NAME:

DEPARTMENT:

YEARS IN REVIEW:

This is a rolling 5-year review, post promotion to Professor. The purpose of this review is to check-in on (possible) new developments in your teaching repertoire, your scholarship, and your service engagements. The purpose of this review is as follows:

1. To provide the FPC with important information necessary for the required performance review.
2. To provide Professors with feedback on the quality of their work.
3. To give faculty a chance to reflect on their work, present their successes, and possibly 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 at your last review?
   ✓ Signs of excellence/success: Ways in which your work reflects “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 years?

This year you will turn in an Annual Workload Report and all the materials necessary for this performance review. 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
- Current self-evaluation
- 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 promotion to Professor you have already shown the FPC that you can achieve excellence. It is expected that you continue to hone your craft and maintain high levels of success in your teaching and in your students’ learning for the remainder of your career. 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. For 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. As a Professor, you have engaged in sustained scholarship throughout your career. In this section, please share with the FPC the work you are currently doing. 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 you 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 it’s members provide, as do professional organizations. Indeed, our communities are better places when we share our expertise with them. As a Professor, you have already made substantial and outstanding contributions to the general welfare of the university. In this section, please note whether and how your service activities have continued, post-promotion.

F. List your service engagements for the year in review. Briefly describe your contributions and time-spent if relevant.
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.