Kinesiology and Outdoor Recreation (KOR) Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Performance Review Policy

Consistent with university policy, the KOR department strives to "recruit, reward and retain faculty who are committed to helping students become educated, engaged and productive members of society" (SUU Policy 6.1.VI). Our P&T policies and procedures stress activities and efforts that provide individualized opportunities for both faculty and students to realize their academic, professional, and personal goals. We promote and support the role and mission of SUU. We seek to advance the roles and missions of the Department, College, and the University as engaged teachers and mentors, as well as through scholarship, service/leadership, and professional responsibility.

PART I: Mentorship Process

Section A: Kinesiology and Outdoor Recreation (KOR) Department Performance Review Policy for Tenure Track Faculty (TT)

Definitions: University Policy 6.1.VII.A. describes Tenure-Track (TT) faculty as faculty initially at an assistant professor position who will be eligible for tenure. Individuals in administrative positions may also hold a faculty position and be awarded tenure in an academic program. The process for applying for tenure and/or rank advancement will be followed as described in University Policy 6.1.

Department P&T Mentor Team: The Department Chair, in consultation with tenured faculty members shall arrange for each TT faculty member to be paired with two tenured faculty members of the department to form a department Mentor Team. These faculty members serve as the TT faculty member's mentors. They provide formative guidance and assistance on an ongoing basis, as needed. If possible, on a three year rotation cycle, one mentor from each team will be replaced with another tenured faculty member. At the request of the TT faculty member and with approval from the Chair, one or both mentors on their team may be kept in place or replaced with other mentors should the need arise and subject to tenured faculty's availability and willingness to serve. TT faculty may also request mentors from outside the department, with approval from the Chair, and provided the external tenured faculty member is willing and able to serve.

Process for Review of Tenure Track (TT) Faculty

a) **Faculty Engagement and Contribution (FEC) Report**. To facilitate TT faculty progress toward fulfilling the University's student-centered mission, each TT faculty member will submit a FEC Report (3 page maximum) to the Mentor Team on or before the listed due dates/deadlines each Fall. The FEC Report documents accomplishments, contributions, and progress covering the period from the previous academic year through the time the report is submitted.

b) The review of the FEC Report by the department Mentor Team is meant to be both formative and evaluative. The FEC Report is assessed in terms of the extent and alignment of goals and objectives defined in the previous annual FEC Plan with actual contributions. The review may also include unanticipated contributions during the academic year that arose out of necessity or opportunity and may have interfered with previously planned goals.

c) **Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan (FEC Plan).** Each TT faculty member will submit a FEC Plan to their Mentor Team for the upcoming academic year. This again, will be submitted as outlined in published due dates/deadlines each Fall. The Mentor Team's review of the plan is meant to be formative. The content of the plan is reviewed for its alignment with the Department and University's student-centered mission. Note that a TT faculty member may make alterations to their FEC Plan at any time, and such revisions are subject to the Mentor Team's approval.

Evaluative Criteria

d) **Specific KOR criteria for Teaching, Scholarship and Service/Leadership are outlined in Part II.**

e) The Department values academic work that supports the student-centered mission of the department, College, and University. Faculty articulate, in the FEC Report, how their activities and contributions align with SUU's mission and departmental evaluation criteria. The department Mentor Team's evaluation will focus primarily on the faculty member's engagement, contributions, and performance in the areas of student teaching and mentoring, and the extent to which the faculty member met or made progress toward their objectives and goals for teaching and mentoring in their FEC Plan. The faculty member's engagement in scholarship, service/leadership, professional responsibility, and activities that integrate multiple areas, must also be documented for the Mentor Team's review and consideration. The Mentor Team will assess the extent to which the faculty member's objectives and goals in these areas were realized.

f) Based on their review of the TT faculty member's annual FEC Report, the Mentor Team and Department Chair will document the faculty member's progress as either "Satisfactory" progress toward goals and contributions or "Development Required." If the performance of the faculty member is deemed "Satisfactory" progress toward goals by the Department Chair and Faculty Mentor, this evaluation and any formative feedback, shall be communicated to the NTT faculty member in writing and in a timely manner according to published schedules. In the event that a "Development Required" determination is rendered, the Mentor Team and Department Chair will provide written justification for this determination through a detailed assessment of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, service/leadership (or combinations of these areas), and identify areas in which improvements can and should be made. The Department Chair may elect to place the faculty member on probation and assist through developmental opportunities. In the case of a dispute between the faculty member, their Mentor Team and/or Chair, the Dean will serve as arbiter.

g) **Early Tenure**
Following University policy, a TT faculty member may opt to apply for tenure one year early (6.1.4,II,C,3). A TT faculty member considering early tenure should discuss this with their Mentor Team. In order to pursue early tenure, a faculty member must get letters of support from the Department Chair and the Dean by the April 1 deadline. The letters of support serve as departmental criteria for a faculty member to apply for early tenure.

Relative Engagement and Contributions by Faculty across Activities

The Department values engagement and contributions faculty make toward the Department, College, University, community and profession to the extent that they advance the goals and mission for the

Department, College, and the University. The Department appreciates that the source of these contributions may and can be different among faculty members, and for individual faculty members over time. To be eligible for tenure, a TT faculty member must demonstrate increasing proficiency and effectiveness in their engagement and contributions documented in their FEC Reports. A TT faculty member who receives a "Development Required" designation on more than one FEC Report within the tenure review period is less likely to receive tenure.

Section B: Kinesiology and Outdoor Recreation (KOR) Department Performance Review Policy for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT)

Definitions: University Policy 6.1.VII.B. defines Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty as "faculty who are under contract but not ultimately eligible for tenure. Non-tenure-track faculty hold regular faculty titles of Associate Professor (NTT), Assistant Professor (NTT), or Lecturer." This policy further states that the Lecturer is an entry- level position, and that a lecturer is eligible to apply for change in status to Assistant Professor (NTT) after serving 4 years as a lecturer. An Assistant Professor (NTT) is eligible to apply for change in status to Associate Professor (NTT) after serving 7 years as Assistant Professor (NTT).   The KOR Department views this succession of NTT ranks to be optional, according to the wishes of the NTT faculty member.

Department P&T Mentor: Unlike Tenure-Track faculty members, an NTT faculty member will have one individual Faculty Mentor rather than a Mentorship Team. The Faculty Mentor for NTT faculty can be a tenured faculty member or Associate Professor (NTT). At the option of the Chair and NTT faculty member, the Faculty Mentor may be rotated every three years, so that the NTT faculty member may have the benefit of mentorship from more than one faculty colleague. The process for applying for NTT rank advancement will be followed as described in University Policy 6.1.

Process for Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty
   a) **FEC Report.** Each NTT Faculty will submit their FEC Report (3 page maximum) to the Mentor Team on or before the listed due dates/deadlines each Fall. The FEC Report documents accomplishments, contributions, and progress covering the period from the previous academic year through the time the report is submitted. The reporting period will be the previous academic year through the time the report is submitted. The FEC Report documentation to be submitted by NTT faculty members will generally emphasize teaching effectiveness.

   b) The Faculty Mentor's review of the FEC Report is meant to be both formative and evaluative. The FEC Report is assessed in terms of the extent to which the goals and objectives defined in the previous annual FEC Plan were met. The review may also include unanticipated contributions during the academic year that arose out of necessity or opportunity and may have interfered with previously planned goals.

   c) **FEC Plan:** According to the published schedule each Fall, Lecturers (NTT) and Assistant Professors (NTT) are also required to submit an annual FEC Plan, outlining their plans to incorporate high impact, evidence-based pedagogies into their classes as engaged faculty members. The FEC Plan is reviewed by the Faculty Mentor and Department Chair.

Evaluative Criteria

d) Specific KOR criteria for Teaching, Scholarship and Service/Leadership are outlined in Part II.

e) **Emphasis on Teaching Effectiveness**. The NTT faculty member's FEC Report will document how active and engaged the NTT faculty member is in teaching and other activities. However, because the role of the NTT faculty (according to University Policy 6.1.V.3) is to "have a primary responsibility for effective teaching while maintaining currency in their field and secondary responsibility for academic unit participation," engagement in non-teaching related activities is of secondary importance in consideration of the NTT faculty member's annual report and plan.

e) **Review and feedback.** The FEC Report is reviewed by their Faculty Mentor and the Department Chair. If the performance of the NTT faculty member is deemed "Satisfactory" progress toward goals by the Department Chair and Faculty Mentor, this result, including any formative feedback, shall be communicated to the NTT faculty member in writing and in a timely manner according to published schedules.

f) **Remediation plan**. If the review of the NTT faculty member's materials indicates "Development Required", formative feedback will be provided to the NTT faculty member in writing. In the case of a dispute between the faculty member, their mentor and/or Chair, the Dean will serve as arbiter. The NTT faculty member will meet in person with the Department Chair and Faculty Mentor to discuss the review, in a timely manner. If it is determined by the Chair and Faculty Mentor that the deficiencies are realistically remediable, the NTT faculty member, in accordance with the requirement of a development plan created in conjunction with the Department Chair, will be responsible to remediate the deficiencies. The NTT faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair and Faculty Mentor, will prepare and implement a plan for improvement, including a written timetable. The Department Chair may elect to place the faculty member on probation and assist through developmental opportunities.

g) **Associate Professor (NTT) Faculty.** Beginning the academic year following promotion of an NTT faculty to the status of Associate Professor (NTT), they will be required to submit a Five-Year Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan (5Y-FEC Plan), not to exceed three pages. At the conclusion of the five year period a Five-Year Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report (5Y-FEC Report) and a new 5Y-FEC Plan will be submitted, analogous to that required for tenured faculty. The policy in the preceding paragraph (paragraph f.) would apply in the event that the post-Associate NTT faculty member's performance was deemed "Development Required."

Section C: KOR Department Performance Review Policy for Tenured Faculty

Purposes & General Requirements

The purposes of post-tenure review are to; a) encourage tenured faculty members to continue to set and strive toward short- and long-term goals, b) continue to make valuable contributions to the Department, College and SUU in ways that support their mission and roles, and c) foster clear communication about tenured faculty members' activities within the department. Beginning the year a faculty member is tenured and each 5-year interval following the award of tenure, the faculty member is required to submit to the Department Chair a 5Y-FEC Plan. Following each five year interval, a 5Y-FEC Report should also be submitted. Both the 5Y-FEC Plan and 5Y-FEC Report are submitted according to published schedules each Fall.

Materials to be Submitted for Post-Tenure Review

a) **Five-Year Faculty Engagement and Contribution Plan (5Y-FEC Plan).** Included in the post-tenure review is a five year plan (three page maximum) which details 1) the faculty member's goals and expected contributions for the next five years, and 2) the faculty member's plan for realizing these goals and contributions. At the conclusion of each five year interval post-tenure, faculty will report on their five year plan and submit a new five year plan. The 5Y-FEC Plan and subsequent 5Y-FEC Report are submitted to the Department Chair according to the published due dates/deadlines each Fall. At the option of the tenured faculty member, any 5Y-FEC Plan may be modified should the faculty member decide to change their engagement goals and/or contributions. Modifications to the plan are reviewed and approved by the Department Chair.

b) **Five-Year Faculty Engagement and Contribution Report (5Y-FEC Report).** After completing five years post-tenure and each five year interval thereafter, tenured faculty members should submit a 5Y-FEC Report, not to exceed three pages, to summarize: 1) their level of engagement with students, 2) self-reflection of their teaching effectiveness with reference to student evaluations, 3) those contributions to the Department, College, and University that align with their respective mission and roles, and 4) the extent to which the goals described in their most recent 5Y-FEC Plan were met. Additional supporting documentation is not required unless requested by the Department Chair or other evaluative committee.

c) **Remediation for Unsatisfactory Performance**. If the results of the post-tenure review indicate the strong need for changes in faculty activities or performance, this will be provided in writing by the Department Chair. The faculty member may appeal the Chair's decision with the Dean acting as arbiter if needed. The tenured faculty member, in accordance with the requirement of a development plan (including a timetable for remediation) and created in conjunction with the Department Chair, is responsible to remediate the deficiencies. This plan will be reviewed by the Department Chair and Dean, either for approval or a referral back to the tenured faculty member for modification and resubmission. After a remediation plan is finalized, the faculty member will be deemed on probation, and the Dean will forward the post-tenure review and plan, and all documentation, to the Provost. If the tenured faculty member makes acceptable progress within the timetable specified in the development plan, their probation ends. If the faculty member does not demonstrate acceptable progress on the agreed plan within an agreed time frame, this may constitute serious misconduct and the University may elect to discipline the faculty member (see University Policies 6.28, 6.22).

d) The time period for post-tenure review of tenured faculty who become academic officers with administrative assignments, e.g., Assistant Dean or Associate Dean, will (1) count the number of years from the previous post-tenure review (or granting of tenure), (2) not count the years of service as academic officers, and (3) resume the count of years from the date of their return to full-time faculty status, with the next post-tenure review to occur when the count of years reaches five years.

PART II: KOR Promotion & Tenure Evaluation Criteria

SUU Policy 6.1 states that faculty contribute to SUU's Student-Centric Faculty Engagement Mission via faculty engagement exemplifying Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service/Leadership in a manner consistent with that described in Policy 6.1 VIII B (Faculty Engagement).

The Kinesiology and Outdoor Recreation (KOR) Department values engagement and contributions faculty make toward the Department, College, University, community and profession to the extent that they advance the goals and mission for the Department, College, and the University. The KOR Department expects and appreciates that the types of contributions may vary among faculty members, and even for individual faculty members over time. To be eligible for tenure, a TT faculty member needs to demonstrate increasing proficiency and effectiveness in their engagement and contributions documented in their FEC Reports. A TT faculty member who receives a "Development Required" designation on more than one FEC Report within the tenure review period is less likely to receive tenure. NTT faculty will have clearly established roles within the department that generally emphasize teaching/mentoring, with a secondary responsibility to Departmental, College and University service/leadership.

The department's P&T Mentorship Teams and the Department Chair review the faculty member's engagement and contribution plan (FEC Plan) to ensure that their planned teaching, scholarly and service/leadership contributions are sufficient to promote the development of the faculty member. Each goal within the FEC Plan should include an explanation of the value of the goal and how the goal will be achieved. Goals that have been achieved should be reflected upon and disseminated in the subsequent annual FEC Report or 5Y-FEC Report. Goals should be supported by evidence and examples provided either in an appendix or available upon request. Goals that were set but not achieved should also be addressed in the FEC Report or 5Y-FEC Report.

As defined in Policy 6.1, in the event of a dispute between the faculty member, the P&T Mentorship Team, and/or the Department Chair, the Dean or Associate Dean will serve as arbitrator.

Section A: Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Criteria

The following KOR Departmental Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness and engagement is aligned with the most recently approved version of SUU 6.1 and represents a broad interpretation of the criteria as listed in Policy 6.1 VIII. Examples and categories provided are consistent with what is considered as "faculty engaged practices" per Policy 6.1 VIII B. FEC Plans should include a variety of category goals which, if achieved, serve to demonstrate the multifaceted nature of a dynamic, engaged and effective teacher.

Examples of activities and forms of evidence demonstrating teaching efficacy are listed below. Activities may be applied to more than one category; therefore, provide an explanation of which category(ies) the activity is applicable in the FEC Plan and FEC Report. Examples may also be used to develop and refine FEC Plan goals. Yearly goals should include both "Highly valued" and "Valued" activities. It is recommended that faculty also choose developmental goals within each category over the course of 2-3

years.

CATEGORIES for Teaching Effectiveness:

    A. Course Materials Provided to Students
    B. Assignments and Assessments
    C. Feedback to Students
    D. Student Evaluations of Professor and Course
    E. Professional Development
    F. Other with justification

The following lists provide EXAMPLES of the types of materials, activities or contributions that are required or that may be included in each Category. Note that these are simply EXAMPLES and other types of materials or contributions can be included with appropriate justification.

CATEGORY A: EXAMPLES of Course Materials Provided to Students
[Sample documents should be included in an appendix or a linked file]

    SYLLABI – REQUIRED (must be made available as an appendix or linked file). Course syllabi demonstrate content expertise, strong instructional design and sound evaluation and assessment procedures with scoring distributions. Syllabi include learning goals or outcomes that are clearly stated as well as how each will be achieved.

    Highly Valued

- Lecture notes or course Powerpoint presentations (partial/skeletal or complete).
- Solutions to homework assignments and/or completed examples (text, pencast, or other format).

    Valued

- List of objectives that are not topic related (critical thinking, problem-solving, etc.) and how each will be achieved.
- Student wikis or discussion boards with significant contributions from you.
- Practice exams or review guides.
- Animations, video clips, or simulations related to course material.
- Articles from scientific literature.
- New teaching methods or materials along with measurements to determine their impact on students.

    Other (please specify and explain the value of the material to students).

CATEGORY B: EXAMPLES of Assignments and Assessments
[Sample documents which clearly demonstrate the purpose or goal of the assignment/assessment should be included in an appendix or a linked file]

Highly Valued

- Integration of relevant High Impact Practices (HIPs) and/or evidence-based teaching strategies into course curricula and reflection on the development, implementation, and efficacy of those teaching strategies.
- Scheduled course work (class activities, tests, projects) in ways which encouraged students to stay up-to-date in their work.
- Problem sets/homework assigned contributing to course grade at regular and frequent intervals.
- Tests, projects, and assignments that cover the most important concepts of the course.

Valued

- Major paper or project (requires longer than two weeks and involves some degree of student control in the choice of topic or design).
- Assignments which require students to use multiple resources (e.g., data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding.
- "Hands-on" projects such as research, case studies, or "real life" activities.
- Assigned projects, tests, or assignments that require original or creative thinking.
- Use of pre-post survey of student interest and/or perceptions about the subject or to assess background knowledge.
- Opportunities for student self-evaluation of learning.

Other (please specify and explain the value to students).

CATEGORY C: EXAMPLES of Feedback to Students

Highly Valued

- Students see graded assignments/exams and answer key (in a timely manner as to facilitate future mastery of information).
- Rubric-based explanations and grading of student academic performance (in a timely manner which facilitates future mastery of information).
- Exams and/or assignment answers discussed in class (in a timely manner as to which facilitates future mastery of information).

Valued

- Students explicitly encouraged to meet individually with faculty member for additional help or guidance.
- Assignments with feedback before grading or with the opportunity to redo work to improve grade.

Other (please specify and explain value to students).

CATEGORY D: EXAMPLES of Professor and Course Evaluations

STUDENT EVALUATIONS – REQUIRED: Inclusion of all student evaluations provided to the faculty with reflection should be included in an appendix or linked documents in each FEC Report (Annual, Mid-Point or 5Year). Plans for addressing deficiencies if needed should be included in the next **FEC Plan**.

Highly Valued

- Peer/Mentor evaluation of teaching materials and/or teaching methods and the action-oriented goals related to this evaluation (recommended yearly).
- Chair evaluation of teaching materials and/or teaching methods, and the action-oriented goals related to this evaluation.

Valued

- Midterm course evaluation.
- Self-evaluation/reflection on teaching materials and/or teaching methods.
- Peer reviews of administrative evaluations.

Other forms of student feedback (please specify and explain value).

CATEGORY E: EXAMPLES of Professional Development

Highly Valued

- Attending a teaching conference or workshop and demonstration of the implementation of new teaching methods/theories.
- Acting as a Peer Evaluator for a colleague's class or teaching materials followed by a discussion with colleague and a written reflection. This can include access to and review of Canvas course organization and resources.

Valued

- Team-teaching a class, lab, or learning activity.
- Participation in professional development activities and reflection on how these activities will be used to improve teaching.

Other forms of Professional Development (please specify and explain value).

Section B: Scholarship Evaluation Criteria

Scholarship: The KOR Department expects faculty members to participate in scholarship, as defined in Policy 6.1 VIII F. Scholarly activities that align with the University's student-centered mission are especially valued.

Tenure-track (TT) faculty are expected to consistently engage in scholarly activities. Scholarly contributions that directly or indirectly promote the student-centered mission of the University may fall under several scholarship domains; which may include discovery, application, teaching or integration. Within the KOR Department engagement in scholarship may be demonstrated through process related outcomes, as well as via dissemination. Accordingly, three contribution categories intended to emphasize a developmental progression from process related outcomes to dissemination are identified below; with examples of contributions that *may* fall in each category. However, each faculty member's P&T mentorship team, in consultation with the faculty member and the Department Chair, determine the category to which each scholarly contribution is assigned. The examples provided are not intended to serve as an all-inclusive list, thus contributions not listed are also encouraged through the "other with justification" option. In general, KOR faculty are encouraged to include a variety of contributions annually. In addition to consistently engaging in scholarly activities, it is recommended that promotion to associate professor among TT faculty include the following *minimum* benchmarks: 4 contributions considered to be "highly valued" and 8 other contributions (any category). It is also recommended that promotion to professor include consistently engaging in scholarly activities with demonstration of continued contributions, while meeting a similar *minimum* benchmark.

EXAMPLES of Highly Valued Scholarship/Contributions:

- Significant publication *(book/lab manual/workbook, etc.)* in appropriate academic area
- Principal writer of funded external grant *(≥ $25,000.00)*
- Project director of funded external grant
- Scholarly paper/presentation or co-presenter with a student at a national or international professional meeting or conference *(peer-reviewed; poster presentation, etc.)*
- Published article or co-published article with a student in a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication of a book chapter
- Principal writer of new academic program development *(R401 for Board of Regents)*
- Principal writer for national accreditation or accreditation self-study
- Peer reviewed journal article/publication
- Peer reviewed technical reports
- Other with justification

EXAMPLES of Valued Scholarship/Contributions:

- Principal writer of funded external grant *(<$25,000)*
- Assistant project director of funded external grant
- Scholarly paper/presentation or Co-presenter with a student at a state (e.g. UCUR), local (e.g. FOE) or regional professional meeting or conference
- Mentor student led research project *(undergraduate or graduate)*
- Funded faculty development grant *(e.g., FDSF or FSSF)* or faculty advisor for student development grant *(e.g., UGRASP)*
- Book review for publishing company

- Workshop presentations
- Principal writer for national accreditation or accreditation annual review
- Contributor to new program development *(R401 for Board of Regents)*
- Contributor for national accreditation or accreditation review/self-study
- Professional consultation *(submitted in writing to a client)*
- Development and integration of knowledge into a course that requires learning and applying new methods or technology
- Recertification of a currently held credential in appropriate academic area *(re-exam, etc.)*
- Other with justification

EXAMPLES of Developmental Scholarship/Contributions:

- Published article in a journal or other print or electronic medium *(not peer-reviewed)*
- Invited speeches and lectures (*not peer-reviewed*)
- Submission and approval of an IRB application
- Significant progress of data collection
- Significant progress of grant development/submission
- Significant progress creating a book/lab manual/workbook etc.
- Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed journal *(rejected)*
- Contributor for national accreditation or accreditation annual review
- Attending professional development workshop/conference *(grant writing, national/regional/state professional organization, etc.)* and discussion of implications or effect on your teaching/scholarly work
- Maintain certification of currently held credential in relevant academic area *(CEUs, etc.)*
- Other with justification

Section C: Service/Leadership & Professional Responsibility Evaluation Criteria

Service/Leadership: The KOR Department expects faculty members to participate (whether voluntary or by appointment) in the operation or function of the Department, College, and/or University (Policy 6.1 VIII.G). In addition, service/leadership roles within the community and/or their professional field and related organizations will be recognized. Service activities that promote the student-centered mission of the University are especially valued. The department's P&T Mentorship Teams and the Department Chair review the faculty member's engagement and contribution plan (FEC Plan) to ensure that their planned service/leadership contributions do not become so excessive as to interfere with the faculty member's performance, objectives, and goals in the area of teaching/mentoring and/or scholarship.

Professional Responsibility: The KOR Department appreciates and values amicable, ethical, collegial, and responsible colleagues. KOR faculty members are expected to adhere to all SUU policies and codes of conduct. Faculty are expected to attend and contribute to College and Department meetings. The KOR Department assumes that faculty members have complied with SUU policies on professional and ethical conduct (University Policy 6.28) unless evidence is presented to the contrary according to processes outlined in Policy 6.28. VII.

Faculty are expected to consistently provide service and leadership when requested and/or opportunities arise. Service/Leadership engagement and activities can be reported under several categories. Faculty are encouraged to include service/leadership engagement and activities from more than one category annually. Adherence to Policy 6.28 is expected as well. In addition to reporting these Service/Leadership activities, evidence in the form of letters of appreciation or support can be provided in an appendix or upon request.

EXAMPLES of Service to the University or College:

- Chair or member of University committees
- Faculty Senate
- Hosting off-campus groups, colleagues or other professionals in a formal setting
- Advisor to a student organization
- College P&T Evaluation Committee
- College committee chair or member

EXAMPLES of Service to the Department:

- P&T Mentorship Team member
- Peer teaching evaluator
- Scholarship development or evaluation of scholarship applicants
- Graduate thesis committee chair or member
- Departmental committee chair or member
- Hosting off-campus groups, colleagues or other professionals at an informal venue (e.g. community workshop)
- Writing letters of recommendation or support for students or colleagues, presentation at departmental seminars or meetings
- Formal Academic Advising

EXAMPLES of Service to the Profession:

- President, board member, council member or office holder in national or regional professional organizations
- Recognized accomplishment in professionally related activity
- Professional consulting or editorial services

EXAMPLES of Service to the Community:

- Involvement in organizing or directing a community service activity
- Participation in a community service activity
- Presentation of workshops or seminars for campus or community members
- Formal representative of the University, College or Department at community events

EXAMPLES of Developmental Activities that may fall under the Service/Leadership Category:

- Participation in seminars or workshops that emphasize mentorship, advising or leadership principles
- Demonstrated improvement in these areas with justification (e.g. letter of support, informal student or peer evaluation, formal evaluation)

Other Service/Leadership activities may be included with justification