "to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for at various levels, and the total performance of the NSF should be judged with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities." The MWP review process is specifically designed to highlight teaching excellence in cultivating student achievement as writers; in that respect, this review process differs significantly from reviews that might appropriately highlight student mastery of content knowledge.

Section E directs reviewers to assess teaching by noting several indirect examples of excellence. These include student-course evaluations, peer observations, and student and peer testimonials, all of which are subsumed in the MWP's review process. The MWP review also focuses on "new and effective techniques of instruction" by requiring direct evidence of student learning, specifically represented in student attainment of learning outcomes.

To determine an Initial Continuing Appointment, ARC's evaluation of a lecturer addresses the lecturer's cumulative record of teaching in the MWP. Noting the MWP courses an instructor has taught, the review committee evaluates instructional performance with respect to "command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new subjects; ability to organize and present course materials; ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to do creative work; and achievements of students in their field" (Unit 18 MOU, Article 7b, Section D).

The ARC chair assigns two members of the committee to review the lecturer's file and report back to ARC members. A summary report is shared and discussed with candidates, with an emphasis on continuous improvement.

For Third-Year and Sixth-Year review, recommendations made to the MWP Director and Dean(s) concerning the quality of the submitted materials reflect the decision of the committee as a whole (votes are reported), as do recommendations for merit increases for Continuing Appointments, and salary increases greater or less than the standard increases recommended in the Unit 18 MOU.

ARC members who are reviewing faculty for Continuing Appointment are lecturers with Continuing Appointments or Security of Employment. If these appointments do not exist in the MWP, chairs for subcommittees reviewing MWP faculty will be selected from the most senior lecturers among the faculty (those who have taught and/or been appointed in the MWP for the most semesters). In a circumstance in which there is not one most senior member, the MWP Director will appoint a chair from among its membership.

III. Continuing Appointment Process

Academic Review involves several stages, including an optional Preliminary Review, and required Third-Year and Sixth-Year Reviews.

Any reappointment of a pre-six lecturer that does not fall within one of the review occasions detailed below is subject to the same standards of teaching excellence delineated in these review procedures and will be subject to the decision of the MWP Director.

Participation in this three-stage process indicates long-term commitment to the MWP and encourages professional development that is appropriate for a Post-Six Continuing Appointment. Full-time faculty who forgo Third Review will be disqualified from subsequent employment in the MWP appointment. Part-time members of the MWP with less than a 40% appointment (less than two four-unit courses annually) are exempt from Preliminary and/or Third-Year reviews but are strongly encouraged to participate in these assessment initiatives. Resulting part-time continuing appointments will be equivalent to the percentage of employment in the sixth year.

(A.) Cover Letters

In a lecturer's Preliminary, Third-Year and Sixth-Year Reviews, as well as in subsequent reviews, s/he will submit four cover letters associated with a teaching portfolio. These include a general cover letter introducing the teaching portfolio, as well as cover letters for each major section of the portfolio (Professional Development, Curriculum, and Assessment), to demonstrate his/her teaching practices and currency in the field. Each letter should succinctly summarize and contextualize the submitted evidence, specifically noting the lecturer's teaching goals, performance, innovations, and/or new projects. Since Preliminary Review is an abbreviated version of Third-Year Review, cover letters should be no more than 500 words each. For Third-Year and Sixth-Year Review cover letters should not exceed 750 and 1000 words respectively.

(B.) Preliminary Review

Optional Preliminary Review is an abbreviated version of the teaching portfolio intended to prepare lecturers for demonstrating teaching excellence in the Third-Year Review. In contrast to Third-Year and Sixth-Year Review processes that are mandatory for continued employment, Preliminary Review is a voluntary process. Participating in Preliminary Review provides a stronger basis for successful future reviews and signals an ongoing commitment to long-term employment in the MWP.

Preliminary Review materials provide opportunity for self-assessment and the evaluation of

student learning outcomes. In addition to the required cover letters (III.A), a Preliminary Review file will include the following materials, submitted by the lecturer and not subject to length restrictions:

(1.) Professional Development: Updated curriculum vitae (highlighting the lecturer's work within and contributions to the Merritt Writing Program)
(2.) Curriculum: (i) An annotated Course Syllabus with objectives and outcomes listed weekly or daily; (ii) one class lesson plan; AND (iii) one Essay Assignment, including the assignment description and an evaluation of one student's essay draft and final draft;
(3.) Assessment: Required student course evaluations for all courses taught during the previous semester(s) up to two years of employment at UCM. The candidate should also provide a summary narrative of evaluation results.

The MWP Director delegates to the ARC chair responsibility for scheduling Preliminary Review for MWP lecturers during the third semester of appointment, with applications due by October 1. In extraordinary circumstances, lecturers may petition for a one semester delay in review; see Section V "Review Timeline: 'Time Off the Clock'." The ARC subcommittee reviewers provide written and verbal feedback by January 30. In instances of spring review, applications are due February 1, with committee written and verbal feedback completed by April 15.

(C.) Third-Year and Sixth-Year Continuing Appointment Reviews

Third-Year or Sixth-Year Continuing Appointment Academic Review files include, in addition to the required cover letters (III.A), a teaching portfolio with evidence provided by the lecturer, supporting the following categories. The complete checklist is described in Section VII.

(1.) Professional Development: Curriculum vitae and self-statement about the candidate's scholarship of teaching and learning;
(2.) Curriculum: Instructional materials such as syllabi, lesson plans, representative student work (e.g., essays, tests, journals), and grading rubrics;
(3.) Assessment: Student and faculty evaluations (including faculty observations, all relevant student evaluations of MWP classes, and all relevant student evaluations of courses not in the MWP, including sections of general education courses), and record of student performance in achieving learning outcomes.

Third-Year and Sixth-Year Review is scheduled for summer, with draft portfolio materials due by May 1 for separate ARC and MWP Director perusal that is intended to ensure that the candidate has submitted all required materials. ARC may also provide a candidate with written and verbal feedback about the quality of a submission. These optional ARC responses will be provided no later than July 1 of the review year. A candidate may revise a portfolio based on committee recommendations. No later than September 1, the MWP Director forwards a final portfolio to an external review committee appointed by the university. The Director will provide that external committee with a separate statement about the candidate's record of teaching and related service as a member of the MWP. A final decision for Continuing Appointment status is made during Fall semester.

Candidates whose employment in the MWP began midpoint in the academic year (i.e., Spring semester) will have a separate timeline for submission of portfolio materials and reviews. In effect, their review process will occur six months later than candidates whose MWP employment began in Fall semester.

During the two months leading up to a candidate's submission of Third-Year and Sixth-Year portfolios, s/he may elect to meet with his/her reviewing members of ARC to discuss progress. These optional meetings will be arranged by the chair of the relevant ARC subcommittee.

In the third year of teaching for the MWP, ARC provides formative and summative assessment of a candidate's teaching excellence. The subcommittee's report is also shared with the MWP Director, who may use that report to recommend reappointment and merit pay. Upon reappointment, there is an automatic 2-step merit increase on the NSF salary scale at the start of the fourth year. However, the committee may recommend a greater (or lesser) merit increase (more or less than 2-steps) along with a recommendation for reappointment. (Unit 18 MOU, Article 22, Section C2b).

Upon completion of the fifth academic year of teaching for the MWP, the lecturer prepares for review with a revised teaching portfolio from Year-Three review (and potentially Preliminary review). At this time, prior to a candidate's completion of a sixth year, the MWP Director determines if there is an ongoing need to staff the courses taught by Unit 18 lecturers. (MOU, Article 7b, Section B). Before a candidate starts the sixth year, ARC must also provide a summary report of teaching portfolios to supplement the reappointment process, which the Director forwards to the relevant Dean and other relevant review bodies for subsequent review. The university's determination of excellence and approval of a Continuing Appointment will be accompanied by an increase up to the minimum salary for a Continuing Appointment and, if deemed appropriate, a minimum two-step merit increase. (MOU, Article 22, Section C2b)

IV. Completion of Sixth-Year Continuing Appointment

A recurring evaluation will occur in the second year following the Continuing Appointment and every three years thereafter. If the standard of excellence continues to be met, ARC will recommend an appropriate merit increase of at least two steps. Merit may be accelerated, if justified; merit reviews may be deferred, at the request of the lecturer, for up to one year. If the committee finds cause to recommend against a Continuing Appointment, notice and appeal procedures in the Non-Senate Instructional Unit contract will apply.

V. Review Timeline and "Time off the Clock"

Consistent with the UCM Academic Personnel Manual's standards for "time off the clock" for tenure cases, the following procedures apply for deferring any of the levels of review. These policies include APM 715 "Leaves of Absence / Family and Medical Leave" and APM 760 "Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing." In accordance to these benefits, MWP faculty who have received any of these associated modified service adjustments can be granted similar "time off the clock" for their review.

VI. Non-Submissions

In the case of a candidate not meeting a scheduled deadline for review, the ARC chair and MWP Director will determine that the candidate is not seeking re-appointment. The evaluation result will automatically be "unsatisfactory" to account for the incomplete (non-submitted) materials.

VII. Portfolio Content

The following checklist is intended to specify the teaching portfolio description outlined in the MWP's Academic Review procedures for Third-Year and Sixth-Year review and merit pay. Items in bold are required for the teaching portfolio. In some cases, menus are provided from which a candidate must choose one piece of supporting evidence—in which case choose only one. The review committee is interested in quality, not quantity. Length limits are specified at the end of each section where necessary.

(I.) Introductory Cover Letter

Provides an overview of the portfolio, introducing its major sections and themes that characterize it throughout so as to elaborate your professional experience in the MWP.

Preliminary/Third-Year Review limit: 250 words
Sixth-Year Review limit: 500 words

(II.) Professional Development: Curriculum Vitae and Scholarship of Teaching

This category includes projects, service, research, and professional experience related to MWP curriculum as well as to the MWP, SSHA, UCM, and the greater Merced communities.

Preliminary/Third-Year Review limit: 500 words
Sixth-Year Review limit: 1000 words

1. **Cover Letter:** Summarize and analyze this work's significance, including MWP or Core Committee responsibilities and additional work such as faculty mentoring, relevant publications, outreach efforts, conference participation, or grant writing. To develop this letter, you might consider the following questions: Is there a theme that describes your scholarship of teaching and learning, including community service, co-curricular activities and research experiences that may inform merit decisions? How have the MWP and/or your teaching practices benefited from your scholarship of teaching and learning?

2. **Curriculum vitae:** List all MWP teaching responsibilities, broadly defined to include courses as well as other instructional activities such as mentoring, tutoring, advising, workshop presentations, and Faculty Instructional Group observations of teaching. Provide specific dates.

(III.) Curriculum: Instructional Materials and Student Learning Outcomes

This category includes representative samples of instructional materials, including evidence of student learning outcomes.

1. **Cover Letter:** Summarize and contextualize the rationale for including these materials,

focusing on objectives achieved in a course or courses. There are two ways to go about this, by either (a) focusing on a specific course that you have taught a number of times and examining how it has evolved with respect to specific goals, outcomes, pedagogical strategies, etc., or (b) describing the breadth of courses you have taught in the MWP or Core with respect to specific common goals, outcomes, or pedagogical strategies among them. To develop this letter, you might consider the following questions: Which student learning outcomes, indicated on your syllabus, were achieved? How? What is your teaching history in relation to the course or selection of courses? How do(es) the course(s) address the specific needs of the UCM student population? If you choose a specialty focus, describe a timeline or sequence of stages for how you have developed the course. For a scope focus, consider what you view as success with respect to student learning outcomes across courses.

Preliminary/Third-Year Review limit: 500 words
Sixth-Year Review limit: 1000 words

2. **Annotated Course Syllabus:** Annotations should provide rationale, theoretical contexts and critical reflections for each element of your syllabus. The schedule should include objectives and outcomes listed weekly or daily.

3. **One Lesson Plan** listing and addressing specific objectives and outcomes.

4. **Choose one of the following:** (a.) Sample of representative student portfolio or chapbook from one course, including three writing assignments within a sequence, including topic descriptions and evaluation of one student's preliminary drafts and final drafts. (This option highlights *specificity*.); (b.) Three writing assignments from across courses (one of which is either WRI 1, WRI 10, or CORE 1)**,** including topic description and an evaluation of one student's draft for each. (This option highlights *scope.*) For scope to be coherent, these materials should link to a common learning outcome or teaching strategy. Selected materials should also represent a typical writing assignment from a typical student in the class (i.e., not an excellent or poor student; this section should demonstrate how you work with average students to improve their writing).

5. **Choose one of the following:** (a.) Student group activity, with instructions for group work and student responsibilities; (b.) Student peer review activity, with documented evaluation and recommendations; (c.) Use of instructional technology, with annotations detailing usage and benefits; (d.) Use of a descriptive grading rubric for a specific assignment or course, with rationale.

(IV.) Assessment: Student and Faculty Evaluations

This category includes examination of student and faculty evaluations.

1. **Cover Letter:** Summarize and analyze both faculty and student evaluations of teaching, with an emphasis on the continuous improvement of teaching. To develop this letter, you might consider the following questions: What does your analysis of student and faculty feedback indicate about how students are learning? What modifications have you made to improve student learning or performance?

2. **Class Visit Report:** Narrative Summary of Completed Collaborative Teaching Practices packet (located on the MWP Crops page) including examples from observations of classes by peers and MWP administrators.

Preliminary/Third-Year Review: one representative observation
Sixth-Year Review: all observations

3. **Required student course evaluations for all courses taught.**
4. **Choose one of the following (to demonstrate sensitivity to assessment and subsequent adjustment of teaching practices):** (a.) List of three student referees; (b.) Audio recording of office hour or class session (with signed student permission); (c.) Selection from teaching journal (not to exceed 500 words) that documents changes to teaching or course design based on assessment results; (d.) Non-required electronic or paper surveys in one class.

VIII. Annual Reappointment Review

Annual Reviews for reappointment are overseen by the MWP Director and Assistant Directors and are aligned with MWP academic review expectations, functioning as an abbreviated process that considers evidence from student course evaluations, observations of classroom instruction, and a candidate's personal statement requesting reappointment. Given the abbreviated function of annual review, this process is not sufficient to confer Continuing Appointment status.

(I). Timeline and Procedure for Annual Review

Candidates who seek reappointment in the MWP must annually submit a letter to the MWP Director requesting a Unit 18 lecturer position for the upcoming academic year. This letter is due by May 1 of the academic year that immediately precedes the requested appointment.

In the letter a candidate should briefly describe his or her role as a member of the MWP during the preceding year, including at least three of these topics: (1) teaching experience; (2) service on committees or faculty-interest groups; (3) evidence of professional development that strengthens or extends teaching effectiveness (e.g., innovative uses of pedagogy, development of new or revised curricular map, collaboration efforts to assess a learning outcome, etc.); (4) support of co-curricular initiatives (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, supplemental instruction, learning communities, student organizations, etc.); and (5) summary analysis of student course evaluations or MWP faculty evaluations of teaching, including any adjustments in course delivery based on mid-semester results. Other information may be included in the letter but only if the length does not exceed 500 words. A candidate who is preparing for Preliminary, Third-Year or Sixth-Year review is encouraged to use text and evidence from the required documents for those review procedures as part of his/her letter requesting annual reappointment.

Whenever feasible, the MWP Director will include results of Third-Year and Sixth-Year ARC reports in a decision to reappoint a candidate. Also, the timeline for confirmation of

reappointment will differ from reviews of candidates who are not undergoing Third-Year or Sixth-Year Review. [See Section III, "Timeline for Final Portfolio Submissions."]

(III). Timeline for Draft and Final Portfolio Submissions

The final portfolios for Preliminary Review are due by October 1 or January 30th in the second year of consecutive MWP appointment. To conform with Memorandum of Understanding deadlines for review and reappointment, a portfolio in draft form for Third-Year and Sixth-Year review is due May 1. A final version of the portfolio must be submitted before September 1. [A candidate hired initially in Spring semester submits the Third and Sixth Year draft portfolio on January 1 and final portfolio on April 1.]

Unlike the Preliminary Review process, submission of a comprehensive Third-Year portfolio is a required activity for candidate's to receive formative and summative feedback from ARC. Also unlike Preliminary Review, this portfolio will be reviewed by the MWP Director who may elect to provide comments that relate to the candidate's potential for successful Sixth-Year review. An MWP faculty member who does not submit a Third-Year or Sixth-Year portfolio will not be rehired.

<u>Initial Appointment in Fall</u>:

Preliminary Review: October 1 of the 3rd consecutive semester or January 30 of the 4th consecutive semester of full-time employment in the MWP

Third-Year Review: Final Portfolio due May 1 of the 6th semester of consecutive full-time employment in the MWP

Sixth-Year Review: Draft Portfolio due May 1 of the 10th semester of consecutive full-time or part-time MWP employment; Final Portfolio due before September 1.

	Semester 2 (May 1)	Semesters 3-4 (Oct. 1/Feb.1)	Semester 4 (May 1)	Semester 6 (May 1)	Semester 8 (May 1)	Semester 10 (May 1)	Semester 10 (Aug 1)
Annual Reappointment Letter	X		X	X	X	X	
Preliminary Review Portfolio		X					
Draft Portfolio				X		X	
Final Portfolio							X

Sixth-Year Continuing Appointment Reviews: Merritt Writing Program

For Sixth-Year Continuing Appointment Academic Review, candidates submit a required cover letter and teaching portfolio to the MWP Director and an internal MWP Academic Review Committee (ARC). The portfolio must be organized into three sections with corresponding evidence noted below:

(1.) Professional Development: Curriculum vitae and self-statement about the candidate's scholarship of teaching and learning;
(2.) Curriculum: Instructional materials such as syllabi, lesson plans, representative student work (e.g., essays, tests, journals), and grading rubrics;
(3.) Assessment: Student and faculty evaluations (including faculty observations, all relevant student evaluations of MWP classes, and all relevant student evaluations of courses not in the MWP, including sections of general education courses), and record of student performance in achieving learning outcomes;

Review Process:

Sixth-Year Review is scheduled for summer, with the cover letter and other portfolio materials due by May 1. The MWP Director and ARC will separately review submitted materials and optionally respond with recommendations for revision by July 1. A candidate's revision of a portfolio must be submitted to the Director before September 1. The MWP Director will forward a candidate's cover letter and portfolio for external university review after September 1. Final decisions for Continuing Appointment status will be made during Fall semester.

Pre-Year Six Timeline:

Upon completion of the fourth academic year of teaching for the MWP, lecturers who are eligible for Continuing Appointments will be contacted by the MWP Director. At that time, the Director will notify these lecturers that their candidacy for Continuing Appointments is contingent on a separate review that determines ongoing need to staff the courses taught by Unit 18 lecturers. That review, conducted by the Director, precedes the end of the candidate's fifth year of ongoing employment, and typically occurs one semester before a teaching portfolio is due. After the Director has confirmed an ongoing need to staff courses with Unit 18 lecturers, a candidate will have a semester to prepare a teaching portfolio that is due May 1, and thereafter may revise the portfolio for final submission before September 1.