I. INTRODUCTION

The Post Tenure Review (PTR) process outlined herein is part of North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University’s, as well as the University of North Carolina System’s effort, to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. This policy is implemented to comply with the 1997 mandate from the Board of Governors that all tenured faculty must be subject to performance review (Section 400.3.3 of the UNC Policy Manual) and the amended Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty as set forth by the Board of Governors in 2008 (Section 400.3.3.1 of the UNC Policy Manual). In accordance with these guidelines, the performance review process for tenured faculty at North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance. Faculty must undergo post tenure review no less often than every five years following the award of tenure. This policy is reviewed every five years.

PURPOSE

Post tenure review is intended to assure continuous improvement in the performance of the faculty as they carry out the institutional mission of teaching, research, creative work and service. The objectives of the post tenure performance review are to: 1.) recognize and reward exemplary faculty performance, 2.) identify and plan to improve less than satisfactory faculty performance and 3.) provide for the administration of appropriate sanctions for faculty whose performance remains deficient. The performance review of tenured faculty is a peer-coordinated process which assesses level of performance, productivity, and/or career development over a longer term than is usually provided by an annual review.

---

1 Approved by the Faculty Senate March 23 2004 with revisions approved by the Board of Trustees on September 17, 2008. Original policy dated July 1998.

2 As the University moves forward with its Strategic Mission/Vision statement subsequent PTR policies may refer to teaching, research, creative work and service as "learning, discovery and engagement."
II. PTR EVALUATION PROCEDURES

PTR evaluations are based on performance standards developed and established by the faculty within the departments of each School/College, the School of Nursing and the Library. All references to ‘department or department faculty’ as used herein shall refer to all departments in the University, the School of Nursing, and the Library.

A. Standards for Performance

Tenured faculty within each department shall develop a narrative statement of the department’s standards for performance by tenured faculty. Standards for Exemplary and Satisfactory shall be established for each of the areas: (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities and (3) Service to the University and the broader community. When these standards are not met, the faculty member will be judged Deficient. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.

Department standards shall be consistent with the standards used for annual performance evaluations and the Faculty Handbook. All department standards shall be fully consistent with the mission of the university, college/school, and department. Department standards for post tenure review shall in no way abrogate the due process protections in Chapter VI of the Code or abridge the rights of the faculty member as described in the Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process (Appendix B-2 of the Faculty Handbook). The University shall provide reasonable resources needed by the faculty to achieve the required level and quality of performance.

The statement of standards, approved by the departmental tenured faculty, shall be the basis for evaluating a tenured faculty member’s performance. The Dean shall forward the statement of standards for each department to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs along with verification that the standards have been written and approved by the tenured departmental faculty. At the beginning of each fall semester the standards shall be distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Departments shall review their standards at least once every five years. A revised policy must follow the process for approval as set forth for the initial policy. Faculty shall undergo post tenure review under the standards that were in place in the first year of their five-year cycle of post tenure review, except for standards imposed by the Board of Governors.

B. Schedule of Evaluation

In accordance with JNC policy, faculty shall undergo Post Tenure Review (PTR) no less frequently than every five years following the awarding of permanent tenure. A successful review for promotion, after a faculty member receives tenure, satisfies the requirements for the faculty member’s post tenure review. If the faculty member has an unsuccessful review for promotion, that faculty member shall undergo a PTR during the next academic year.

---

3 Department Chairpersons are considered administrators. As such they are not subject to PTR evaluation but rather to an administrator’s evaluation. The writing of the department performance standards is a faculty task and as such the Department Chairpersons may not participate.
Similarly, a faculty member who establishes a Performance Development Plan following a PTR evaluation shall undergo his/her next PTR evaluation five years after completing his/her Performance Development Plan. The five-year counting process shall be put on hold during the period of time 1) while a faculty member is on an official leave of absence, or 2) while a faculty member serves in administration. The post tenure review clock will resume when the leave or administrative appointment ends. When necessary, a faculty member may make a written request to the Dean with a copy to the Chairperson for a delay of up to one year.

Review of a faculty member with a joint appointment shall be conducted in the primary department where the faculty member’s tenure was granted with input from other departments in which the faculty member holds joint appointment.

Faculty who have submitted to their Department Chairperson and Dean a certified letter of irrevocable intent to retire and/or resign, effective within one year of their scheduled PTR, may elect not to undergo a PTR.

### III. PTR EVALUATION TIMELINE and PROCEDURES

The calendar for PTR evaluation procedures shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>EVALUATION PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Department meeting in the Fall</td>
<td>Department Chairperson shall distribute department Post Tenure Review standards to all tenured or tenure-track faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Friday in August</td>
<td>The Provost shall notify the Dean of faculty members who are scheduled for Post Tenure Review in accordance with the five year cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 15th</td>
<td>The Dean shall notify the Department Chairperson of faculty in the department who are scheduled for review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Last Friday in September  | • The Department Chairperson shall notify the faculty member in writing that a performance review will be conducted. The notification letter should include the Website addresses of the University’s PTR policy and a copy of the PTR Submission Form. (See Sample - FORM A: The Submission Form p. 114.)  
  • The Department Chairperson will call a meeting of the tenured faculty who will select three tenured faculty to serve on the Performance Review Committee (PRC). The tenured faculty members selected for the PRC will select a PRC chairperson in that meeting. A faculty member |

---

4 Both a review for promotion and the successful completion of a Performance Development Plan are cumulative reviews and satisfy the Guideline in the General Administration Memorandum 371, dated June 24, 1997, that faculty undergo “a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years.”

5 Faculty members who have entered into a Phased Retirement Program with the University, as part of their agreement have relinquished tenure and consequently are not subject to PTR.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Friday in October (or 30 days after receiving the request for the portfolio)</td>
<td>The faculty member being reviewed shall submit his/her portfolio, in accordance with the department standards, to the Department Chairperson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Friday in November</td>
<td>The Department Chairperson or academic unit head will forward the portfolio to the PRC and charge the PRC to begin the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15th</td>
<td>The PRC submits its report to the Department Chairperson or academic unit head and the faculty member being reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 7 days after receiving the PRC report</td>
<td>The faculty member being reviewed may respond in writing to the PRC Report with copies to the PRC and the Department Chairperson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| February 1st                              | - The Department Chairperson shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members indicating his/her response to the PRC findings.  
- The Chairperson will forward a copy of the PRC’s report to the Dean along with the Chair’s response, a copy of the departmental standards, and any response from the faculty member. The faculty member’s portfolio will be forwarded to the Dean if applicable. |
| March 1st                                 | The Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members and the Department Chairperson, indicating his/her response to the PRC’s findings. |
| Within 7 days after receiving the Dean’s response | The faculty member being reviewed may respond to the PRC Report, the Chairperson’s response, and the Dean’s letter in writing to the Dean. |
| April 1st                                 | The Dean will notify the faculty member by letter of the Post Tenure Review decision and shall send a copy of his/her letter, along with a copy of the PRC report, the department standards and any correspondence from the reviewee, the Department Chairperson, and members of the PRC to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. |
| By May 1st                                | The Provost will respond to the Dean and faculty member in writing regarding the Post Tenure Review decision. |
A. Selection of Performance Review Committee

Tenured faculty in all departments in all Schools/Colleges shall constitute the pool eligible to serve as members of a Performance Review Committee (PRC). Administrative tenured faculty are ineligible to serve on a PRC. The Office of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall verify annually the eligibility of all committee members and maintain records of the members of the University-wide PRCs. From this pool, three faculty members shall be selected to serve on the PRC in accordance with the selection process and term of service agreed upon by the tenured faculty in the department, School of Nursing, or the Library. The selection process shall provide for the replacement of a PRC member in the event of illness or separation from the University. Committee members will select a chairperson of the PRC. A faculty member being reviewed may not unilaterally select members of the peer review committee.

C. The Review Portfolio

The faculty member selected for review shall submit a review portfolio to his/her Department Chairperson by the last Friday in October or 30 days after receiving the letter of notification from his/her Department Chairperson, whichever is the later date. Failure to submit a portfolio on a timely basis may result in disciplinary actions.6

The post tenure review portfolio shall include both qualitative and quantitative documentation of performance over the review period. The PTR Submission Form (p.114) is provided as a sample.

The faculty member has the right and obligation to provide all the documents, materials, and statements relevant and necessary for review in accordance with Department standards, and all materials submitted shall be included in the portfolio. The documentation shall include evidence of teaching, research, creative work, professional growth, and service to the University and the broader community. At minimum, the portfolio must include the last four annual reviews and the current curriculum vita. Other materials, at the discretion of the faculty member, may include a maximum of six letters of support from NCA&TSU colleagues and persons external to the university. The portfolio shall be submitted in one three-ring notebook binder with a table of contents, and tabbed sections for ease in locating sections and materials. The faculty member has final determination regarding the contents of the review portfolio and no documents may be added to the portfolio without the faculty member’s approval.

6 Included in such actions is the possibility of dismissal, suspension of employment, reduction in rank or reduction in rank with commensurate reduction in salary. If the faculty member fails to submit the portfolio, the Dean shall so advise the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Penalties may be imposed only in accordance with the procedures prescribed in Appendix B-2, Section 4 - Faculty Handbook and with Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. (See the APPEAL section.)
IV. THE REVIEW PROCESS

The performance review focuses on the faculty member’s (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities and (3) Service to the University and broader community, based on the department standards.

A. Evaluation of the Portfolio

Upon receiving a portfolio, the Department Chairperson shall forward it to the chairperson of the PRC who will convene the PRC.

The PRC shall render a judgment of Exemplary, Satisfactory or Deficient in each of the three faculty areas of responsibility and an overall judgment of Exemplary, Satisfactory or Deficient. Considerable justification must be given if findings of the Post Tenure Review differ substantially from the findings of the four most recent annual reviews. Additionally, the review is to provide informed and candid feedback to the faculty member concerning the quality of his/her contributions, as well as any weaknesses or deficiencies in performance, along with constructive recommendations. If the faculty member has received an overall judgment of Deficient, recommendations for the Professional Development Plan (PDP) must be included in the report. The PRC, after reaching its decisions, shall collectively draft its findings. The chairperson of the PRC shall write a finished version of the committee’s report and circulate it to committee members for agreement and/or suggested changes. The finalized report shall be signed by each of the three committee members. By January 15th, the chairperson of the PRC shall, on the same day, give the report to the faculty member and a copy to the Department Chairperson.

In keeping with UNC policy (400.3.3.1), post tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels and the department chair or academic unit head must consult with the PRC.

B. PTR Overall Assessments

The performance review shall result in one of three possible overall assessments: Exemplary, Satisfactory, or Deficient. An overall assessment of Exemplary or Satisfactory concludes the faculty member’s PTR for the current five-year cycle. An overall assessment of Deficient shall result in the faculty member having to address the deficiencies. The overall assessments are outlined as follows:

1. Exemplary - An overall judgment of Exemplary requires that the faculty member is judged Exemplary in Teaching Performance and in Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities and is Exemplary or Satisfactory in Service to the University. An overall judgment of Exemplary may also be awarded when the faculty member is judged Exemplary in Teaching and Exemplary in Service to the University when extraordinary and long-term service has been rendered in a particular area of the University mission. An overall assessment of Exemplary concludes the PTR process for the five-year cycle.
All faculty members whose performance is judged Exemplary must receive:

- a letter of commendation from the Provost’s Office
- recognition in the local newspaper, Aggie Report, and campus newspaper
- recognition at the Honor’s Day Convocation (names submitted by the Provost’s Office) with a University lapel pin and a plaque.

Additionally,

- the faculty member may be considered for campus amenities such as a one year membership at the fitness center, passes for the faculty or student dining hall and season football/basketball passes.
- the faculty member may be considered for a professional development grant, i.e., a monetary award, which may be used for such things as travel to professional meetings, professional association memberships, computer hardware/software, office supplies, etc.;
- the faculty member may be recommended for priority consideration for a one-semester three-hour teaching load reassignment with the agreement of the faculty member and approval of as approved by the Department Chairperson and Dean;
- the faculty member may be recommended by the Department Chairperson for consideration by the School/College Awards Committee/University Awards Committee, including the UNC Board of Governor’s Excellence in Teaching Award Committee.

2. Satisfactory - An overall judgment of Satisfactory requires that the faculty member is judged at least Satisfactory in Teaching Performance and in Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities, and in Service to the University. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account. A faculty member who is judged to be Satisfactory will receive a letter from the Provost with copies to the Dean and Chairperson. An overall assessment of Satisfactory concludes the PTR process for the five year cycle.

3. Deficient- A faculty member who is not judged Exemplary or Satisfactory is considered Deficient and shall develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP). A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties. The recommendations for the PDP shall be included in the report. The PRC will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson.
C. The Faculty Member’s Response to the PRC Report

The faculty member must be given an opportunity to provide a written response to the report of the Performance Review Committee, the Chairperson’s letter, and the Dean’s response and each must be included in the PTR report that is submitted to the next highest administrative level. The faculty member will have seven days to respond to each.

D. Department Chairperson and Dean Responses to a PRC Report

In keeping with UNC policy (400.3.3.1), post tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. The Department Chairperson shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members, indicating his/her response to the PRC’s findings. The Chairperson will forward a copy of his/her response and the PRC’s report to the Dean along with, a copy of the departmental standards, and any response from the faculty member. When the faculty member is judged Deficient, the Chairperson will forward the faculty member’s portfolio.

The Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members and the Department Chairperson, indicating his/her response to the PRC’s findings. The Dean shall send a copy of this letter, along with a copy of the PRC report and any correspondence from the reviewee, the Department Chairperson and members of the PRC to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
When the Department Chairperson or the Dean disagrees with the PRC report, he/she must consult with the PRC. The consultation with the PRC shall be done with all three PRC members present and the department standards must frame the discussion. The Chairperson or the Dean may ask the PRC to reconsider its findings when the Chairperson or the Dean believes the PRC has misapplied a department standard or provides evidence that the faculty member's portfolio, upon which the PRC based its report, contains inaccurate information. For example, the PRC has judged the faculty member Satisfactory on Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities when the standard calls for at least one publication in a refereed journal and the faculty member has none. The resolution of each specific issue will be based on a consensus or a simple majority with each PRC member, the Chairperson, and the Dean having one vote. A tie will be construed as a favorable decision for the faculty member. The PRC shall determine whether to alter the PRC report as a result of the consultation.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

When the faculty member is judged Exemplary or Satisfactory overall, the PTR process for the current five-year cycle ends. When the faculty member is judged Deficient, the faculty member must address each deficiency and establish a Performance Development Plan (PDP) in consultation with the Department Chairperson and in accordance with the recommendations of the PRC. If duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, then the development plan should so indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities. The PDP should be formulated within 30 days of the faculty member's receiving the PRC report and shall be designed for completion within a three-year period.

Developing the Performance Development Plan

The Department standard for Satisfactory in Teaching, Research, and Service shall form the basis of the PDP criteria. Although each PDP is tailored to individual circumstances, the PDP will:

- identify specific strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member’s performance
- define specific measurable and objective goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies
- outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes
- set appropriate time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes
- indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member could monitor progress
- identify institutional resources to support the PDP
- a clear statement of consequences should improvements not occur within the designated time.
When the Department Chairperson and the faculty member have developed a PDP, the Department Chairperson shall submit the PDP to the Dean with a copy to the PRC. When the Dean accepts the PDP, the faculty member, the Department Chairperson and the PRC are so informed in writing by the Dean, who also forwards a copy to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Failure of the faculty member and the Department Chairperson to reach an agreement on a PDP shall necessitate mediation by the Dean with input from the PRC. This meeting shall include the Dean, Department Chairperson, the faculty member, and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the PDP shall be based on a simple majority. The faculty member does not vote. When the PDP is accepted, the faculty member must comply with the PDP. When the PDP is rejected, the Department Chairperson and the faculty member must revise the PDP and submit it to the Dean with a copy to the PRC.

VI. ASSESSMENT

A PDP requires periodic assessment. This assessment must include accomplishments relative to: 1.) the measurable and objective goals and outcomes 2.) activities to be undertaken 3.) timelines for accomplishment of activities and achievement of outcomes 4.) criteria by which the faculty member can monitor progress; and 5.) institutional resources that will support the PDP including mentoring peers.

Assessment of Progress and Completion of a PDP

The faculty member and the Department Chairperson shall meet semiannually to review the faculty member’s progress towardremedying the identified deficiencies. The second meeting of the year shall determine whether the annual progress on the PDP is acceptable and shall include the Department Chairperson, the faculty member, and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the annual progress on the PDP shall be based on a simple majority with the Department Chairperson and the PRC members each having one vote. A tie will be construed as acceptable progress. The faculty member shall not vote. The Department Chairperson will forward the PDP progress report signed by the PRC members and the Chairperson to the Dean at the end of the academic year.

If the Dean does not agree with the annual assessment of the PRC and the Department Chairperson, the Dean shall notify the PRC, the Chairperson and the faculty member in writing within 14 days and shall initiate a consultation with the Department Chairperson, faculty member and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the annual progress on the PDP shall be based on a simple majority with the Dean, Department Chairperson, and the PRC members each having one vote. A tie will be construed as acceptable progress. The faculty member shall not vote. The Department Chairperson, the PRC, and/or the faculty member may respond in writing to the Dean within 14 days of the Dean’s letter or the consultation.
In the last year, the faculty member, the Department Chairperson, and the PRC shall meet by the last Friday in February. The final meeting and report may come earlier if the faculty member is ahead of schedule in completing his/her PDP. When the Department Chairperson and the PRC conclude that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Department Chairperson shall make a final report to the Dean and send a copy to the faculty member and PRC. When the Dean accepts the report, the faculty member and the Department Chairperson are so informed, by the first Friday in March, and a copy is forwarded to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This ends the PDP assessment process. The PDP is a cumulative review and the faculty member's next PTR evaluation shall come five years after this cumulative review.

When the Dean disagrees that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Dean shall initiate a consultation with the Department Chairperson, the faculty member, and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the completion of the PDP shall be based on a simple majority with the Dean, Department Chairperson, and the three PRC members each having one vote. A tie will be construed as acceptable completion. The faculty member shall not vote. When the conclusion of the meeting is that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member with copies to the Department Chairperson, the PRC and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This ends the PDP assessment process. The PDP is a cumulative review and the faculty member's next PTR evaluation shall come five years after this cumulative review.

When the outcome of the vote is that the faculty member has not satisfied the objectives of his/her PDP, the Dean's letter to the Provost/Vice Chancellor and the faculty member shall recommend an appropriate sanction. Any action shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of The Code of the University. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall, by the third Friday in May, write a letter to the Dean supporting his/her recommended sanction or replacing it with an alternative sanction. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall send a copy of his/her letter to the faculty member, the Department Chairperson, the chairperson of the PRC, and the Dean. The faculty member may appeal the sanction. (See the APPEAL section.)

VII. APPEAL

If the faculty member believes the post tenure review process and resulting sanctions have been unjustly or arbitrarily applied, within five days after receiving a written notice of the penalty, he/she may request, in writing, a private conference with the Dean. This request shall be granted, and the conference held forthwith, within five days after receipt of the request, if possible.

Within five days after the conference, the Dean shall give the faculty member an unelaborated, written statement of whether the original decision remains in effect. Within five days after receiving notice that the original decision remains in effect, the faculty member may in writing request a conference with the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This request shall be granted, and the conference held forthwith, within five days after receipt of the request, if possible.
Within ten days of this conference, the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall send a written evaluation of the matter to the faculty member, the Dean and the Department Chairperson. The evaluation may be in the form of an unelaborated concurrence with the decision; an expression of disagreement with the decision, with or without supporting reasons; or a recommendation for reconsidering the decision, with or without suggestions for specific procedures in doing so.

Within five days of receiving an evaluation from the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that disagrees with the decision or recommends its reconsideration, the Dean shall give the faculty member and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs a response in writing.

For a grievance pertaining to this process prior to a discharge or imposition of other sanction, the full faculty grievance process becomes operative as prescribed in the Policy Manual of the University of North Carolina (Grievances filed pursuant to Section 607 of The Code) and in the Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process (Appendix B-2 of the Faculty Handbook). A discharge or imposition of other sanction may be appealed pursuant to Section 603 of The Code and in the Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process (Appendix B-2 of the Faculty Handbook).
FORM A: SUBMISSION FORM

North Carolina A&T State University
Submission for Faculty Post Tenure Review

1. Teaching Performance
   a. Summarize evidence of effectiveness in teaching in the last five years. This may include:
      • Brief discussion of teaching methods used in classroom
      • Summary of student evaluation results with discussion of additional efforts to collect student evaluations
      • Attendance at workshops, seminars and conferences in specialty area
      • Relationships maintained with other professionals in specialty area
   b. Summarize special contributions to course and curriculum development, experimentation with new methods, materials, etc. in the last five years. This may include:
      • Description of courses developed and taught
      • Use of appropriate technologies in the classroom
      • Use of other materials (e.g., journal articles, study guides, etc.)
      • Innovative approaches to teaching
      • Other devices used to enhance the learning experience (e.g., field trip)
   c. Summarize evidence of effectiveness in academic advising and counseling.

2. Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities.
   a. List in bibliographic form publications in the last five years OR describe creative works/performances in the last five years
   b. Summarize evidence from last five years of funded research
   c. Summarize evidence of professional growth with the past five years. This may include:
      • Professional meetings/conferences/workshops/seminars attended
      • Professional memberships/registrations maintained

3. Service to the University
   a. List significant committee and administrative responsibilities and contributions. Provide evidence of level of participation/contribution.
      • Department
      • School/College
      • University
   b. Indicate significant contributions to the broader community outside the University.
      • Consulting/professional activities outside of the University
      • Other contacts with and/or participation in professional organizations
        Workshops/seminars conducted

---

7 If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.