NAME:

DEPARTMENT:

YEARS IN REVIEW:

This 3rd year post-tenure or 5th year rolling review is a check-in on your progress towards promotion. The purpose of this review is as follows:

1. To provide the FPC with important information necessary for the performance review.
2. To provide tenured Associate Professors with important feedback about their progress towards meeting the requirements for their next promotion to Professor.
3. To give faculty a chance to reflect on their post-tenure work set new goals for their professional growth. As you prepare your materials for this review, please consider the following:

- Prior Goals: Did you reach the goals you set for yourself last year?
- Signs of excellence/success: Ways in which your work reflects or is building up to “excellence”?
- Challenges: What stressors did you meet and how did you overcome or address them?
- Future Goals: What do you hope to accomplish in the coming year?

In this review, the committee evaluates your work in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service by examining:

- Previous FPC evaluation letters
- Previous + current Annual Workload Reports
- Previous + current self-evaluation(s)
- Course evaluations
- Course syllabi
- Current CV

Teaching is the primary activity of faculty members in CAS and it is expected that we all strive for excellence in this regard. By earning tenure and promotion you have already shown the FPC that you can achieve excellence. It is expected that you continue hone your craft and maintain high levels of success in your teaching and in your students’ learning, post-tenure. That is, full professors are consistently excellent teachers. To review how the university defines teaching excellence, please see “FPC Review: Overview & Guidelines” and the Faculty Handbook, chpt 4. In this evaluation, please discuss the excellence in your work. As relevant, refer to your goals for teaching, your student learning objectives and outcomes, and the course evaluations therein. Note that the committee has reviewed your course evaluations thus you do not need to repeat “the numbers.” Rather, please discuss what you think the evaluations signify, regarding the quality of your teaching. As well, faculty experience challenge in their work no matter their rank. As relevant, discuss challenges and what you’ve done to face them, as well. Advising is part of our teaching workload as well, thus you are also asked to discuss your advising process.

A. Discuss your teaching. (University criteria of excellence, prior goals, successes, challenges, future goals).

[please type or paste in your response here]
B. Advising. Discuss your advising process.

[please type or paste in your response here]

Part 2: Scholarship.
Engagement in scholarly activities is an important part of our workload in the CAS. To earn the title “Professor” you must engage in high quality sustained scholarly work post-tenure. To earn the next promotion, you must have accomplished more with your scholarship than you did for your tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Please use this space to discuss your current work and goals therein, regarding your scholarly work. At Pacific University, we recognize that scholarship takes many forms and your entire scholarly portfolio may contain alternative forms of scholarship. Please see “The FPC Review- Overview & Guidelines” and Chapter 4 in the Faculty Handbook for further discussion of how to best represent your scholarly work to the FPC.

C. Briefly explain your program of research or creative endeavors. As appropriate, note your aims, goals, and/or intended outcomes with this work. Discuss successes, and challenges if relevant, too.

[please type or paste in your response here]

D. Denote the progress of your work. What have your produced, in the last year? (Note: finished products are to be added to your open file. This section can be a list from your CV or a list of works-in-progress)

[please type or paste in your response here]

E. Rubric for Quality Assurance. Explain how the committee should evaluate the quality of your work. If your work fits “the Discovery Model” then peer-review or its equivalent is the typical quality assurance. If your work falls into an alternative “Boyer category” please provide the FPC with a rubric for how to evaluate the works quality, reach, and/or impact. For advice on how to do this, please review The FPC Review- Overview & Guidelines”, meet with the current FPC Chair, or discuss with your department chair.

[please type or paste in your response here]

Part 3. Service to the college, university, and community
Universities run, in no small part, on the service its members provide, as do professional organizations. Indeed, our communities are better places when we share our expertise with them. To promotion you must show meaningful support of the university and greater community, in that it is desirable to see colleagues who support their local and/or professional communities as well. The purpose of this section is to list your service engagements and explain your contributions to the FPC.
F. List your service engagements for the year in review. Briefly describe your contributions and time-spent if relevant.

[please type or paste in your response here]

G. Whenever possible, it is desirable for service engagements to match with your professional skill set and interests. If you would like to serve on a particular committee, please share that here.

[please type or paste in your response here]