**Career Faculty Performance Review Template**

[Date]

TO: [Full name], Divisional Dean for [Division]

 College of Arts and Sciences

FROM: [Full name], [Rank] and Head of [Department/Program]

RE: Performance Review for [Rank] [Full name]

 Review Period [Date] to [Date]

**Introduction**

Sample: [Full Name] has been an instructor in the [Unit] since [date] and continuously hired at 1.0 FTE in a 9-month Career Faculty appointment for the past six years. In their current appointment, they teach nine courses per year, per our unit’s workload policy.

As described in the unit policy, 90% of [Name]’s performance expectations are related to teaching, and 10% are related to service.

Discuss your unit’s performance review process for Career Faculty.

**Teaching Evaluation**

*Faculty performance evaluations will use the evaluation criteria required by the CBA and in the unit’s NTTF evaluation policy. See the UO Senate’s “Warning and Guidance on Student Evaluations of Teaching.”*

Teaching was evaluated using the Teaching Quality Criteria document, which articulates the conditions to meet expectations from the August 2019 Memorandum of Understanding which modifies the CBA. The personnel committee report describes the evidence used to determine whether [Name] did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for use of the Teaching Quality Standards (professional, inclusive, engaged or research-informed).

The data that informed these decisions included Course Evaluation data from 2014-2018, Student Experience Survey data from 2019-20, peer reviews of teaching, and a candidate’s statement of teaching.

*Professional Teaching Standard*

Conditions:

1. Readily available, coherently organized, and high-quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading, and class policy expectations.
2. Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback.
3. Students’ activities in and out of class are designed and organized to maximize student learning.

Evaluation

[ ]  Does Not Meet Conditions

[ ]  Meets Conditions (meets the conditions consistently or shows a pattern of improvementduring the review window)

[ ]  Exceeds Conditions

Comments.

*Inclusive Teaching Standard*

Conditions

1. Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation are valued.
2. The content of the course reflects the diversity of the field’s practitioners, the contested and evolving status of knowledge, the value of academic questions beyond the academy and of lived experience as evidence, and/or other efforts to help students see themselves in the work of the course.

Evaluation

[ ]  Does Not Meet Conditions

[ ]  Meets Conditions (meets the conditions consistently or shows a pattern of improvementduring the review window)

[ ]  Exceeds Conditions

Comments.

*Engaged Teaching Standard*

Condition

1. Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of course content and pedagogy.

Evaluation

[ ]  Does Not Meet Condition

[ ]  Meets Condition (meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvementduring the review window)

[ ]  Exceeds Condition

Comments.

*Research-Informed Teaching*

Conditions

1. Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise.
2. Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for core education, university; the goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students.
3. Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course.
4. Instruction engages, challenges, and supports students.

Evaluation

[ ]  Does Not Meet Conditions

[ ]  Meets Conditions (meets the conditions consistently or shows a pattern of improvementduring the review window)

[ ]  Exceeds Conditions

Comments.

My evaluation of [Name]’s teaching, based on the standards and specific conditions outlined in the 2019 MOU, is that they have [not met/met/exceeded] our expectations by [not meeting expectations, meeting conditions in all areas, OR meeting and exceeding in ## conditions].

**Service Evaluation**

Evaluation

[ ]  Does Not Meet Expectations

[ ]  Meets Expectations

[ ]  Exceeds Expectations

Comments.

**Contributions to Equity and Inclusion**

Evaluation

Comments.

*There are no standard expectations for contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion, so please do not use the language of expectations in your evaluation.*

**Overall Evaluation**

[ ]  Does Not Meet Expectations

[ ]  Meets Expectations

[ ]  Exceeds Expectations

Final comments if warranted.

I have read and discussed this performance review and been given an opportunity to respond in writing.

[Candidate’s Name] [Date]