



Eastern Oregon University  
Teaching and Librarian Faculty  
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Handbook  
Edited 6/09

Edited and Revised to include library faculty, fixed-term faculty, and adjunct online faculty evaluation

## **Preface**

This version of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Handbook builds on revisions made in 5/08 and is organized by types of appointment to optimize access and utility. The RTP Handbook codifies review procedures for both online faculty and bargaining unit members covered by the AAP-EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement. The categorical types of appointments are as follows:

### **Tenure Track Appointments**

- Annual Tenure
  - First-Year Review
  - Second-Year Review
  - Third-Year Review
  - Tenure Review/Promotion
- Indefinite Tenure
  - Post-Tenure Review
  - Full Professor Promotion Review Tenure-Track Evaluation Criteria

### **Fixed Term Appointments**

- Visiting Status
- Regular Full- and Part-Time
  - Annual / Routine Review
  - Promotion Review
- Adjunct Online
  - Evaluation Criteria
  - The Adjunct Online Teaching Portfolio

Substantive changes have been made to the organization of policies and procedures used for all personnel actions during academic year 2009-2010. Library faculty, Fixed-Term faculty, and Adjunct Online faculty review procedures not included in previous iterations of the Handbook have been added. These additions and other additional language has been indicated in red.

**Sections**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. General Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>

**II. Tenure Track Appointments****A. Annual Tenure**

1. First-Year Review
2. Second-Year Review
3. Third-Year Review
4. Tenure Review / Promotion
  - a. Minimum Qualifications
  - b. Minimum Criteria for Tenure
  - c. General Considerations for Promotion
  - d. Minimum Criteria for Ranks of Tenure Track Faculty

**B. Indefinite Tenure**

1. Post-Tenure Review
  - a. Biennial Post-Tenure Portfolio Review
  - b. Formal Post-Tenure Portfolio Review
  - c. Unsatisfactory Progress
  - d. Implementation
2. Full Professor Promotion Review

**C. Tenure Track Evaluation Criteria**

1. Teaching Faculty
2. Library Faculty

**D. Portfolios**

1. General Recommendations in Preparing the Portfolio
2. The Teaching Portfolio
3. The Librarian Portfolio

**E. Review Procedures and Processes****III. Fixed Term Appointments****A. Visiting Status****B. Regular Full- and Part-Time**

1. Annual / Routine Review
2. Promotion Review

**C. Adjunct Online**

1. Evaluation Criteria
2. Adjunct Online Teaching Portfolio

## I. General Introduction

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education's OAR 580-021-0135 provides that criteria for faculty evaluation shall be established for each institution as a "guide in evaluating faculty in connection with decisions on reappointment, promotion, and tenure," and "as a basis for assessing those aspects of the faculty member's performance in which improvement is desirable, whether the faculty member is tenured or non-tenured, with a view to stimulating and assisting the faculty member toward improvement through the resources available under the institution's staff career support plan."

In addition, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has indicated that the "criteria shall reflect the primary functions" for which the State System was established. Further, four general primary functions were identified as instruction, research accomplishments and other scholarly achievements, professionally related public service, and institutional service.

The State Board of Higher Education further requires the following: "sources of such input shall include, but need not be limited to, solicitation of student comments, student evaluations of instructors and opportunities for participation by students in personnel committee deliberations."

Eastern should assume basic competency by a person having the necessary credentials to be appointed in the first place and then pose the question of what special qualities, over and above basic competency, does this person possess which so distinguishes him or her that consideration should be given for promotion or indefinite tenure or reappointment? This represents a fundamental belief that in faculty performance more is required than just basic competency

The *Administrative Rules* of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education describe major criteria for faculty evaluation. In addition, specific Eastern criteria for the evaluation of faculty is developed by the University through a shared governance process.

## II. Tenure Track Appointments

Faculty members who hold tenure-track appointments are reviewed regularly before and after a tenure decision for teaching effectiveness, commitment to the subject discipline, service to the institution, and outreach to the public. Performance reviews are a critical opportunity for faculty members to engage in the sort of self-reflection and peer-review that lead to maturation within the profession. Not only do performance reviews provide a forum for framing and documenting accomplishments in each area of review, but they also present an occasion for identifying and sharing evolving interests and talents that contribute to the broader University enterprise to guide and to serve students.

Faculty who hold tenure-track appointments follow uniform procedures and cycles of review, as outlined in the section below. Responsibility for initiating, conducting, and coordinating review procedures rests with the Deans of the Colleges (and the Director of the Library as appropriate). College and Faculty Personnel Committees are responsible for reviewing faculty portfolios and making recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion through the processes outlined in this handbook.

## A. Annual Tenure

1. **First-Year Review.** Faculty in their first year of service at Eastern will be reviewed by the College Dean **or designee** and a recommendation **will be made** to the Provost, who will forward a recommendation to the President. The President will inform the faculty member of the decision by March 15 of the first year (3-month notice).
2. **Second-Year Review.** Faculty in their second year of service at Eastern will be reviewed by the College Dean **or designee** and a recommendation **will be made** to the Provost, who will forward a recommendation to the President. The President will inform the faculty member of the decision by December 15 of the second year (6-month notice).
3. **Third-Year Review.** Tenure track faculty members are formally evaluated in their third year of service. This review combines the features of a continuance assessment and a prescriptive analysis in preparation for the tenure review. **Candidates for continuance are required to develop a portfolio in accordance with evaluation criteria and portfolio requirements specified below in sections C and D.** In cases where continuance is not recommended, the faculty member has a one-year notice of termination.
4. **Tenure Review.** Faculty members on annual tenure ("tenure track") are normally reviewed for tenure during the Fall term of the fifth year at Eastern. The Notice of Appointment will state the "starting date" to be used for purposes of determining eligibility for consideration for indefinite tenure under the "five years at Eastern" criterion. If, at the time of initial hiring, there was agreement to count years of service elsewhere than at Eastern toward the "five years" criterion, then this will be stated as a part of the Notice of Appointment; unless such a statement exists on the Notice of Appointment, time-in-rank calculations begin with the year of initial service at Eastern.

**A successful tenure review generally results in promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (unless the candidate is already at that rank).**

**a. Minimum Qualifications.** Appointees to the rank of Associate Professor ordinarily hold the highest earned **terminal** degree associated with their fields of specialization and assignment. The individual considered for promotion must have shown a competence and willingness to participate in the work of the institution, to make significant contributions to teaching and to engage in research or scholarly activity.

**b. Minimum Criteria for Tenure**

1. The awarding of tenure is a significant institutional commitment to a faculty member and should be done only after careful deliberation. First, there should be a determination of need for the individual's specialization, skills, and appropriate fit for the long-range plans of the institution. Then, there must be a convincing case that the faculty member is highly qualified and has a history of performance demonstrating that he/she will make outstanding contributions to the institution.
2. To obtain tenure, the individual must demonstrate significant contributions to teaching, a competence and willingness to participate in the work of the institution,

and a productive commitment to research or scholarly activity. The criteria for Associate Professor ordinarily apply as minimum criteria for tenure. Consideration of tenure will include evaluation of instruction through review of course reaction surveys, the teaching portfolio, peer evaluation of instruction, and surveys of alumni, each conducted as specified in the section on teaching evaluation.

3. Under no circumstances will tenure be granted to one whose principal duties include instruction unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.
4. **A primary consideration for tenure is the collegiality of the candidate.**

### **c. General Considerations for Promotion**

Effective teaching is the most important criterion to advancement. Under no circumstances will promotion be granted to one whose principal duties include instruction unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. Consideration of all promotions will involve evaluation of instruction through review of course reaction surveys, the teaching portfolio, peer evaluation of instruction, and surveys of alumni, each conducted as specified in the Evaluation of Teaching section.

1. Advancement in rank should reflect continuing professional contribution to teaching and learning.
2. Basic competence is assumed. A case for promotion must be built on special qualities over and above basic competence which so distinguish the candidate and justify his or her promotion.
3. The minimum criteria listed here are a reflection of the institutional expectations of faculty. There may be special cases where individuals have outstanding and exceptional qualifications other than those specified in the document. A case for promotion when there are exceptional qualifications will be initiated by the College Personnel Committee.
4. For faculty holding **Instructor through** Associate Professor rank who **are** within three years of retirement and where the date of retirement has been contractually agreed to by the faculty member and the University, the University will consider promotion to the next **higher** rank on an exceptional basis but only where there is a convincing case that the faculty member is a superior teacher.  
Where the exception involves the lack of an appropriate terminal degree, the normal criteria for promotion must be met in each of the other three areas for evaluation. Where the faculty member has a terminal degree, exceptions may be made where there is a weakness in one area (other than in the teaching area) but demonstrably above average performance in other areas of evaluation.
5. **See the AAP-EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 6—Types of Faculty and Appointments, Section 2.A.1.a.-c. and Article 7—Librarians.**

## **B. Indefinite Tenure**

**1. Post Tenure Review.** Post tenure review takes place biennially. When that policy requires more intense review, the processes and criteria associated with review for tenure and the rank of the individual being reviewed, as outlined in the preceding section on **tenure review**, is used.

The following processes are meant to address four specific audiences, with differing goals: (1) the faculty member, as an opportunity for self-reflection and continued growth, (2) the

University, as an opportunity to affirm achievement and locate areas for improvement, (3) the higher education community, as an opportunity to fulfill requirements for accreditation through ongoing review of faculty, and (4) the citizens of the State of Oregon, as an affirmation of continued faculty professionalism in a public university setting.

- a. **Biennial Development Plan.** A written professional development plan will be submitted by the faculty member by the beginning of winter quarter of a review year. The plan should be organized to address the four areas of evaluation (for tenure and promotion) and should be both reflective (what has been accomplished in the past two years of service) and predictive (what will be accomplished in the next two years). The plan should be in a narrative form that provides the context for faculty work and leads the writer into a dialog with the reader (the Dean or Division Chair). The plan should be succinct.

Upon receipt of the plan, the Dean or Division Chair will meet with the faculty member during winter or spring term for discussion of the document. (In Arts and Sciences, the document will then be passed from the Division Chair to the Dean for review.) If the Dean notes significant areas of concern in performance, these will be fully articulated in writing and become part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Dean and the faculty member will then jointly develop a one-year plan of improvement that will, if successfully completed, return the faculty member to the biennial development plan review schedule. Any irreconcilable disagreement between the faculty member and the Dean about formation of the plan of improvement or about whether or not it has been successfully completed will initiate the formal post-tenure portfolio process (#B below) to be completed in the second year.

- b. **Formal Post-Tenure Portfolio Review.** The formal review process follows that of promotion and tenure review process. After the formal post-tenure portfolio review, the faculty member will rejoin the cycle for biennial development planning until a formal post-tenure portfolio review may become necessary again.
- c. **Unsatisfactory Progress.** Oregon Administrative Rules and personnel procedure currently in place offer means as well to address unsatisfactory performance. When unsatisfactory performance is noted, these means can be procedurally enacted.
- d. **Implementation.** The policy will be implemented over a two-year period. Approximately half the tenured faculty in each College will prepare the professional development plan during each of the two years of implementation. For faculty not currently tenured, the first such review will occur two years after the year in which a faculty member is successfully considered for the award of tenure. Colleges will notify affected faculty of their involvement in the process early in the academic year. Colleges will maintain records pertinent to the implementation and conduct of this policy. Colleges will, on an annual basis, inform the Provost's Office of those faculty for whom the process of biennial plan development and review has been completed, any cases involving preparation of a plan of improvement, and any situations that will result in the step of initiating the formal post-tenure review process. In cases where a plan of improvement has been developed, a copy of that plan will be forwarded to the Provost's Office. The Provost will annually include, as a part of the schedule of academic

personnel procedures, dates for completion of the various steps of the biennial post-tenure review process.

Oregon Administrative Rules on Post-Tenure Review (580-021-0140) require that institutional post tenure review procedures "clearly link the level of remuneration to faculty performance"; OUS IMD 4.002 Post Tenure Review further specifies that institutional post-tenure review approaches must include: "a description of the institutional plan for relating post-tenure reviews to the faculty reward system, so that annual salary-adjustment decisions (i.e., increase, no increase, decrease) will reflect the results of performance evaluations."

Eastern Oregon University, in its implementation of the EOU policy on Post-Tenure Review, meets these OUS requirements as follows:

***Note: The following section is an artifact of a pre-collective bargaining environment. It is uncertain as to the status of this set of points:***

all "across the board" salary adjustments require satisfactory service; where service is not satisfactory, no salary increase is given, exceptional service results, using processes and procedures described elsewhere in this Handbook, whenever service is not, satisfactory - as determined at any of the stages of post-tenure review - the College Dean will, after consulting with the College Personnel Committee, make a recommendation to the Provost on the question of a reduction in salary; the Provost will present a recommendation on salary reduction to the President after consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee.

**2. Full Professor Promotion Review.** Promotion to Professor requires the candidate to have demonstrated outstanding performance as a teacher and scholar. In addition to the degree requirements for an Associate Professor, the candidate should ordinarily:

- Have demonstrated above-average ability as a teacher.
- Be able to conduct courses for our students at all levels.
- Be able to direct research or creative work by students.
- Demonstrate solid commitment to the broad discipline.
- Demonstrate recognized professional attainment within the field of specialization involving clear external evaluation and/or recognition normally beyond the State or northwest region.
- Demonstrate a dedication to teaching and learning that assures a continuing commitment.
- Generally has about 12 to 15 years of college-level teaching experience. Exceptions: "that only in a *very rare* and *uniformly exceptional*, and *extraordinarily well-documented* case should a faculty member be consider for promotion to Professor prior to the 12th year of service." The operative words are "very rare," "uniformly exceptional," and "extraordinarily well-documented." "Uniformly exceptional" is interpreted to mean exceptional achievement in each of the four areas of review. "College-level teaching" refers to full-time teaching with complete responsibility for the courses being taught; experience as a graduate teaching assistant is not relevant. [The initial Notice of Appointment for tenure-related appointments will clearly state

whether any years of teaching prior to the initial appointment at Eastern are to be included in calculating the applicability of this criterion.]

## C. Tenure-Track Evaluation Criteria

### 1. Teaching Faculty

Teaching Faculty members under review for continuance (third year), tenure, post tenure, and promotion are evaluated in four major categories:

- i. Instruction
- ii. Commitment to Subject Discipline
- iii. Contribution to the Institution
- iv. Outreach to the General Public

Specific descriptions of these four major categories are as follows:

**i. Instruction.** Effective teaching is an essential criterion to advancement. Under no circumstances will tenure or promotion commitment be made to one whose principal duties include instruction unless there is a clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of teaching, the reviewers should consider such points as the following: The candidate's command of his/her subject; continuous growth in the field; ability to organize materials and present them with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationships of his/her subject to other fields of knowledge; grasp of general objectives; the spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize his/her learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal and professional attributes as they affect his/her teaching and students; the extent and skill of participation in the general guidance and advising of students.

Advising is an obligation to the student body and to the University. The skills and motivation required for advising are not equally distributed and should not be taken for granted. Special efforts and competencies in this area count as an important part of a faculty member's performance and should be rewarded. Factors involved in assessing this criterion include: accessibility to students; amount of time spent in advising students; familiarity with the requirements of various University programs; ability to relate successfully to a wide variety of students for purposes of advising; knowledge of resources available for the meeting of students' needs and the keeping of adequate records.

The reviewers should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. They should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been placed.

Standards and criteria to be used in the evaluation of teaching are further developed in the section on teaching evaluation below.



**ii. Commitment to Subject Discipline / Pedagogy.** Basic to the instructional role that a faculty member performs is an interest in and recurring commitment to his/her subject discipline **and / or pedagogy**. There is an implied obligation, to remain in the academic community, for a faculty member to reach beyond the classroom to maintain his/her competency and to contribute to the **research of the discipline and / or to the scholarship of teaching**.

Although for some disciplines specific criteria will be considered by the CPC, the same standards for scholarship apply to *all* disciplines (if there are published criteria developed that are discipline specific, please insert a link here). In judging the commitment to subject discipline / pedagogy, personnel committees should ensure that the following characteristics and standards of scholarship shared by research, creative endeavor, and teaching are consistently applied to all disciplines.

*Characteristics.*

The characteristics that identify a faculty member's commitment to subject discipline / pedagogy include, but are not limited to, the following indicators:

- reading of scholarly and professional journals;
- peer-reviewed publication of significance and quality;
- research in progress and substantially planned work;
- participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings;
- reading papers or presenting at conferences;
- holding office, serving on editorial boards;
- association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement of the participant and bring recognition to the University;
- professional consultation;
- constructive use of sabbaticals and leaves of absence;
- scope and depth of scholarship;
- works of art;
- public performances;
- public recognition.

*Standards.*

The same standards of quality in research, creative endeavors, and pedagogical scholarship should apply in all disciplines. Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the person's published research, original writings, recognized artistic productions, or the like. There should be evidence that the person is continuously and effectively engaged in creative **or scholarly** activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity **or scholarly endeavor** normally expected in the person's field.

**iii. Contribution to the Institution.** There is an implied obligation for a faculty member to actively participate in and to contribute to the ongoing activities of the institution as reflected by his/her accepting a role in the institutional governance, committee assignments, evaluation of programs, in the establishment of academic standards, and commitment to students through activities and advising. In judging this commitment, the reviewers should consider points such as the following: contributions to committees;

assistance to student activities; work with student interest groups; ability to carry out special assignments of the College or University; contribution to programs through outcomes assessment that leads to improvements in pedagogy, student learning, and curriculum design.

**iv. Outreach to the General Public.** There is an implied expectation that concerns an individual's outreach to the general public as time and specialty will permit. On judging this commitment, the reviewers should consider points such as the following: appropriate weight should be given to the evaluation of such service when it constitutes one of the faculty member's principal duties or responsibilities in the University community or public service programs; community activities related to one's field; using one's professional knowledge or skill in a layman's activity which contributes to the well-being of the community as a whole, of which the University is an integral part; special appointments or awards as a result of professional expertise used on behalf of the community; consultant work; public lectures and seminars; public speeches.

The preceding principles and expectations apply to each of the reviews of teaching faculty undertaken at Eastern.

## **2. Library Faculty** (excerpted from Letter of Agreement, AAP-EOU Contract 2005)

Librarians at Eastern are evaluated for continuation, tenure, promotion, and continuing review in the following four major categories:

- i. Librarianship/teaching
- ii. Research and Scholarship
- iii. Institutional Service
- iv. Professional Service

### **i. Practice of Librarianship/Teaching**

Librarianship within the University setting encompasses a broader scope than classroom instruction. Librarians are not only instructing in classroom settings but are also specialists in providing access to all types of information and are involved in the development of collections (resources), instruction, reference and advisory services, development of information systems, bibliographic control and organization, and administration and planning.

### **ii. Research and Scholarship**

As in other disciplines, progress in library and information science results from the development of new principles and applications of existing ones to professional theory and practice. Evaluation of a publication is based on its contribution to the discipline, rather than on the forum in which it appears because of the variable quality within and among these forums. Papers, presentations and reports to professional organizations also constitute intellectual contribution and the dissemination of scholarship and are evaluated accordingly.

The advancement of librarianship is dependent upon cooperative effort. Research activities conducted within professional organizations are cooperative by necessity and rarely result in individual dissemination of results. Although this activity differs from traditional

models for research and scholarship, its contribution to librarianship and to the ability of the University to provide excellent library service is vital. The particular nature of a collective intellectual contribution is evaluated individually for each librarian and usually is corroborated in peer review from outside the University.

Providing subject expertise in research collection management and development to the University community is a scholarly endeavor unique to the librarians. Librarians identify new areas in established and emerging disciplines and sub-disciplines. This knowledge is used in bibliographic activity and in interaction with the scholarly community. Building collections appropriate for institutional programs requires scholarship, judgment and foresight on the part of the librarians.

### **iii. Institutional Service**

Librarians are expected to contribute to institutional governance and committees, services to students through student welfare activities such as advising with student organizations or groups, and similar activities.

### **iv. Professional Service**

Participation in professional organization and related associations provides the primary vehicle for the fulfillment of a substantial service obligation for librarians. The profession requires coordination and consensus for implementation of the standards, guidelines, and programs which strengthen the position of the University Library in regional, national, and international information systems which extend the librarians' teaching function to the community.

## **D. Portfolios**

### **1. General Recommendations in Preparing the Portfolio**

**a. Coherence:** It is essential that the portfolio provide an integrated view of the candidate. The framing statements are the mechanism for achieving this objective. In a well-designed portfolio, the framing statements themselves should, alone, be sufficient for understanding the case developed by the candidate. While supporting evidence is an important part of the portfolio, the information only verifies the points made in framing statements.

**b. Relevance:** Each type of review has, associated with it, explicit criteria that are to be used by those conducting the review. The portfolio must adequately address each of the relevant criteria. For those reviewers from disciplines other than the discipline of the candidate, the connection may not always be clear between evidence provided and a particular review criterion. Here, the framing statement can again be very helpful by connecting evidence with the review criterion upon which it bears. Familiarity with the relevant criteria can also help determine what is irrelevant, what does not need to be in a portfolio. That leads to the next point.

**c. Succinctness:** A portfolio need not be long. Succinct portfolios are, in the experience of the FPC, far better than lengthy documents arriving with boxes of supporting materials. Portfolios present the evidence that is strongest and most relevant to the criteria for the review being conducted. Swamping such critical

information in vast amounts of tangential information only dilutes the focus of the portfolio and may weaken the case.

**d. Timeliness:** The portfolio must be up-to-date and framing statements should emphasize the more recent achievements.

**e. Completeness:** The portfolio must be complete. Significantly deficient portfolios will be returned without action and with a request that the deficiencies of completeness be addressed prior to further consideration. Carefully review the outline of the portfolio -- including the teaching portfolio component -- to understand what should be in a portfolio.

**f. Consultation:** When in doubt about what to include, never hesitate to ask for guidance from your Dean, members of the FPC or CPC, or the Provost.

The remainder of this section presents portfolio criteria specific to Teaching Faculty (2.) and Library Faculty (3.).

**2. The Teaching Portfolio.** The **tenure-track** academic **personnel review procedures** of the University have, at their core, a portfolio prepared by the colleague being reviewed. It is essential that this portfolio paint a complete, coherent, and up-to-date portrait. Faculty being reviewed for promotion or tenure will include in their portfolios copies of all previous personnel review recommendations made during their career at Eastern (College Personnel Committee recommendations, Faculty Personnel Committee recommendations, College Dean's recommendations, Provost's recommendations, and the President's recommendations) as well as the following:

**The Introduction.** The Introduction should be a general framing statement describing the focus or general direction of your career; and the range of your responsibilities at Eastern (e.g., teaching three dimensional studio art and art history).

- **Instruction.** All **teaching** faculty undergoing personnel evaluation reviews (tenure; promotion; third- and fifth-year reviews; continuation; and full post-tenure reviews) will assemble a portfolio that is a collection of material depicting the nature and quality of an individual's teaching and students' learning. Faculty will assemble systematically collected data from a number of sources so that their teaching can be evaluated fairly and given the emphasis it requires. This portfolio must be modest in size and limited to information that is relevant and current. The following materials are to be included in the portfolio to document performance in teaching and advising **for on-campus and on-site faculty**.

**1. Framing Statement** – Faculty provide a "framing statement" indicating the individual's teaching roles and responsibilities along with a reflective statement focusing on teaching philosophy, important educational outcomes, instructional strategies, activities engaged in to improve teaching, and future goals. This statement creates the conceptual framework that will help members of personnel committees to understand diverse faculty intentions, goals and teaching practices. Faculty diversity in approaches to the instructional mission will be respected; but this can only be done to the extent that the Framing Statement provides an

internally coherent and complete articulation of the faculty member's pedagogical assumptions and approaches. The intent is to evaluate faculty within the context of their unique approach taken to teaching and goals pursued, which can vary widely depending on individual temperament and the demands of their discipline.

**2. *Student Evaluations*** – Student evaluations for all courses taught with enrollments of more than three in the most recent two years, including courses taught inload and out-of-load, will be included in the portfolio. At a minimum, Eastern's standard student evaluation form and standard evaluation procedures are to be used for each course; faculty may elect to supplement these evaluations with approaches of their own design.

**3. *Course Syllabi*** – Faculty will include three representative course syllabi from those taught in the past two years, including lower and upper division or graduate courses.

**4. *Academic Advising*** – The portfolio will include evidence that the faculty member is making valuable contributions in the area of student advising. Data on advising caseloads will be reported on a term-by-term basis for the past two years.

**5. *Institutional Records and Descriptive Information*** – Faculty are to assemble the following institutional records and descriptive information:

- List of classes taught, course delivery mode (on campus, Weekend College, online, etc.), and enrollment numbers in the past two years
- Grade distributions in all classes taught in the past two years
- Service on capstone committees, both in the capacity of advisor and/or reader
- Curriculum development activities either at the program or University-wide level
- Programs, summaries of field trips, other experiences used to broaden students' knowledge beyond the classroom context
- Optional items -- Faculty members' inclusion of optional items is strictly limited to those that will represent a picture of some significant aspect of their teaching that is not revealed in the required portfolio items.

**6. *Direct Evaluation of Instruction for On Campus and On Site*** – In addition to maintaining a Teaching Portfolio as specified in the preceding section, faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure shall be observed and peer-evaluated directly in the classroom and have personnel committee interviews of selected alumni who have taken courses from the professor.

**i. Classroom Observations.** The direct classroom observations will take place in the year prior to the promotion or tenure decision. At a minimum, two unannounced classroom visits are to be made by three different individuals: the College Dean, a faculty peer selected by the person being evaluated, and a faculty peer selected by the College Dean.

The following standardized items are to be used to guide *face-to-face* classroom observations. The report of each peer reviewer should address each of the items below:

- **Communication skills as observed:**
  - Projected voice to be heard easily
  - Listened to student questions and comments
  - Presented examples to clarify points
  - Commanded attention
- **What were the most and least helpful things the instructor did to communicate effectively?**
- **Knowledge of and enthusiasm for subject matter and for teaching:**
  - Presented material appropriate to the stated purpose of the lesson
  - Demonstrated command of the subject matter
  - Encouraged student involvement
- **What content appeared the most and the least suitable to the lesson?**
- **Attitudes towards the students:**
  - Encouraged student discussion
  - Encouraged students to answer difficult questions
  - Used questions to determine if students were having difficulty
- **How did the instructor show interest in students and their learning?**
- **Comments on overall teaching effectiveness.** The individual reports of peer reviewers are available to the faculty member being reviewed and are to be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier being reviewed by personnel committees, the dean, the provost, and the president.

**ii. Evaluation of Teaching. Characteristics to be Evaluated.** Exemplary on-campus teaching is complex, creative, and intellectually challenging. Drawing upon summaries of prior research, Eastern has identified eight broad characteristics of instruction that **are to be addressed by the candidate in a framing statement:**

- Good organization of subject matter and course
- Effective communication
- Knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter and teaching
- Positive attitudes toward students
- Fairness in examinations and grading
- Flexibility in approaches to teaching
- Appropriate student learning outcomes
- Appropriate and effective pedagogy and documented evidence of student learning
- Effectiveness in advising

**7. Indirect Evaluation of Instruction for On Campus and On Site. Course Reaction Surveys** – Faculty are to obtain student evaluations in all courses with enrollments of 3 or more and to do so all terms. Courses taught "in-load" and "out-of-load" are included as are campus-based and off-campus courses, using the University's approved forms and procedures developed for on campus and online/on site. Faculty may choose to supplement these forms with other ways to obtain student evaluations of instruction but these efforts would be supplements and not substitutes.

Each term, the overall student evaluation data will be tabulated with campus-wide norms being reported to faculty when they receive their individual reports. This provides a comparative frame of reference for interpreting student evaluation results.

Faculty around the country differ on the extent to which they view course reaction surveys as **direct** measures of teaching effectiveness or as simply **indirect** measures of student satisfaction. What is certain is that such surveys will, by default, carry more weight than, perhaps, they should if additional means of assessing teaching are not used. Eastern does require varied and complementary means of systematically evaluating teaching; the remainder of this Handbook section presents those means.

**8. Alumni Interviews** – Alumni will be interviewed either face-to-face or via telephone. The following set of standardized questions are to be utilized to focus the interview.

What is your overall assessment of Professor X in terms of:

- course organization?
- communication skills?
- enthusiasm?
- rapport with students?
- effectiveness of the class?
- grading practices?
- How would you describe your working relationship with Professor X?
- How satisfied are you with the education you received in Professor X's classes?
- How would you compare Professor X with other teachers in the same area?
- How would you compare Professor X with other teachers in other areas?
- Did you ever recommend Professor X's courses to other students?

The faculty being evaluated will provide a list of eight graduates who have taken at least two courses from them. College Personnel Committee members will interview at least three alumni from this list.

The individual reports of the alumni interviews are to be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier being reviewed by personnel committees, the dean, the provost, and the president.

- **Scholarship/Commitment to Subject Discipline / Pedagogy.** The purpose of this section is to describe your work as a member of your profession. It should include:
  - Framing Statement which describes your understanding of where your own professional interests fit into your broader discipline. The purpose of this framing statement is to help reviewers understand how the things you have done contribute to your profession.
  - Standard Vita information should be provided including:
  - Lists of publications or their equivalent
  - Lists of papers presented at professional meetings or their equivalent
  - Service on editorial boards or its equivalent
  - Offices, etc. in professional associations

- Evidence and External Review. Generally reviewers may not be equipped to evaluate your professional work directly. Thus, while you may include copies of articles, slides of art work, etc., the reviewers generally may not have adequate background to evaluate them. Comments about your scholarship by professionals in your field away from Eastern are valuable to reviewers and should be included if available.
- **Contribution to the Institution.** This section describes your involvement in the broader University community. Service on committees is most generally listed here. Other things you do for the University (e.g., serve as public address announcer for home basketball games) are also important here. Include:
  - Framing Statement describing in particular any focus in your activities.
  - List committees, etc. that you have served on.
  - Include contributions to GEC and Program-level assessments that resulted in improvements in student learning and curriculum design.
  - Most importantly, be sure to describe what you have done -- in the nature of your contribution to Eastern.
- **Outreach to the General Public.** Eastern serves the educational and cultural needs of the ten easternmost counties in Oregon. We all are expected to contribute to that mission in some way. Include in this section:
  - A Framing Statement which describes how you see your own activities contributing to the University's outreach to eastern Oregon.
  - A list of specific activities which you have undertaken which contribute to the University's outreach to eastern Oregon. Your list might include, among other things, a list of "regional classes" you have taught, research or other scholarly projects you have undertaken which have a direct impact on eastern Oregon, service on boards, etc.

**3. The Librarian Portfolio.** Library Faculty will follow the portfolio guidelines and content categories enumerated in the Section II.C.2 Library Faculty above. Below are the evaluation criteria for each category.

- **Practice of Librarianship**
  - effective interaction with library users
  - positive working relationships and effective communication with other members of the University community
  - provision of access to the information in the research and instructional collections of the University and other resources
  - advancement of the University's educational and research mission through the development of instructional and research collections
  - independence and initiative in meeting the goals of the library
  - skill in attracting, training, developing and effectively supervising staff
  - formation and implementation of the Library's policies and procedures
  - commitment to professional service
- **Teaching**
  - individual or group instruction or academic supervision of students



- course-related lectures (such instruction shall be evaluated by supervisors and/or colleagues)
- credit courses
- improvement of instruction such as teaching innovation, curriculum planning, new courses, the development of new methods, or other related work
- **Research and Scholarship**
  - developing the University's instructional collections
  - significant innovations and developments with respect to library collections, services or methods
  - research and other scholarly activity which may result in some published work and which benefits library operations, or librarianship, or scholarship, included are:
    - publications, including articles or essays in journals; books monographs; chapters in books and essays in encyclopedias; papers in proceedings; technical reports; online tutorials; training scripts; pathfinders; web resources; bibliographies; abstracts; book reviews; and reviews of creative activities;
    - demonstrate efforts to obtain external grant/contract funds, research awards, fellowships and scholarship
  - journal editorship and other editorial work
  - planning, organizing or conducting workshops/seminars and other educational activities
  - critical acclaim or citation by other scholars
  - poetry, reports, pamphlets, columns, films, tapes, exhibits, compositions, concert performances, audiovisual material, etc.
  - leadership in international, national, regional, state or local professional associations in a capacity which advances theory and practice
  - honors, awards, other professional recognition
  - presentation of papers at international, national, regional, state or local conferences and meetings
  - research in progress
  - study toward additional degrees beyond the terminal degree, Master of Library Science
- **Institutional Service**
  - service and leadership within the University through participation in committees and other programs which address its goals
  - participation in student welfare activities [New Student Days, etc.]
- **Professional Service**
  - participation in local, state, regional, national and international professional associations
  - public service in a professional capacity
  - the appraisal of external grant proposals, fellowship applications or other awards
  - consulting work
  - community service, such as work with civic and charitable organizations and groups, either as an individual or as a representative of the University.

## **E. Review Procedures and Processes**

1. **Procedures for the Review Process.** Each year, the Provost's Office develops a schedule for completion of the steps in the academic personnel review procedures. This is shared with the College Deans prior to the beginning of the academic year and is made available online to all faculty.
2. **Library Faculty.** For purposes of reviewing Library Faculty for Promotion and Tenure, the terms “Dean of the College” or “Dean” as used in the Handbook will refer to the Library Director. For purposes of reviewing Library Faculty for Promotion and Tenure, the term “College Personnel Committee” will refer to the Library Personnel Committee.
3. **Library Personnel Committee**
  - a. **Composition.** The Library Personnel Committee shall consist of at least five members including: two librarians, each with at least five years service, one faculty member from each major academic unit, i.e., Colleges of Education and Business, College of Arts & Sciences. Librarians shall be ineligible to serve on the Library Personnel Committee during their review year.
  - b. **Election.** Five members of the Committee will be elected by their peers (Librarians will elect their two representatives, each College will elect its own representatives.)
  - c. **Terms of appointment.** Members of the Library Personnel Committee shall serve for two year terms. They may be reelected.
  - d. The Library Personnel Committee may ask a tenured Librarian from another University for consultation on Library Faculty evaluations.
4. **The Librarians shall request that a librarian serve on the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC).** If a Librarian is not selected to serve on the FPC, the librarians will nominate a tenured librarian to serve in an advisory capacity.
5. **Tenure Clock Delay:** A tenure-track faculty member who becomes the parent or legal guardian of a child by birth, adoption, or legal guardianship will automatically be granted a one time one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. All individuals and committees participating in tenure reviews must recognize that any individual who has received an extension must be held to the same standard to which a faculty member without such an extension is held. A faculty member may choose not to use the automatic extension. Such a request should be made within a year of the child’s arrival in the family.
6. **Procedures for biennial post-tenure review are described separately,** appearing in **Section II.B.1** in this handbook. The procedures described in this section may be employed as a component of the post-tenure review processes when necessary; conditions leading to a need for this more intense post-tenure review are described in the policy on post-tenure review.

The procedure for each of the other types of review is initiated somewhat differently, but then each type of review (*third-year, promotion, tenure*) follows the same basic steps.
7. **College Procedures.** Colleges are encouraged to develop supplemental procedures. For example, a professional program may wish to invite practicing professionals to offer comment on course syllabi; other programs might wish to systematically survey majors and include questions about instructional and advising quality as well as about instructors and advisors.

[FPC—Please review and revise the following section: Colleges may also seek to change or perfect components of the University policy. For example, a College may find that a particular approach to peer evaluation or to the questions asked of alumni is better suited to the situation and objectives of the College. Development of improved and tailored approaches is encouraged; however, any departures from or amendments to the University policy must be approved by the College faculty and Senate, the College Dean, and the Provost prior to implementation. Some changes are likely to be minor: e.g., the wording of questions asked of alumni. If, however, the Provost judges the College policy to depart from the principles and high expectations set by University policy, then she/he will require Senate approval before acting on the proposal. Approved College-level modifications will be noted in this Handbook].

## **8. Steps in the Review Process**

### ***Step 1: Initiating the Process***

- i) Promotion: The Deans of the Colleges meet with their respective College Personnel Committee and develop a list of nominees for promotion. The list of nominees for promotion considered will consist of those faculty who either apply for consideration or who are proposed by a member or members of the College Personnel Committee or who are proposed by the College Dean.
- ii) Tenure: Faculty members on annual tenure appointments who have begun their fifth year of service at Eastern will be automatically reviewed for tenure during their fifth year except as noted in the Tenure Clock Delay.
- iii) Third-Year (Retention) Review: Faculty members who are in their third year of service at Eastern will be automatically reviewed.

### ***Step 2: Notification***

At the start of Fall Term, the Deans will inform faculty who will be evaluated for promotion, tenure, or continuance.

### ***Step 3: Preparation of the Review Portfolio***

Faculty being reviewed prepare a portfolio with contents as described above. (Faculty undergoing their first or second year review do not prepare a portfolio).

### ***Step 4: Submission of the Portfolio***

The portfolio is returned to the Dean of the School by a date mutually agreed upon in the College. At this point the file is shared by the College Personnel Committee (CPC) and Dean of the College. A portfolio that is incomplete when judged by the portfolio specifications in the Faculty/Staff Handbook may be returned to the candidate by the Dean or the CPC without action but with identification of the deficiencies and a request that the deficiencies in completeness be addressed and that the portfolio then be resubmitted.

### ***Step 5: College-Level Review***

The Deans of the Colleges will then consult with their College Personnel Committees and, after that, write a comprehensive evaluation of each candidate based upon the four major categories taking into consideration the faculty member's past assignments and future potential as well as tenure criteria and general considerations. The CPC may

concur with the Dean of the College or, if not, they must submit a separate evaluation(s). The results of the peer evaluation of teaching and the survey of alumni become part of the portfolio at this step (see [Policy on the Evaluation of Instruction](#)).

***Step 6: College-Level Consultation with the Candidate***

The Deans of the Colleges will review their written evaluation with the faculty member at this point. As a result of this discussion, modification can be made and sent to the Faculty Personnel Committee.

***Step 7: Submission to the Faculty Personnel Committee***

The portfolio, along with recommendations and evaluations added in prior steps, is forwarded from the College to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). A portfolio that is incomplete when judged by the portfolio specifications may be returned to the College Dean by the FPC without action but with identification of the deficiencies and a request that the deficiencies in completeness be addressed and that the portfolio then be resubmitted to the FPC for further consideration.

***Step 8: FPC Consideration***

The FPC, as a whole, should then discuss each candidate and make a recommendation. It is expected that the recommendation will be accompanied by a rationale. Any minority positions should be included along with rationale.

***Step 9: Addressing Differences in the Recommendations at the College and University.***

Should the FPC take a position contrary to the Dean of the College, the CPC will meet with the Dean of the College to discuss the difference. As a result of this conference, the Dean of the College may request a meeting with the FPC. Following this the FPC will notify the faculty member of the recommendation made.

***Step 10: The Possibility of Appeal***

In the case of a negative recommendation, the faculty member will be given a chance to meet with the Faculty Personnel Committee. This is the sole appeal point with this Committee or the College Personnel Committee.

***Step 11: The Decision***

The portfolio, containing all information and all recommendations, will then be submitted to the Provost. Prior to making a decision, the Provost will consult with the FPC whenever, based upon her/his initial review of the portfolio, the Provost is unclear as to how the FPC reached its recommendation. The Provost's decision will be reviewed by the President, who notifies the faculty member of the University's decision.

***Step 12: Evaluation of the Process***

Upon completion of the review procedures, the Provost meets with the FPC to critically analyze the functioning of the University's review procedures. Recommendations for improving the procedures are formed with the expectation that they will be implemented for the following year.

### III. Fixed Term Appointments

Fixed Term appointments may be made at Instructor, Senior Instructor, or higher ranks depending upon the programmatic needs of the University.

#### A. Visiting Status

Article 6—Types of Appointment, AAP-EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement

#### B. Regular Full- and Part-Time (on campus/on site)

Regular faculty members not on tenure track (i.e., faculty with appointments not covered by the tenure policy or faculty with transitional status under the tenure policy) are reviewed for annual continuation by the Dean, with submission of a teaching portfolio in the third year and every third year thereafter.

##### 1. Annual / Routine Reviews

a. **Evaluation Criteria.** *Effective teaching* is the most important criterion for continuation. Under no circumstances will continuation be granted to one whose principal duties include instruction unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.

1. **Course Reaction Surveys.** Faculty members are to obtain student evaluations in all courses with enrollments of 3 or more and to do so all terms. Courses taught "in-load" and "overload" must use the University's approved forms and procedures developed for on campus and online/on site. Faculty may choose to supplement these forms with other ways to obtain student evaluations of instruction but these efforts would be supplements and not substitutes. Eastern has identified eight broad characteristics of instruction used to determine continuation on an annual basis:

- Good organization of subject matter and course
- Effective communication
- Knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter and teaching
- Positive attitudes toward students
- Fairness in examinations and grading
- Flexibility in approaches to teaching
- Appropriate student learning outcomes
- Effective pedagogy and evidence of student learning
- Effectiveness in advising (when the Dean has assigned advising as part of the load)

2. **Assessment of Student Learning.** Fixed Term faculty members are expected to contribute direct evidence of student learning in accordance with General Education and Degree Program learning outcomes and assessment cycles.

b. **Third Year Teaching Portfolio Review.** In the third year, and every third year thereafter, the Fixed Term faculty member will submit a teaching portfolio to the College Division Chair or Dean's designee, with a recommendation for continuation made to the Dean.

*The Teaching Portfolio.* The portfolio will include a collection of material depicting the nature and quality of an individual's teaching and students' learning. Fixed Term faculty will assemble systematically collected data from a number of sources so that their teaching can be evaluated fairly and be given the emphasis it requires. This portfolio must be modest in size and limited to information that is relevant and current. The following materials are to be included in the portfolio to document performance in teaching:

1. *Framing Statement* -- Faculty provide a "framing statement" indicating the individual's teaching roles and responsibilities along with a reflective statement focusing on teaching philosophy, the use of technology to maximize student-teacher interaction, instructional strategies and use of a wide array of tools to help students achieve important educational outcomes, activities engaged in to improve teaching, and future goals. This statement creates the conceptual framework that will help members of personnel committees to understand diverse faculty intentions, goals and teaching practices. Faculty diversity in approaches to the instructional mission will be respected; but this can only be done to the extent that the Framing Statement provides an internally coherent and complete articulation of the faculty member's pedagogical assumptions and approaches. The intent is to evaluate faculty effectiveness within the context of online delivery and their unique approach taken to teaching and goals pursued, which can vary widely depending on individual temperament and the demands of the discipline.
2. *Student Evaluations* – The student evaluation form developed by the Faculty Personnel Committee will be used for all on-campus and on-site courses taught in the most recent two years with enrollments of more than three students. Faculty may elect to supplement these evaluations with approaches of their own design.
3. *Course Syllabi* – The Fixed Term faculty member will include three representative course syllabi from those taught in the past two years, including lower and upper division or graduate courses. Syllabi will be evaluated by the Dean or designee for the following criteria:
  - Is the syllabus consistent with the standards required by EOU and program faculty, and does it maintain the intent of the master course syllabus?
  - Does the syllabus compare in scope and depth with similar courses in the discipline?
  - Does the syllabus articulate the appropriate standards and outcomes consistent with GEC and / or programmatic outcomes?
  - Are the range of activities, strategies, resources, and assessments commensurate with other similar courses in the discipline?
4. *Sample Assessments* – The Fixed Term faculty member will submit a set of assessments used in each course. The Dean or designee will examine the assessments to determine the following:
  - Do the assessments match the learning outcomes of the course?
  - Do the assessments compare in depth of expectation to those of similar courses in the discipline?
5. *Sample Faculty-Student Interaction* – The adjunct faculty member will submit a representative sampling of email logs, Discussion Board interaction, and feedback on

assignments, as well as documentation of other means of interaction with students when appropriate. The Dean or designee will examine the Faculty-Student Interaction to determine the following:

- Is the instructor timely in response to student needs and inquiries?
- Does the instructor provide adequate feedback on assessments and assignments?
- Does the instructor engage in regular and substantive interaction with students?

## 2. Promotion Reviews

- Instructor to Senior Instructor.* Advancement in rank should reflect continuing professional contribution to teaching and learning. Basic competence is assumed. A case for promotion must be built on special qualities over and above basic competence which so distinguish the candidate and justify his or her promotion. Eligibility requirements for promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor are available in Article 6.1.B.2 a-b of the AAP-EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement. Faculty will submit a Teaching Portfolio in accordance with the Academic Personnel Calendar, and the Teaching Portfolio will be reviewed by both College and Faculty Personnel Committees, with recommendations for promotion made to the Dean and Provost.
- Other Ranks.* Promotion to other ranks follow the criteria, portfolio requirements, and academic personnel process outlined in Section II of this document.

## C. Online Adjunct Teaching Appointments

Online adjunct teaching appointments are not covered by the AAP-EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement. Agreements for Provision of Instructional Service will be made annually by the appropriate academic Dean. The beginning and ending date of the employment period are specified in the Agreement for Provision of Instructional Services. Beyond the ending date of this period, there is no commitment for continued employment, and timely notice is not required. Fixed-term appointments for one year or less may be renewed subject to such factors as evaluation of teaching and program needs.

Adjunct faculty in their third year of service at Eastern will undergo a portfolio review and formal consultation with the College Dean or designee. This review is automatic and follows the Academic Personnel Review calendar for submission of the portfolio. In cases where continuance is not recommended, the Dean will inform the faculty member.

- 1. Evaluation Criteria.** Adjunct online teaching will be evaluated using the following characteristics of instruction:

- A current course syllabus
- A set of sample assessments matched to course outcomes
- A sample of the interaction between instructor and students in a course
- A statement of pedagogical approach, beliefs, and practices

- 2. The Adjunct Online Teaching Portfolio.** All adjunct online faculty undergoing personnel evaluation reviews in the third year will assemble a portfolio that is a collection of material depicting the nature and quality of an individual's teaching and students' learning. Faculty will assemble systematically collected data from a number of

sources so that their teaching can be evaluated fairly and be given the emphasis it requires. This portfolio must be modest in size and limited to information that is relevant and current. The following materials are to be included in the portfolio to document performance in teaching:

- a. *Framing Statement* -- Faculty provide a "framing statement" indicating the individual's teaching roles and responsibilities along with a reflective statement focusing on teaching philosophy, the use of technology to maximize student-teacher interaction, instructional strategies and use of a wide array of tools to help students achieve important educational outcomes at a distance, activities engaged in to improve teaching, and future goals. This statement creates the conceptual framework that will help members of personnel committees to understand diverse faculty intentions, goals and teaching practices. Faculty diversity in approaches to the instructional mission will be respected; but this can only be done to the extent that the Framing Statement provides an internally coherent and complete articulation of the faculty member's pedagogical assumptions and approaches. The intent is to evaluate faculty effectiveness within the context of online delivery and their unique approach taken to teaching and goals pursued, which can vary widely depending on individual temperament and the demands of their discipline. Faculty must document how they meet the requirement of "regular and substantive interaction" from the HEA requirements for distance education, as defined:

*(19) DISTANCE EDUCATION-*

*(A) IN GENERAL- Except as otherwise provided, the term 'distance education' means education that uses one or more of the technologies described in subparagraph (B)--*

*(i) to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor; and (ii) to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, synchronously or asynchronously.*

- b. *Student Evaluations* – An online student evaluation form developed by the Faculty Personnel Committee will be used for all online courses taught in the most recent two years with enrollments of more than three students. Faculty may elect to supplement these evaluations with approaches of their own design.
- c. *Course Syllabi* – The adjunct faculty member will include three representative course syllabi from those taught in the past two years, including lower and upper division or graduate courses. Syllabi will be evaluated by the Dean or designee for the following criteria:
- Is the syllabus consistent with the standards required by EOU and program faculty, and does it maintain the intent of the master course syllabus?
  - Does the syllabus compare in scope and depth with similar courses in the discipline?
  - Does the syllabus articulate the appropriate standards and outcomes consistent with GEC and / or programmatic outcomes?
  - Are the range of activities, strategies, resources, and assessments commensurate with other similar courses in the discipline?



- d. *Sample Assessments* – The adjunct faculty member will submit a set of assessments used in each course. The Dean or designee will examine the assessments to determine the following:
- Do the assessments match the learning outcomes of the course?
  - Do the assessments compare in depth of expectation to those of similar courses in the discipline?
- e. *Sample Faculty-Student Interaction* – The adjunct faculty member will submit a representative sampling of email logs, Discussion Board interaction, and feedback on assignments, as well as documentation of other means of interaction with students when appropriate. The Dean or designee will examine the Faculty-Student Interaction to determine the following:
- Is the instructor timely in response to student needs and inquiries?
  - Does the instructor provide adequate feedback on assessments and assignments?
  - Does the instructor engage in regular and substantive interaction with students?

Revised Fall 2009 to include library, fixed term, and online adjunct faculty evaluation--for review by FPC