

University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting # 9

Tuesday, October 15, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
 - Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 8 (October 8, 2019) **Attach. #1**
- III. Consent Agenda
- IV. Chair's Report
- V. Provost's Report
- VI. Committee Reports
 - Faculty Affairs Committee: Review of Tenure (FSH 3520) and Promotion (FSH 3560) Policies
 - Torrey Lawrence (Vice Provost for Faculty)
 - F. Marty Ytreberg (Member Faculty Affairs Committee)
- VII. Other Announcements and Communications
- VIII. Special Orders
- IX. New Business
- X. Adjournment

Attachments:

- **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 8 (October 8, 2019)
- **Attach. #2** Review of Tenure (FSH 3520) and Promotion (FSH 3560) Policies

University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate – **Amendment Approved**

Meeting # 9

Tuesday, October 15, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bacon, Bridges, Caplan, Chapman, Chopin, Cosens, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice- Chair), Lawrence (Proxy for Wiencek, w/o vote), Lee-Painter Lockhart, Paul, Sammaruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, R. Smith, Tibbals,

Present via Zoom: Kern, McKellar, Tenuto, Sears.

Absent: DeAngelis, Luckhart, Raja, Wiencek.

Guests: 4.

Guest Speakers: Torrey Lawrence, Vice Provost for Faculty

F. Marty Ytreberg, Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

- I. **Call to Order:** Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:33 PM.

- II. **Approval of Minutes (vote):** A motion to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 8 (October 8, 2019) (Lee-Painter/Dezzani) passed unanimously.

- III. **Consent Agenda:** There was no Consent Agenda

- IV. **Chair's Report**
 - We had a recent loss in the Vandal Family: Adam Seo (Senior chemistry major and active in the Air Force ROTC program), passed away on Oct. 4th, 2019. Chair Grieb called for a moment of silence to honor Adam Seo.
 - For the purpose of providing better acoustics to our Zoom participants and better audio in the room, from next week we will go back to the “U-shaped” seating arrangement, with chairs on the inside and the outside of the tables. The microphone will be in a better (more central) location.
 - Comments to Bookstore Vendor Committee are due tomorrow. Bookstore Committee will meet next week. Chair Grieb thanked A. Smith for volunteering to be the Senate representative on the committee. The committee will meet on October 23rd and 24th at the Wallace Center.
 - Update on the GESC process. Chair Grieb thanked Cher Hendricks for her visit last week. He clarified that the report of the GESC will go to the Provost first for budget reasons, and also per State Board policy. The GESC will then report to the UCGE and follow the regular channels to the University Faculty Meeting (UFM).

V. **Provost's Report** (Presented by VP Torrey Lawrence)

- Homecoming events this weekend!
- Benefits Open Forum – Tuesday, Oct 22, 1:00 pm @ ISUB Summit Rooms (Zoom available)
- NWCCU president will meet with campus on Thursday, Oct 24, 11:00 am @ ISUB Horizon Room (Zoom available)
- University Leadership Weekend: Thursday, Oct 31 – Saturday, Nov 2
- Sabbatical applications are due Oct 31; however, pay attention to college deadlines that are likely before Oct 31.

VI. **Committee Reports:** Faculty Affairs Committee reported on the review of Tenure (FSH 3520) and Promotion (FSH 3560) policies (Torrey Lawrence, VP for Faculty & Marty Ytreberg, FAC)

- VP Lawrence highlighted the goals of the new policy and the target timeline for presenting it at the December UFM. The overarching goal is to develop a policy which unifies FSH provisions for promotion and tenure at the unit, college, and university levels, thus removing existing internal contradictions and inconsistencies. The document is not a Redline because there have been multiple changes since the beginning of the project. The plan is to circulate broadly the current version of the document. There is a website through which one can submit questions and comments (the link is on the cover memo accompanying the revised policy).
- Discussion: To the recurrent question as to whether all changes to the original policy are reflected in the present version, it was replied that this is a very advanced version. In response to a question, it was suggested that broad distribution among faculty may be more useful than among staff, although staff members who assist with P&T packages would benefit from having it. Senators were encouraged to share it as broadly as they see fit.

Marty Ytreberg, representative of Faculty Affairs Committee, remarked that in the past much of the P&T committee membership was left to unit and college bylaws, but with the new policy those processes will be “unified”. Some senators thought that more clarity is needed, in particular for newly hired faculty members who may choose to go through the P&T process according to existing bylaws. In response to these concerns, VP Lawrence said that this point was discussed with General Counsel. The current process is so confusing and contradictory that new faculty members are not likely to favor it. If approved by Senate and at the December UFM, it will be implemented on April 1st, 2020. The new process will be used but the “old” timelines will be honored if a faculty member chooses to go by those. Early implementation is the “cleanest” thing to do. It will remove many inconsistencies which have created problems, legally or otherwise.

The discussion moved to the relation between the new policy and the current definitions of ranks. It was replied that the P&T policy stands on its own without any reference to changes in ranks.

With regard to Third Year Review, a senator asked whether the new policy still allows for termination after an unsuccessful Third Year Review. VP Lawrence replied that the Third Year Review process has now a more formative nature. However, a report from Third Year Review could still trigger non-renewal proceedings.

The question was raised whether the new policy would render college and unit bylaws obsolete. VP Lawrence answered that college and unit bylaws are still needed, for instance for no-P&T committee compositions. Also, the criteria are still a prerogative of each unit and college. A Senator emphasized that it is important to stress this aspect, namely that procedures, not criteria, have been changed in the new policy. As for the need of units and colleges to revisit their bylaws in view of the new policy, it was recalled that those are supposed to be revised every 5 years anyways.

A senator expressed skepticism about a unified “FSH 3500” policy being able to function at all levels. Another senator inquired about a version that had come before the Senate in April 2019. It was noted by VP Lawrence that it was an earlier version which had undergone many changes ever since.

Senators raised questions about the timeline for promotion. It was noted that this question had generated a lot of discussion and feedback since last year from Senate, deans, associate deans, unit administrators, and the Faculty Affairs Committee. As a result of the extensive feedback, many revisions were implemented.

The issue of ranks was brought up again. VP Lawrence reiterated that rank revision is being worked on by a different group that he is part of. Some terminology may have to be changed eventually, but the P&T revisions being presented will stand. There are no conflicts. There was some discussion about whether clinical faculty should be explicitly mentioned in FSH 3500 A-4 a; on the other hand, it was noted, they are implicitly included by the language of that section. Senior instructor and research professor positions can be either tenure- (we do have some) or non-tenure track, as stated in FSH 3500 A-3 d (p.2 of the provided pdf document). FSH 3500 A-3 d defines tenurable ranks, not all ranks (that is done in FSH 1565). There is no contradiction with FSH 1565.

The role of service as a unit administrator in promotion consideration was discussed. VP Lawrence noted that, even though a larger percentage of administration may be present in a faculty member’s Position Description (PD), the same promotion criteria as reflected in the college or unit bylaws must be satisfied.

A suggestion was presented to replace “academic” with “academic, scholarly, and creative” on p.2 of FSH 3500 A-3 a. Clarifications were asked about the information that goes out to external reviewers. It was replied that the information is about scholarly accomplishments, not service or teaching. Requiring peer review of teaching was seen positively. Additional clarifications were asked about whether the external reviewers would also receive the candidate’s PD. Indeed, that will be included to provide better context. On the other hand, annual professional evaluations are not included, to avoid any possibility of influencing opinions. A senator expressed some concern about the selection of peer reviewers, especially the number that must be taken from a list provided by the candidate. VP Lawrence explained that stating such number as “at least one” makes it easier to complete the selection process, because some invited reviewers decline the request. Some senators argued that the candidate should be able to “strike” reviewers from the list, due to the possibility of conflicts of interest. It was then noted that conflicts of interest can be managed early in the process, since candidates are asked to disclose them.

The discussion shifted to the criteria for early promotion or early tenure. It was explained that the need to secure the Provost's approval in the latter case is motivated by the much more serious consequences of going up for early tenure and being unsuccessful. Senators observed that the need to be nominated by a full professor in the unit before early promotion consideration can begin is no longer present. In response, it was noted that the former policy was unclear. With the present revisions, the Dean's approval is still needed. Also, even if nominated, it wouldn't be wise to go up early without the Dean's support.

It was suggested to clarify that Clinical Associate Professors can advance in rank.

Concern was raised about the selection of the unit-level P&T committee, which, in a senator's opinion, gives too much power to the unit administrator.

A Senator expressed some concern with the timescale for promotion to Full Professor as compared to the typical timescale in her college. The senator added that the proposed timelines are inconsistent with typical ones across other law schools, which may make it difficult to recruit new faculty. The Senator requested the addition of the following language: In C-1.b, 3rd line, after "accomplishments," add "or on the timetable for promotion that is typical for the faculty member's academic field." On the other hand—it was replied—it's best to have a uniform process with an appropriate timeline. There is still a lot of flexibility in the proposed policy.

Finally, the question whether an open forum would be welcome was raised, and an "unofficial vote" was taken. A large majority of senators did not support the idea, but off-site senators said it was difficult for them to feel well informed. The discussion ended with the plan to reach out to the centers with a communication strategy involving a face-to-face component.

- VII. **Other Announcements and Communications:** There were none.

- VIII. **Special Orders:** There were none.

- IX. **New Business:** There was none.

- X. **Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn (Tibbals/Dezzani) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate

University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate – Pending APPROVAL

Meeting # 8

Tuesday, October 8, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bacon, Bridges, Caplan, Chapman, Cosens, De Angelis, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice- Chair), Lockhart, Luckhart, Paul, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, Tibbals, Wiencek (w/o vote).

Present via Zoom: Kern, McKellar, Tenuto, Sears.

Absent: Chopin, Lee-Painter

Guests: 7

Guest Speaker: Cher Hendrick (Vice President Academic Initiatives)
Dean Panttaja (Director of General Education)

I. Call to Order

- Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:34 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)

- Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 7 (October 1, 2019)
 - Motion to approve the Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting #7 (Dezzani/ A. Smith).
- Secretary Sammarruca apologized for the technical difficulties. In addition, she requested some amendments to the minutes.
 - Replace “1889” with “*the distant past*”.
 - Replace “*codes types which may have not been revisited*” with “*code types are not been revisited or audited on a routine basis*”.
 - Replace “*from the center to the colleges*” with “*from the center to the colleges and/or vice versa*”.
 - Replace “*assigned at some point*” with “*given as narrative above the graphs in the appendix*”.
 - Before the last paragraph in item **V**, add the statement: “*A Senator stated that he has been at several large public research universities and it is a common believe among faculty that the administration is bloated at the expenses of the academic budgets. In his experience, this may be a myth. It is not a terribly productive use of time to continue to seek a restructuring and dismantling of administrative functions that are currently working.*”
- Secretary Sammarruca announced that she requested a handheld microphone to improve the audio in the room and for the benefit of the Senators who participate via Zoom.
- Chair Grieb proposed an additional amendment. The fourth item of the Chair’s report should read “*Peer/Benchmark recommendations will be distributed to senate by end-of-day October 2nd Senators are asked to comment by Thursday October 10th so that feedback can be provided to the Provost’s office before they make a final recommendation.*”
- Chair Grieb called for a motion to approve the minutes as amended.
 - Motion to accept the minutes as amended (Dezzani/R. smith) passed unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda

- There was no Consent Agenda

IV. Chair's Report

- Chair Grieb recognized Senator Dezzani to welcome new Senator Jerry Fairley (Geological Science) to Faculty Senate.
- The 2019 Borah Symposium on Climate and Conflict is this week. The keynote address is Wednesday, Oct. 9th and features Samantha Power, former US Ambassador to the United Nations.
- Chair Grieb invited Vice Provost Torrey Lawrence to provide an update on the revisions of the Tenure & Promotion policy (presently with the Faculty Affairs Committee). This policy re-write is a complete re-organization. The Faculty Affairs Committee is close to the final product. The draft in its current version will be distributed tomorrow for discussion and feedback. It is not final or ready for a vote. Senators are invited to share the document with their constituencies and solicit feedback. The document consists of about 10 pages of policy and an introduction explaining what the people working on this project want to accomplish. Since last Spring, it has been shared with Senators, Deans, and Associate Deans. The chairs have seen it as well.
- The UI Bookstore circulated a request for proposal for vendor services. Chair Grieb spoke with Greg Cain from Auxiliary Services to obtain more information. In the effort to increase quality of service and reduce costs, they came up with three paths forward:
 - 1) Keep the *status quo* – continue to have the Auxiliary Services operate the bookstore.
 - 2) Full operation proposal – where the vendor takes over full operation of the Bookstore. (Barns & Noble and Follett Corporation).
 - 3) Books only proposal– the clothing and non-book items are separate from the book vendor (Texas Book Company).
- Six proposals were received, which the committee brought down to three. There will be one presentation on October 23rd and two presentations on October 24th. Auxiliary Services seek representatives from both Staff Council and Faculty Senate to sit at the presentations and provide feedback in the selection process. Senator A. Smith volunteered to be the representative for Faculty Senate. Chair Grieb said we look forward to a report from A. Smith on the presentations from the vendors.
- A Senator asked whether the vendors will take comments and suggestions on how to best turn the bookstore in a “real” one. Chair Grieb responded in the affirmative and asked to send him comments and suggestions. He will pass them to T. Mahoney at the Budget Office.
- Chair Grieb recognized B. Foisy to speak. B. Foisy said that he has a piece of information to share with the Senate. According to a report of sales by categories from the bookstore, every single revenue category except clothing has been down since 2015. They are investigating how they can improve the situation. Chair Grieb opened the floor for questions and comments.
- A senator mention that she is surprised to hear that Barn & Noble is getting involved because they almost disappeared. Barnes & Noble were bought by another company and they closed many stores.
- Another Senator commented that Barnes & Noble has been managing University Bookstores for over 20 years. He provided examples from University of California and Boston University. Provost Wiencek confirmed the comment from the Senator and added that they manage the WSU bookstore as well.

- Structure of the Chair Governments on Campus. Faculty Senate leadership is beginning discussions with Staff Council about an update to shared governance at the UI. There will be a ZOOM meeting with University of Minnesota tomorrow. A meeting with VP Lawrence will take place next week. Discussions will go on throughout the year with a visit to Senate later this semester or in the Spring semester.
- Benchmark Institutions. The report to Senate with recommendations and supporting worksheet was distributed to Senators last week. Comments are invited. Chair Grieb will be submitting a report to the Provost's Office early next week. Chair Grieb solicited comments or questions. A Senator asked whether this documentation is for distribution and Chair Grieb answered in the affirmative.
- Sustainable Financial Working Group Update. The first meeting of the Sustainable Financial Model (SFM) Working Group provided an overview of the UI financial situation. President Green indicated that we need a roadmap for where to invest as opposed to where to cut. There are three main issues to address as a committee: Shortfall in our unrestricted net position; Shortfall in our General Education (GenEd) operating budget; and a financial model that can be applied going forward to ensure our financial position is sustainable. Currently, the working group is in the information gathering stage. We need to determine what data are most useful in order to make fully informed recommendations. We also need to determine what are the most important issues to consider. The Sustainable Financial Working Group recommendations go to the president who will work with Provost Council to decide on the best actual path forward.
- Chair Grieb solicited questions or comments and there were none.

V. Provost's Report

- Provost Wiencek said he doesn't have much to add to the previous report.
- He reminded everyone of the Borah Symposium, October 7-9, 2019.
- Sustainable Financial Working Group. Provost Wiencek commented that the previous discussion of the working group was a good and detailed one. He mentions that the conversation was productive. Provost Wiencek solicited questions or comments.
 - A senator asked what the shortfalls are in the reserves and in the GenEd Budget. Chair Grieb answered that we have two categories. The first is Unrestricted net position and he explained that the shortfall here is due to accounting transactions and not cash transactions. The unrestricted net position account is negative \$13 million. The minimum required by the State Board is \$20 million. In total the shortfall is \$33 million in the unrestricted net position. He continued by explaining unrestricted net position is not a budget deficit, it is a balance sheet item, and it is only one line item in what could be considered the equity section of the balance sheet. The second category is the General Education Budget. Chair Grieb recognized the Argonaut for doing a great report on this matter. He added that the shortfall for the 2020 budget is \$14 million.
- Provost Wiencek solicited questions or comments and there were none.

VI. Committee Reports

- There were no Committee Reports.

VII. Other Announcements and Communications

- General Education Curriculum and Assessment Updates - C. Hendricks and D. Panttaja
 - VP Cher Hendricks delivered a presentation on the recent progress of the General Education Steering Committee. She presented the committee members from a slide in her presentation. She reported that Dean Panttaja and VP Hendricks solicited feedback from graduating students and met with Engineering alumni ranging from a last-year graduate to one who had graduated 45 years ago. She proceeded to highlight the committee accomplishments. They made contact with Portland State to learn about their innovative GenEd program. GESC's main philosophy is that GenEd means integrated education. Their goal is to implement a GenEd program which is sustainable. They want to promote the message that GenEd is not something "to just get through". Instead, it is a most important component of a broad education. They will work to eliminate problems currently existing in the curriculum. GESC decided that there will not be a separate committee on reward and recognition of faculty who teach GenEd courses.
Nominations are welcome for people who can serve on one of the three subcommittees: 1) Integrative Education Curriculum & Pedagogy Committee; 2) Integrative Education Sustainable Budget Committee; 3) Integrative Education Communications Committee. VP Hendricks asked that nominations be forwarded to her through Faculty Senate. She asked for other means to communicate this request as broadly as possible. The Daily Register was suggested (Secretary Sammarruca) or the Talking Points (a Senator).
 - A Senator asked for more information about Portland State and their innovative program. VP Hendricks replied that they completely revamped their program already 10-15 years ago. They have people dedicated specifically to GenEd. The same Senator followed up commenting that it may be difficult to disperse the students' misconception that GenEd does not help with their major or minor or their career. How can we convince people that GenEd is part of their education and not an obstacle to it? VP Hendricks proposed including information on the student's degree map, explaining the importance of some courses and their value for their skills and towards becoming a "fully formed individual".
 - A Senator asked for clarifications on the definition of GenEd. VP Hendricks and Dean Panttaja proceeded to clarify: it includes basic math, behavioral social science, arts and humanities. There is an international component.
 - A Senator argued that it is important for advisors to communicate the value of those courses to their students. Addressing a question as to whether faculty are "on the same page", VP Hendricks commented on the importance of convincing everyone. Faculty need to be more involved.
 - A Senator expressed his support for integrative and inclusive education. He also expressed some concern that there may be a "disconnect" between the University Committee on General Education (UCGE) and the General Education Steering Committee. Sometimes, establishing ad hoc groups, rather than going through existing channels, may backfire.
 - Chair Grieb asked what one may expect in terms of process and timelines. VP Hendricks emphasized that it is important to proceed slowly and carefully when dealing with very important things. The goal is to complete the curriculum work by the end of the academic year.
 - Chair Grieb requested an outlook for ISEMs. Will they continue to be offered? VP Hendricks answered in the affirmative, until there is a curriculum change.
 - Some additional conversation took place between VP Hendricks and Chair Grieb about ISEMs. VP Hendricks said that last year there had been some talk about suspending them to save money (they tend to be expensive and hard to staff), until a way is figured out to pay

for it. VP Hendricks pointed out the negative aspect of eliminating something which support freshmen and replacing it with nothing. She asked the provost to support it for one more year and he agreed, so ISEM's are offered this year. A path forward without ISEM's needs to be addressed, and it should happen in the short term.

- A Senator, in reference to the integrated education, wondered whether we are “repackaging” without actually changing the substance. VP Hendricks replied that the main point is to have more integration into the majors, such as, for instance, including Integrated Seminars into the majors. These are some of the ideas the committee is considering.
- A Senator said that sharing those ideas may get a lot of faculty interested, a statement with which VP Hendricks agreed. Hendricks and Panttaja proceeded with the remaining part of the presentation, focused on assessment.
- In this area, there has been a lot of “push-back” from faculty. Every program (for every major), in addition to GenEd, will need to have learning outcomes. For GenEd, they are using CAMPUSLABS tools for assessment just as it is done for any major. Hendricks and Panttaja showed and went over the survey. After they collect all the inventory information, they will get back in touch with faculty about following up. It is crucial to follow up on how students are doing. Faculty who teach GenEd courses may find this cumbersome. Nevertheless, it is important to move us forward.
- In response to a question from a Senator, she emphasized that support is available for faculty.
- A Senator asked whether services such as Academic Tutoring Assistance will be connected with this program. VP Hendricks answered in the negative. Although, she added, each of those programs will have their own form of assessment.

VIII. Special Orders

- APM 20.25: Non-Capital Inventories Control Policy (Consumable Supplies and Merchandise)
 - Chair Grieb introduced the last item: Administrative Procedure Manual (APM) 20.25: Non-Capital Inventories Control Policy (Consumable Supplies and Merchandise). Since this is not a revision to the Faculty Staff Handbook, it comes before the Senate as an “FYI” item.

IX. New Business

- A Senator proposed that we ask ITS for updates on the computers they buy and where they buy them. They may be more expensive than if bought elsewhere, or better suited for office environment than for research. Chair Grieb said we will invite the Director of ITS soon, possibly October 22nd to talk about this issue.

X. Adjournment

- Motion to adjourn (Dezzani/A. Smith) passed unanimously.
 - Adjournment at 4:49 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate



MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 9, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Torrey Lawrence, Vice Provost for Faculty
Diane Whitney, University Policy and Compliance Coordinator

CC: Faculty Affairs Committee, President, Provost, Deans, Assoc. Deans, and Unit Administrators

RE: Draft of New Promotion & Tenure Policy

The most recent draft of a revised Promotion & Tenure (P&T) policy is attached. A preliminary discussion about the policy is scheduled for the next faculty senate meeting on Tuesday, October 15. Here is an overview of where the policy stands:

Why are we revising our P&T procedures?

Our current procedure is a complex web of separate policies that are overlapping, inconsistent, and incomplete. They contradict other UI policies as well as unit/college bylaws. This complexity makes it difficult to understand and even more challenging to follow properly.

What are the goals of this revision?

1. To unify provisions of the FSH regarding the promotion and tenure procedure at all levels (unit, college, and university).
2. To help faculty navigate promotion and tenure by clarifying the procedure.
3. To free reviewers to concentrate on the candidate's materials, not on complex procedures and process interpretation.

Are we changing our P&T criteria?

No. The proposed policy addresses the *procedure* for tenure and/or promotion evaluation. It does not change *criteria* for P&T evaluation.

What has changed from our current policy?

Many small changes have been made to provide clarity and create a better process. In addition, the following noteworthy changes have been introduced:

1. A single process for evaluating both promotion and tenure that also allows for evaluation of promotion or tenure alone as needed.
2. Clarity regarding the promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

3. Uniform committee structures across units/colleges and clearly defined criteria for committee membership.
4. Delegation of “administrative guidance” elements to the provost.
5. Uniform dossier requirements including content, submission timelines, and supplemental materials.
6. Further clarification of special circumstances.

Who wrote the new policy?

The initial draft was created by former Policy Coordinator, Liz Brandt. A small group of people familiar with the P&T process revised the policy throughout 2018-19 year (Liz Brandt, Torrey Lawrence, Anna Thompson, Mary Stout, and Kim Rytter). The policy is currently in the hands of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). Revisions have continued in fall 2019 and feedback was collected from constituencies who have a direct role in the P&T process.

Who already provided initial feedback?

1. **Spring 2019:** Feedback was collected from Faculty Senate (1 meeting), Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)(2 meetings), and unit administrators (2 meetings).
2. **Fall 2019:** Feedback was collected from Deans (2 meetings), associate deans (2 meetings), and FAC (2 meetings thus far).

Can I share this with my constituency?

Yes! You are invited to share this document; however, please note we plan to send it to all faculty next week after receiving input from our Senate meeting. Feedback is invited through an online survey: [P&T Policy Feedback Form](#).

What are the next steps?

The policy will be discussed with Senate on October 15. It will then be shared broadly with all faculty who may provide input via the online feedback form. An open forum will be planned if senate advises us to do so. The policy will then return to FAC for final consideration and approval before going to Senate, UFM, President, SBOE, etc.

If approved, all administrative guidance materials will be updated by the Provost in spring 2020. In March, training will be revised and provided to those directly involved. The new procedures would go into effect on April 1, 2020.

Questions?

Contact Torrey Lawrence with questions (tlawrence@uidaho.edu or 885-7941).

Proposed Policy Changes Regarding PROMOTION AND TENURE
(v.8 – revised October 9, 2019)

Note: The four existing sections of FSH chapter 3.5 will be deleted to accommodate this policy. They are FSH 3520, 3530, 3560, 3570. To avoid confusion with previous policies, this new policy will add two new chapters: FSH 3500 and 3510.

FSH 3500
PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. INTRODUCTION.

A-1. Definitions.

a. Board. As used throughout this section, “board” refers to the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho.

b. University. As used throughout this section, “university” and “UI” refer to the University of Idaho.

c. Faculty Member. For the purposes of this section and certain other sections that contain references to this subsection, “faculty member” is defined as any member of the university faculty who holds one of the following ranks: instructor, senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

A-2. Faculty Promotion.

a. General. Promotion to a rank requires the faculty member to meet the requirements for that rank. Responsibility for the effective functioning of promotion procedures rests with faculty and administrators. Decisions are based on thorough and uniform evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in relation to the expectations as listed in his/her position description. ~~Performance of university administrative duties as a unit administrator is not a consideration in promotion.~~

Commented [LT-V(1)]: This contradicts the “based on PD” statements throughout this policy.

b. Criteria. Promotion is awarded only to faculty members who effectively perform in the responsibility areas contained in FSH 1565 C and meet university, college and unit criteria. Promotion in rank is granted only when there is reasonable assurance, based on performance, that the faculty member will continue to meet the criteria for promotion. Each faculty member shall be evaluated based on the faculty member’s individual position description. The faculty of each college or unit shall establish specific criteria for promotion consistent with the university requirements. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity and shall be included in college or unit bylaws.

A-3. Faculty Tenure.

a. General. Tenure is intended to protect academic freedom in order to maintain a free and open intellectual atmosphere. The justification for tenure lies in the character of ~~scholarly-academic~~ activity, which requires protection from improper influences from either outside or inside the university. Tenure strengthens UI’s ability to attract and retain superior teachers and scholars as members of the faculty. UI’s tenure policy improves the quality of the faculty by requiring that each faculty member’s performance be carefully scrutinized before tenure is granted.

Commented [LT-V(2)]: “Scholarly” contradicts the criteria referenced in policy (see A-3-c below). “Academic” refers to all areas of faculty work.

b. Definition. Tenure is a condition of presumed continuing employment accorded to a faculty member, usually after a probationary period, on the basis of an evaluation and recommendation by a unit committee and administrator, a college committee and dean, a university committee, the provost, and the president. Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed (RGP II.G.1.b). After tenure has been awarded, the faculty member’s service can be terminated only for adequate cause, the burden of proof resting with UI (FSH 3910), except under conditions of

financial exigency as declared by the board (FSH 3970), in situations where extreme shifts of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position, or where the board has authorized elimination or substantial reduction in an academic program (RGP II.G.6.a).

c. Criteria. Tenure is granted only to faculty members who demonstrate that they have made and will continue to make significant contributions in their disciplines through effective performance in the responsibility areas contained in FSH 1565 C as specified in their position description and consistent with university, college and unit criteria. The faculty of each college and/or unit shall establish substantive criteria for tenure consistent with the university requirements for tenure. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity and shall be included in college and/or unit bylaws.

d. Tenurable Ranks. The tenurable ranks are: senior instructor, assistant professor, assistant research professor, associate professor, associate research professor, professor, research professor, and librarian, psychologist/licensed psychologist, and extension faculty, all with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Senior instructor and research professor positions can be either tenure track or non-tenure track.

Commented [LT-V(3)]: This area needs significant revision; however, changes are being considered by QTT (aka Non-Tenure Track Task Force).

A-4. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Positions.

a. Promotion. Full-time non-tenure track positions at the assistant and associate professor level are eligible for promotion to the next rank. Full-time instructors are eligible for promotion to senior instructor.

b. Conversion to Tenure-Track Status. Conversion from non-tenure track appointments to tenure-track appointments requires the approval of the provost, dean, unit administrator, and unit faculty.

B. ROLE OF THE PROVOST.

B-1. Delegation. The provost may delegate any of his or her responsibilities in this policy to a designee.

B-2. Provost's Administrative Guidance. The process of promotion and tenure is administered by the provost. The provost shall, from time to time, publish guidance necessary for the administration of the promotion and tenure system that is consistent with the *Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH)* and the *Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures (RGP)*. This guidance shall be mandatory. The provost's administrative guidance shall include:

- a. Deadlines for promotion and tenure;
- b. The forms required to document the promotion and tenure process (e.g. dossier submission form, unit voting forms, etc.);
- c. Procedures for requesting early consideration for promotion;
- d. Requirements for curriculum vitae;
- e. Requirements regarding the submission of promotion and tenure dossiers including format, order of evidence, page limits for evidence, etc.;
- f. Requirements for the selection of external reviews for scholarly work;
- g. Procedures for collecting feedback from faculty, staff, and students to be used by committees in this process;
- h. The timing of appointments and relative representation of faculty on the university promotion & tenure committee pursuant to section E-3-a-1 herein; and
- i. Other matters necessary to ensure the appropriate administration of the promotion and tenure process.

B-3. Committee Problem Resolution. If the unit administrator and/or the college dean is not able to fill membership on a committee required under this policy, the provost, in consultation with the dean, shall appoint an appropriate faculty member to fill any opening in order to comply with the requirements of this policy. If the provost takes such action under this provision, documentation of the action shall be maintained by the provost.

C. SCHEDULE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE CONSIDERATION.

C-1. Promotion.

a. Timing of Promotion. A faculty member shall be considered for promotion according to the schedule below.

1. Instructors. Full-time instructors shall be considered for promotion to senior instructor during their sixth year of continuous, full-time service as an instructor. Part-time instructors are not eligible for promotion. Senior instructor is not a rank from which a faculty member may be promoted (FSH 1565 D-1-b).

2. Tenure Track Assistant Professors. Assistant professors who are on a tenure track shall be considered for promotion at the same time they are considered for tenure and shall be promoted if they receive tenure (C-2-a herein).

3. Non-Tenure Track Assistant Professors Assistant professors who are not on a tenure track shall be considered for promotion during their sixth full year as an assistant professor.

4. Associate Professors. Associate professors may be considered for promotion during their sixth full year of service, or thereafter, as an associate professor.

b. Early Consideration for Promotion. A faculty member may be considered for promotion at an earlier time than permitted by this policy with the approval of the dean based on the faculty member's record of accomplishments. The process for requesting early consideration for promotion shall be set forth in the provost's administrative guidance pursuant to B-2 herein.

c. Reconsideration for Promotion. When a faculty member has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she may be considered again during their third full year of service or later after denial of promotion unless earlier consideration is approved in writing by the dean.

C-2. Tenure.

a. Timing of Tenure. A faculty member is considered for tenure during the sixth full year of probationary service. Consideration at that time is mandatory (RGP II.G.6.b.ii.). If an associate or full professor is not appointed with tenure, they are considered for tenure during the fifth full year of service.

b. Early Consideration for Tenure. In certain exceptional cases, a faculty member may be considered for tenure at an earlier time than permitted by this policy (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.1), with the approval of the Provost based on the faculty member's record of accomplishments. The process for requesting early consideration for tenure shall be set forth in the provost's administrative guidance pursuant to section B-2 herein.

C-3. Special Circumstances.

a. Late Appointments. When the appointment begins after the start of the academic year (for academic year appointments) or after the start of the fiscal year (for fiscal year appointments) then the timeline for promotion and tenure consideration begins the following year.

b. Transfer between Units.

1. Approval Process. When a non-tenured faculty member transfers to another unit within UI, the transfer must be approved by the provost in consultation with the units and college dean(s).

Commented [LT-V(4)]: FAC suggests changing to "eight weeks after the start of the academic or fiscal year" Note: current policy uses "after January 1."

2. Impact on Time to Promotion and Tenure. The extent to which service in the first unit counts toward tenure and/or promotion in the new unit must be communicated to the faculty member in writing by the provost at the time of the transfer. (RGP II.G.6.1.ii.)

3. Tenure Status. Tenure status does not change when a tenured faculty member transfers from one unit to another within UI.

c. Administrative Appointment. A faculty member who serves as an administrator retains membership in his or her academic department and his or her academic rank and tenure. The faculty member may resume duties in his or her academic department when the administrative responsibilities end.

d. Effect of Lapse in Service. A non-tenured faculty member who has left the institution and is subsequently reappointed after a lapse of not more than three (3) years may have his or her prior service counted toward eligibility for the award of tenure. Eligibility for the award of tenure must be clarified in writing before reappointment. A tenured faculty member who has left the institution and is subsequently reappointed after a lapse of not more than three (3) years must have tenure status clarified in writing by the president before appointment. The faculty member may be reappointed with tenure, or may be required to serve additional years before being reviewed for tenure status. (RGP II.G.6.1.i)

e. Credit toward Tenure and/or Promotion at Time of Appointment. Credit toward tenure and/or promotion may be granted at the time of appointment with the approval of the provost. Such credit must be documented in the letter offering the candidate employment at UI. Where credit toward tenure and/or promotion is approved, all evidence of success in the faculty member's areas of responsibility having arisen during the years for which credit is given shall be included in the candidate's tenure and/or promotion dossier and must be considered in evaluating whether the candidate has demonstrated success in the applicable areas of responsibility. Credit toward promotion and tenure may be granted under the following circumstances:

1. After review of the candidate's qualifications, the faculty in the unit vote that the candidate meets UI criteria for the rank to be offered, and
2. The candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed through service at another institution, or has made substantial contributions to their field of specialization.

f. Appointment with Tenure. A candidate may be initially appointed as an associate or full professor with tenure with the approval of the provost. Appointment with tenure may be offered under the following circumstances:

1. The candidate has attained tenure at another college or university, and
2. After review of the candidate's qualifications, the faculty in the unit vote that the candidate meets UI criteria for tenure and the rank to be offered, and
3. The candidate has demonstrated performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed.

g. Administrative Appointment. A faculty member who serves as an administrator retains membership in his or her academic department and his or her academic rank and tenure. The faculty member may resume duties in his or her academic department when the administrative responsibilities end.

h. Unit Administrator under Review for Tenure and/or Promotion. If the unit administrator is scheduled to be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion the dean shall fulfill all the responsibilities under this policy normally fulfilled by the unit administrator.

i. Conflicts of Interest. A faculty member who is a “related individual” to the candidate as defined in FSH 6241 A shall not participate in the process of promotion and tenure evaluation.

C-4. Extensions.

a. Childbirth or Adoption: A faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption, may request an automatic one-year extension of the timeline for tenure and/or promotion. (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.2.)

b. Other Circumstances: An extension of the timeline for tenure and/or promotion may be granted in other exceptional circumstances (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.2) that may impede a faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure and/or promotion, including but not limited to significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care, child care and/or custody, disability or chronic illness or such other reasons deemed by the provost to be exceptional and likely to impede the faculty member’s progress.

c. Third Year Review. In the event that an extension is requested and granted before the third year review, the review is also automatically delayed for one year.

d. Length of Extension. In most cases, extension of the time to tenure and/or promotion shall be for one year; however, longer extensions may be granted upon a showing of need by the faculty member. Multiple extension requests may be granted.

e. Option to Shorten Extension. A faculty member may choose to be considered for promotion and/or tenure on his or her original timeline, even if an extension has been granted.

f. Procedure for Requesting an Extension:

1. The faculty member must request the extension from the provost in writing by March 15 of the calendar year in which the review process begins, as set forth in the provost’s administrative guidance in B-2. The written request must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other exceptional circumstance.

2. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the provost shall have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost shall, in his or her discretion, determine if consultation with the dean and/or unit administrator is appropriate.

3. The provost shall notify the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean of the action taken.

g. Effect of Extension. If an extension is granted, the expectations for tenure and/or promotion remain the same.

D. PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER. All evidence provided by the candidate and by the unit administrator shall be compiled together into a single dossier in the manner prescribed by the provost’s administrative guidance (B-2 herein). This dossier is the basis for all reviews required by this policy.

D-1. Evidence to be Provided by the Faculty Member. The candidate shall submit the following evidence:

a. Current Curriculum Vitae. The curriculum vitae in the required UI format.

b. Candidate Statements. This section is limited to eight pages.

1. Context Statement. A Context Statement, written by the candidate, describing the candidate’s academic unit and the candidate’s responsibilities within his or her unit as established in the position description. It is intended to inform reviewers about the candidate’s academic environment so that

reviewers may consider the similarities and differences between their own academic unit and that of the candidate. The context statement should also describe the expectations placed on the candidate by interdisciplinary programs or research centers, the requirements of joint appointments or other special circumstances.

2. Personal Statement of Accomplishment. The candidate has an opportunity to interpret their record of accomplishment relevant to the responsibilities in their position description and the criteria for promotion and/or tenure, but should not duplicate other materials in the dossier. The statement may explain and analyze evidence submitted and include a philosophical vision as it relates to the broader impact of accomplishments. The statement explains the nature of the faculty member's activities so that others will understand them fully for purposes of assessment. The format and method of presentation is a matter of faculty choice.

c. Evidence of Accomplishment. Evidence of accomplishment may be provided for each area of responsibility in the position description. Evidence could include examples of scholarly work, teaching evaluation materials, letters of support, etc. This shall not include additional narrative written by the candidate regarding promotion or tenure. This section has no page limit.

D-2. Evidence Provided by the Unit Administrator. The unit administrator shall provide the following evidence to the candidate, in the format prescribed by the provost's administrative guidance (B-2 herein), at least 10 business days prior to before the deadline specified in D-3-a herein:

a. Bylaw Sections. College and unit bylaw sections that cover the following areas:

1. Annual review process and annual performance criteria.
2. Criteria for promotion and tenure.

b. Position Descriptions and Annual Evaluations. Copies of the candidate's position description(s) and annual evaluations for the period under review.

c. Teaching Effectiveness. If teaching is included in the candidate's position descriptions, copies of the candidate's student course evaluation summaries (RGP II.G.6.e) and peer evaluations of teaching as prescribed by the provost's administrative guidance (B-2 herein). The candidate may supplement this section to include other evidence of teaching effectiveness as outlined in FSH 1565 C-1-a.

d. Prior Reports. Copies of the third year review committee reports, periodic review reports, unit administrator's and dean's reports (as applicable) and any responses by the faculty member to the reports.

e. External Peer Reviews. The unit administrator shall obtain three to five external reviews of the candidate's performance in the area of scholarly and creative activity, except in the case of third year review or faculty without responsibility for scholarship or creative activity as defined by FSH 1565 C-2.

1. Qualifications of Reviewers. External reviewers shall be tenured faculty members who have expertise in areas closely related to the candidate's expertise. If the review is to be in support of promotion, each reviewer shall be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking. Because reviewers are asked to provide independent and objective review, reviewers shall not have a personal or professional relationship with the candidate that could prevent a biased assessment.

2. Selection. The list of the reviewers to be solicited shall be developed in collaboration by the unit administrator and the candidate. The unit administrator shall make the final selection of external reviewers, but at least one reviewer shall come from a list of suggested reviewers provided by the candidate.

3. Request Letter. The letter of request to the reviewers shall be based on a template provided by the provost.

4. Materials. The unit administrator shall provide only the candidate's CV, position descriptions for the period under review, candidate statements from D-1-b herein, and up to four examples of the candidate's scholarly work chosen by the candidate. The unit administrator shall not provide the complete dossier or any additional materials to external peer reviewers.

5. Review Criteria.

- a) The review shall be limited to the candidate's scholarly accomplishments in relation to the applicable tenure and/or promotion criteria and the faculty member's position description(s).
- b) Reviewers may not be asked to evaluate the candidate pursuant to external criteria such as those at the reviewer's institution or other professional organizations.
- c) The unit administrator shall make every effort to keep the names of the reviewers confidential from the candidate.

D-3. Submission and Supplementation of Dossier.

a. Deadline for Submission. A candidate's dossier in support of tenure and/or promotion, containing all of the evidence described in section A, must be submitted to the unit administrator either prior to the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to begin or prior to the submission of the candidate's materials to the external reviewers, whichever is earlier.

- 1. External peer reviews need not be submitted as part of the dossier prior to the deadline, but must be submitted, if required, prior to any consideration of the dossier.
- 2. The dossier may be supplemented with scholarship or creative accomplishments occurring after submission. Supplementation must be made pursuant to the provost's administrative guidance.

b. Finalization of Dossier. Submission is final when the faculty member has signed a dossier submission form (developed and updated from time to time by the provost) and provided the signed form to the unit administrator. The evidence described in D-2 herein must be submitted by the unit administrator prior to the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to begin. Other than supplementation provided for in D-3-a-1 and D-3-a-2 herein, the dossier is final when submitted and may not be supplemented or altered after submission.

c. Consideration of Dossier. A faculty member's application for tenure or promotion does not qualify as being considered until the final decision of the president on the application.

Commented [LT-V(5): Needed to clarify timing of appeals (FSH 3840-B-3).

E. TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW.

Commented [LT-V(6): Section E is nearly half of the policy. Consider breaking into three sections E/F/G for unit/college/university.

E-1. Unit Level

a. Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee.

1. Membership. The unit administrator shall constitute a promotion and tenure committee for each candidate according to the following criteria:

- a. The committee shall be composed of five members who shall elect a chair from among their tenured members. At least three of the committee members must be tenured faculty members in the unit. At least one member shall be a tenured faculty member from outside the unit.

b. Because the promotion and tenure committee is a personnel committee, students and non-university employees shall not serve on the committee.

c. In cases considering promotion to full professor, unit administrators are encouraged to include full professors in the committee.

d. Neither the unit administrator nor the dean may serve as a member of a promotion and tenure committee.

e. If there are not three tenured faculty members available to serve on the committee, the unit administrator, in consultation with the dean, shall designate tenured faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are closely related to the work of faculty in the unit. One such member may chair the committee if there is not a tenured member from the unit available to serve as chair.

2. Basis for Evaluation. The unit administrator shall submit the completed dossier to the chair of the promotion and tenure committee. The review shall be based on the dossier as well as feedback collected by the committee from faculty, staff, and students in the unit. The process for requesting such feedback shall be set forth in the provost's administrative guidance pursuant to section B-2 herein. The dossier and feedback must be made available to all committee members at least two weeks prior to their first meeting.

3. Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee Recommendations. The committee may provide the candidate with the opportunity to present evidence from the dossier in support of his or her application for tenure and/or promotion. The committee shall evaluate the promotion and tenure dossier in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The committee shall write a report presenting its evaluation of the evidence and the candidate's performance in each area of responsibility. The report shall also include the committee's recommendation of whether the candidate should be tenured and/or promoted and shall include an anonymized record of the committee's vote for and against tenure and/or promotion. Abstentions are not allowed. The chair of the committee shall deliver the report to the unit administrator. The report shall not be shared with faculty who are not members of the college or university promotion and tenure committees.

b. Unit Faculty Voting.

1. Voting by Tenured Faculty. In the case of tenure, based solely on the dossier, the unit administrator shall poll all tenured faculty members of the candidate's unit regarding as to whether the candidate should be granted tenure. The dossier must be made available at least two weeks prior to voting. Faculty members may submit evaluative comments to the unit administrator for their consideration. Voting results shall not be shared with the candidate's promotion and tenure committee.

2. Voting by Promoted Faculty. In the case of promotion, based solely on the dossier, the unit administrator shall poll all unit faculty members of rank to which the faculty member seeks promotion or a higher rank regarding as to whether the candidate should be promoted. The dossier must be made available at least two weeks prior to voting. Faculty members may submit evaluative comments to the unit administrator for their consideration. Voting results shall not be shared with the candidate's promotion and tenure committee.

c. Unit Administrator.

1. Unit Administrator's Report. The unit administrator shall prepare a written report after considering the tenure and/or promotion dossier, the unit promotion and tenure committee report, and the unit voting results. The unit administrator's report shall include the anonymized voting results as well as the administrator's recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion in light of the university, college and unit criteria. In the event that the administrator submitting the recommendation

has not had at least one year to evaluate the candidate, he or she shall, except for reasons clearly stated in writing, defer to the evaluations and recommendations of the committee when submitting his or her own recommendation.

2. Transmission of Reports to the Candidate and Written Response. The unit administrator shall provide the candidate with copies of the unit administrator's report and the report of the unit promotion and tenure committee. The candidate may provide a written response to the reports within five business days after receiving the reports.

d. Forwarding Materials. The unit administrator shall forward the tenure and/or promotion dossier and all reports and the candidate's response, if any, to the dean.

E-2. College Level.

a. College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each college having more than one unit shall have a standing promotion and tenure committee. The members shall be tenured and shall serve staggered three-year terms. Each unit shall have one representative elected by the unit faculty. The committee shall elect its chair from among its members or may elect the dean or associate dean to serve as chair without vote

b. College Promotion and Tenure Committee Recommendations. The committee shall review the completed tenure and/or promotion dossier including all reports and responses in light of the applicable unit, college and university criteria. The committee chair shall write a report for each candidate making recommendations regarding whether the candidate should be promoted and/or tenured. For each candidate, the report shall include a brief rationale for the committee's recommendations and an anonymized record of the committee's vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. Abstentions are not allowed.

c. Dean's Recommendation. The dean shall make a written recommendation as to whether each candidate should be promoted and/or tenured after considering the evidence presented in the tenure and/or promotion dossier (including all reports, responses and polling information), and advice of the college committee. The dean may also confer individually or collectively with unit administrators about the qualifications of the candidate.

d. Transmission of Reports to Candidate and Written Response. The dean shall provide the candidate with copies of the dean's report and the report of the college promotion and tenure committee. The candidate may provide a written response to the reports within five business days after receiving the reports.

e. Forwarding Materials. The dean shall forward the completed tenure and/or promotion dossier and all reports, recommendations, and responses to the provost.

E-3. University Level.

a. Composition of University Promotion and Tenure Committee. A university promotion and tenure committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost, is appointed each year.

1. Nominations. One-third of the committee's membership shall be randomly selected by the provost from the previous year's committee; the remaining members shall be selected by the provost and the chair and vice chair of the Faculty Senate from nominations submitted by the senators. The delegation representing the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members who should be representative of the breadth of the disciplines within the college. The delegation representing the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members from the college comprising two each from (a) faculty with greater than 50% teaching and research appointments and (b) faculty with greater than 50% University of Idaho Extension appointments. The delegations from the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large each nominate two faculty members from their constituencies. If senators from a college do not submit

Commented [LT-V(7)]: Our colleges currently use a variety of structures, with the main difference being the inclusion/exclusion of the dean in the college committee. As drafted, it allows for faculty on the committee to choose from both options.

nominations by the deadline announced by the provost, the provost shall appoint members from that college, as specified in E-3-a-2 herein.

2. Membership. The membership of the committee shall be as follows:

a. The vice president for research, the dean of the College of Graduate Studies and the provost's designee with primary responsibility for faculty promotion and tenure, to serve *ex officio* (without vote).

b. Two representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, and one representative from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large.

b. University Promotion and Tenure Committee Recommendations. The committee shall make recommendations to the provost regarding the tenure and/or promotion of each candidate with specific reference to the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Each member shall vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. Abstentions are not allowed.

c. Provost Recommendation. The provost shall write a report to the president making a recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. The report shall include a rationale for each recommendation and the results of voting from the university promotion and tenure committee.

E-5. Presidential Approval. The president shall confer with the provost and make the decision regarding tenure and/or promotion for each candidate. The awarding of tenure and/or promotion to an eligible faculty member is made only by a positive action of approval by the president.

E-6. Notice to the Candidate. The president shall give notice in writing to the faculty member of the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion by May 1 of the academic year during in which the decision is made. (RGP II.G.6.c.) The provost's recommendation shall be forwarded to the candidate at that time. Notwithstanding any provisions in this section to the contrary, no person is deemed to have been awarded tenure solely because notice is not given or received by the prescribed times. If the president has not given notice to the faculty member as provided herein, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to make inquiry to ascertain the decisions of the president.

E-7. Denial of Tenure. If a faculty member is not awarded tenure, the president, at his or her discretion, may:

a. Notify the candidate that the year in which the tenure decision is made is the terminal year of employment (RGP II.G.6.k.), or

b. Issue a contract for a terminal year of employment following the year in which the tenure decision is made (RGP II.G.6.j), or

c. Issue to the faculty member contracts of employment for successive periods of one (1) year each. Such appointment for faculty members not awarded tenure must be on an annual basis, and such temporary appointments do not vest in the faculty member any of the rights inherent in tenure and there shall be no continued expectation of employment beyond the annual appointment (RGP II.G.6.j).

F. IMPLEMENTATION.

F-1. Effective Date. With the exception of the provisions of section C herein, this policy shall be effective April 1, 2020.

F-2. Applicability.

- a. The provisions of section C herein regarding the timing of tenure and/or promotion and special circumstances shall apply to faculty hired after the final approval of this policy.
- b. Faculty hired before the adoption of this policy may elect to be governed by the provisions of section C herein with written notice provided to the unit administrator, dean and provost.
- c. Faculty who do not elect to be governed by the provisions of section C herein are subject to the corresponding policies in place prior to the adoption of this policy, specifically those in FSH 3520 and FSH 3560. These historic policies shall remain available on the provost's web page.

**FSH 3510
THIRD YEAR REVIEW**

A. GENERAL. In addition to the annual evaluation of faculty by the unit administrator, each full-time faculty member who is not tenured shall be reviewed by a committee of colleagues during the 24 to 36 month period after beginning employment at UI. It shall provide the faculty member with detailed information regarding the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

B. THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE.

B-1. The third year review committee is appointed by the unit administrator. Each committee shall consist of four faculty members. One shall be a tenured faculty member from outside the unit.

B-2. In the case of a review of a tenure-track faculty member, at least three of the four members of the committee must be tenured members of the faculty member's academic unit. The committee shall be chaired by a tenured faculty member from the unit who shall be appointed by the unit administrator. If there are not two tenured faculty members in the unit available to serve on the third year review committee, the unit administrator shall appoint, as necessary, one or two tenured faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are most closely related to the area of expertise of the faculty member under review. If necessary, a tenured faculty member from another unit may chair the third year review committee.

B-3. In the case of a review of non-tenure-track faculty member, at least three of the four members of the committee must be faculty members holding a rank higher than the faculty member under review in the faculty member's unit. The committee shall be chaired by a higher ranked faculty member from the unit who shall be appointed by the unit administrator. If there are no faculty members holding a higher rank in the unit available to serve on the third year review committee, the unit administrator shall appoint, as necessary, one or two other faculty members from the unit who are most familiar with the non-tenure-track faculty member's area of expertise. If necessary, a higher ranked faculty member from another unit may chair the third year review committee.

C. BASIS FOR EVALUATION. The unit administrator shall provide the completed dossier (FSH 3500 D), excluding external peer reviews, to the chair of the committee. The review shall be based on the dossier as well as feedback collected by the committee from faculty, staff, and students in the unit. The process for requesting such feedback shall be set forth in the provost's administrative guidance pursuant to FSH 3500 B-2. This feedback is intended to be formative and shall not include a vote of the faculty.

D. THIRD YEAR REVIEW REPORT AND CANDIDATE RESPONSE. The committee shall write a report evaluating the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each of the faculty member's responsibility areas. The report shall provide direction to the faculty member regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may provide a written response to the report within five business days after receiving the report. The chair of the committee shall forward the report and any response from the candidate to the unit administrator.

E. UNIT ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW AND CANDIDATE RESPONSE. The unit administrator shall write a report evaluating the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each of the faculty member's responsibility areas. The report shall provide direction to the faculty member regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may provide a written response to the report within five business days after receiving the report.

F. FORWARDING MATERIALS AND RECORD KEEPING. The committee report, the unit administrator's review, the candidate's response(s), if any, and the tenure and/or promotion dossier shall be forwarded to the dean. The dean shall acknowledge receipt and shall forward the materials to the faculty member and to the provost's office for recordkeeping.