University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #3

Tuesday, September 8, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #2, September 1, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo (Provost)

VII. Committee Reports.
     Faculty Affairs:
     FS-10-002: FSH 3520 – Faculty Tenure
     FS-10-003: FSH 3560 – Faculty Promotions
     FS-10-004: FSH 3570 – Professional Portfolio
     FS-10-005: FSH 1565 – Ranks and Responsibilities

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2009-2010 FS Meeting #2, September 1, 2009
FS-10-002 through FS-10-005
University of Idaho  
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
2009-10 Meeting #2 Tuesday September 1, 2009

Present: Baillargeon, Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Edwards, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, (sorry she isn’t FS member, was committee chair) Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Limbaugh, Marshall, Mihelich, Miller (chair), Murphy, Stark, Stearns, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Off-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene). Absent: Barlow, Stohner. Guests: 3

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved (Murphy/Huber) to accept the minutes of the meetings of May 5, 2009, meeting #28 of the 2008-09 Faculty Council and meeting #1 of the 2009-10 Faculty Council.

A friendly amendment was proposed for the minutes of meeting #28. Professor Haagensen for Professor Bender, Chair of the Intellectual Property Committee suggested to amend FC-09-078 FSH 5300, changing the second paragraph to: The Intellectual Property Committee had no position on the proposed change, as the committee had not been able to meet.


Chair’s Report: The Chair thanked senate members for their willingness to work on behalf of the UI community. He noted important changes to the constitution that had been implemented effective July 1, 2009. The name change from Faculty Council to Faculty Senate was one that emphasized the importance of the role of shared governance in the UI system. He further noted that the three Centers, Coeur d’Alene, Boise and Idaho Falls now each had a full participating voting member on the Faculty Senate. In addition, the constitutional change allowing faculty across the state to participate in General Faculty Meetings would have importance in the upcoming year. He further suggested that all senators mark their calendars as the first General Faculty Meeting for the year will be held on September 16 at 3:30 (Pacific summer time). The Moscow venue would be JEB 104.

The Chair went on to note that this year is likely to see lots of changes and stresses with the continuing recession and inevitable budget cuts. These will be important issues that the senate will deal with and he advised senators to be sure to be well prepared, reading the distributed material each week and coming to the Faculty Senate meeting prepared to discuss the issues. He also encouraged senators to think about the broader issues and to consider the impact of our decisions on the university as a whole.

He noted that any major policy issue that arises this year should be considered by the senate and asked all members to be vigilant in their awareness of such issues and to bring them to the attention of the Chair, Vice Chair or the Secretary of the Faculty.

The Chair noted that the inauguration of President Nellis would be held on October 16 in the Kibbie Dome and he encouraged everyone to add this important event to their calendars.

Provost’s Report: The Provost noted that last year was full of challenges and this body had achieved a great deal. He thanked the members of the 2008-09 Faculty Council for their hard work. He went on to note that many fiscal challenges were still before us. State revenue was now projected to be down compared to projections at the close of the legislative session.
On the up-side, we have a new president. President Nellis is enthusiastic about increasing revenues in creative and innovative ways. He spent his first ten days at UI touring the state and listening to constituents. He was impressed with faculty achievements and impacts across the state. He noted that the President’s inauguration would be both a celebration of a new era and a celebration of the achievements of the institution.

The Provost moved on to address the first few in a long list of issues that are before us this year. On October 12/13, representatives of the North-West Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) will be on campus for the UI fifth year review. This was part of what was a 10 year cycle, but under changes to the NWCCU, will now work under a seven year scheme. Thus, UI would be involved in review activities regularly over the next few years as the new term arrangements phase in. The Provost noted the importance of receiving a successful review by NWCCU as accreditation was required for UI to receive federal funding. He thanked senator Jane Baillargeon for her work in preparing the review documents in response to the review in 2004.

The Provost went on to note concerns about the H1N1 flu virus. It appears that symptoms will last for around three days in most cases. He noted that anyone running a fever should stay home. Information about the virus was available at the following webpage: http://www.uidaho.edu/H1N1.aspx. UI was also collaborating with the local community health care system to provide information about the virus and how to avoid infections. We are investing in protection. The vaccine will not be available for about one month. He encouraged faculty to share information with students and colleagues.

The Provost further noted that many in the UI community had worked hard on the Requests for Innovations (RFIs) last spring. President Nellis and interim President Daley-Laursen had worked together in reviewing the RFIs and were in close agreement. Information and roll-out of the successful RFIs will occur in the next week or two.

Faculty Secretary’s Annual Report: The report was briefly reviewed at the senate retreat. The report is very useful for those researching recent activities of the FS. It provides a reference tool summarizing all of the important issues that were dealt with by the 2008-09 Faculty Council. It can also be accessed at the Faculty Secretary’s website.

FSH 3750: The Chair noted that benefits for spouses of new professors were restrictive. He suggested that improving this benefit might have low budget impact and provide a stronger incentive to attract and retain quality faculty. Discussion about how this might be handled followed. Would it be implemented through Human Resources? It was noted that the typical pathway was recommendation from committee forwarded to FS that would then move on to higher administration and ultimately the Regents for approval. A further suggestion was that the issue could be broadened to include supplemental support (suggested 50% of fees) for the children of faculty and staff. Some years ago the head of HR services had conducted a fiscal impact study and it was then thought that the impact would be small. The Provost noted that it would be useful to model the effects of the suggested changes to determine impact on revenues. The Chair suggested that there may even be a positive impact on revenues increasing the student enrollment that might otherwise be lost. It was also suggested that data describing such benefits at peer institutions would be helpful in bringing a policy change forward. It was moved (Miller/ Murphy) that Senate ask the Faculty Affairs Committee to review FSH 3750 in order to recommend changes that will enhance employee recruitment and retention. Approved.

Approval of sites remote from the Moscow Campus for General Faculty Meetings. (FSH 1540 A1-Venue Determination). The Faculty Secretary noted that three nominations were received: Twin Falls, Coeur d’Alene and Idaho Falls. Each was strongly supported by resident faculty, 12, 8 and 11, faculty
signatures respectively. It was noted that at the Boise Center, a committee would work on proposing the site and providing the nominees needed for the University Multi-Campus Communications Committee. It was moved (Williams/Guilfoyle) to approve the sites at Twin Falls, Coeur d’Alene and Idaho Falls. Approved unanimously.

**Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo from the Provost.** The Chair suggested that the items in the Provost’s memo could be categorized into six issues and that the Senate might address each one in a systematic way. He encouraged collegial discussion on these issues.

The Provost provided some framing comments: He noted that we continue to face budgetary issues and simultaneously further implement strategic planning. He noted the $12M reduction in state funding compared to the previous year and that the stimulus package addition of $4M to offset the state reduction in 2009-10 was unlikely to be available again in 2010-11. However, legislators were negotiating towards a potential repeat federal stimulus allocation of $4M in 2010-11. It is also likely that state revenue will be down (not flat) in 2010-11. President Nellis is asking the community to look for innovative ways to increase revenues. Prior to his arrival investment in graduate stipends, advancement and research have shown returns. Both graduate and undergraduate enrollments appear to be up and reliable figures on undergraduate enrollment will be available within a few days. Research activity is up: the number of proposals up 40% and the requested dollar amount is up 60% on last year. Fund-raising in FY09 was up 3% compared to peer institutions who showed major drops in fund-raising.

The discussion turned to proposed class size limits. The Provost noted that less than 1% of our classes had more than 40 students and approximately 50% had fewer than 15 students. He suggested that solutions to these low numbers may lie in offering classes every other year or perhaps in some cases partnering with WSU. Senate questions follow in italics with responses following.

*What is the 5 year trend in student numbers? It would be useful to know specific numbers rather than percentages.* The Provost noted that these numbers would be helpful and suggested that the Assistant Vice President of Enrollment Management, Steve Neiheisel, could provide a report to the Senate.

*Do we have the faculty numbers to teach increased enrollments?* The Provost responded that he believed we had additional capacity for teaching.

*How was the critical class size of 15 identified? It was suggested that there are many other models and ways to look at class size rather than working on a static number.* The Provost responded that Provost’s Council had deliberated and discussed these numbers during the summer. It was decided that we needed to make some decisive moves and this model was chosen. The Provost was interested in exploring other models if they could be well-justified.

*If WSU students are included in a class, their numbers are not presently captured using the data system in place. How can this be corrected?* The Provost noted that the problem referred to was known by the deans and that they would be accounting for WSU students taught in our classes in making determinations of class sizes.

*Will Directed Studies be included in identifying small classes?* No.

*Will teaching classes (class numbers) away from the Moscow campus be evaluated using the same criteria?* The Provost responded that much of the teaching at Idaho Falls for example, was done on a contractual basis and falls into the exemption built into the policy.
Will Special Topic classes be included in identifying small classes? Classes that are limited by infrastructure, for example if a small number of microscopes are available, this type of class would also be exempt.

The numbers given for undergraduate classes converts to 60 students in a major. There is a danger that a large number of majors could be discontinued under this policy. In addition many graduate majors would be affected and this is likely to have a large negative effect on research revenues. The Provost responded that he was aware of examples such as this in the College of Science. This may mean that different models will need to be discussed. The Provost noted that the Yardley report had identified weaknesses in having too many very small graduate education programs.

It was further suggested that graduate classes tended to be variable in number from year to year and that some form of rolling average number might provide a better indicator of overall numbers in many cases. The Provost noted that this may be another useful model to consider.

The chair then noted the Senate having other required business to finish put an end to this important discussion noting that more time is needed and the discussion would be taken up again. The following actions took place:

- Moved and seconded to confirm Professor Rod Hill as Secretary to the Faculty Senate (Huber/Williams). Approved.
- Election of a member to the University Budget and Finance Committee was deferred to next meeting.
- Election of a member to the Campus Planning Advisory Group. Professor Marshall was nominated, unopposed. Approved.
- FSH 2450 - Judicial Appeal four regular senators and a student needed. Senators Battaglia, Miller, Graden, Guilfoyle and Limbaugh were nominated unopposed. Approved.
- Confirmation of Sabbatical Leave for 2010-11. Approved.

Professor Murphy provided comment on the budget situation. He noted that the budget situation would be very difficult in 2009-10. He asked for any feedback on the recent interviewed candidates for the Budget Director position.

In closing, the Chair noted that items would be coming forward from Faculty Affairs Committee. These are changes in addition to related earlier changes to FSH 3320 Annual Performance Evaluations and Salary Determination of Faculty Members, FSH 3050 Position Description and FSH 3140 Performance expectations. These include FSH 3520 Faculty Tenure, 3560 Faculty Promotions and 3570 Professional Portfolio. Senators are advised to look at these important changes carefully in consideration of discussion at upcoming meetings on September 8 and 15.

Professor Guilfoyle noted that she was serving on the President’s Inauguration Committee and asked senators to think about the magnitude of the inauguration, and next week would bring a motion to ask for classes to be cancelled on that day to allow both faculty and student to attend the celebrations, which requires Senate approval.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Murphy/Fritz) to adjourn at 4:55 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
FACULTY TENURE

PREAMBLE: This section defines tenure and sets out the procedure by which a faculty member is evaluated, at the department, college, and university level, for a possible award of tenure. In general, the material gathered here was all an original part of the 1979 Handbook. The material that provides the first sentence of what is now subsection F, H-1, J-1 through J-3 was added in July 1987. At that time what is now subsection D (criteria for tenure) and subsections I-4 and J-1 (specifying review at the university level) were added and what is now H-4 (concerning the formal tenure-review process) greatly enlarged. Substantial revisions to D, H-3, H-4, H-5, and I-4 were made in July 1998. The tenurability of lecturers and senior instructors was clarified (Section E) in July 2001. Subsections F, G, and H were revised and J-3 added in July 2002; G-1 and H-3 were substantially revised July 2005. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. Minor rearrangements and clarifications were made January 2008. In July 2008 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms that were intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. Except where specifically noted, the rest of the text was written in July 1996. More information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448) or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151).

CONTENTS:
A. Definition of Tenure
B. General Purpose of Tenure
BC. Further Definitions
D. Criteria for Tenure
E. Tenurable Ranks
F. Tenure Eligibility
G. Time Requirements for Tenure
H. Evaluation for Tenure
I. Review of Evaluations at the College Level
J. Review of Evaluations at the University Level

A. DEFINITION OF TENURE. Tenure is a condition of presumed continuing employment that is accorded a faculty member by the regents, usually after a probationary period, on the basis of an evaluation and affirmative recommendation by a faculty committee with concurrence by the faculty member’s departmental administrator and college dean and by the president. Tenure is granted only when there is a reasonable assurance based on performance that the faculty member will continue to meet the standards for tenure. After tenure has been awarded, the faculty member’s service can be terminated only for adequate cause, the burden of proof resting with UI [see 3910], except under conditions of financial exigency as declared by the board [see 3970], in situations where extreme shifts of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position, or where the board has authorized the elimination of, or a substantial reduction in, an academic program. [ed. 7-98]

AB. PURPOSE OF TENURE GENERAL. Tenure has as its fundamental purpose the protection of academic freedom in order to maintain a free and open intellectual atmosphere. The justification for tenure lies in the character of scholarly activity, which requires protection from improper influences from either outside or inside the university. A tenure policy strengthens the capability of a university 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 and on an annual basis periodically thereafter [see FSH 33204]. [ed. 7-90]

BC. FURTHER DEFINITIONS.

BC-1. Board. As used throughout this section, “board” refers to the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho. [ren. ?]

R-12. TENURE is a condition of presumed continuing employment that is accorded a faculty member by the regents board, usually after a probationary period, on the basis of an evaluation and affirmative recommendation by a
faculty committee, with concurrence by the faculty member’s departmental administrator, and by the college dean, and by the president. Tenure is granted only when there is a reasonable assurance based on performance that the faculty member will continue to meet the standards for tenure. After tenure has been awarded, the faculty member’s service can be terminated only for adequate cause, the burden of proof resting with UI [see 3910], except under conditions of financial exigency as declared by the board [see 3970], in situations where extreme shifts of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position, or where the board has authorized the elimination of, or a substantial reduction in, an academic program. [fed. 7-98]

**B-3C-2. University.** As used throughout this section, “university” and “UI” refer to the University of Idaho.

**B-4. 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 [see 1520-H-1] who holds one of the following ranks: instructor, senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

**C-1-D. CRITERIA FOR TENURE.** 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 (FSH 1565 C) as specified in their position description/teaching and service and their scholarship in the areas of teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery and application, or appropriate and specified in their position descriptions. The college and departmental criteria [see H-1 and G-1-II] must also be met. [rev. 7-98].

**D. TENURABLE RANKS.** The tenurable ranks are: senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, assistant research professor, associate research professor, distinguished professor, research professor, and librarians, psychologist/licensed psychologist, and extension faculty all with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Administrative and service positions, as such, are not tenurable. Lecturer and instructor are not tenurable ranks. (See FSH 3560 D-1.) The rank of senior instructor can be used with either a tenure or non-tenure track position but it is not a rank from which a faculty member may be promoted (See FSH 1565 D-1 bc.) Appointments made to the titles may be made as “tenure track” or “non-tenure track” positions. [rev. 7-98, 7-07]

**E. TENURE ELIGIBILITY.** The granting of tenure is based on the criteria formulated and described below and follows the procedures specified in subsections E, F, G, H, and I. Full-time faculty members who hold tenurable ranks are eligible for appointment to tenure under the conditions and through the procedures described in this section—appointments to tenure may not be made, however, that will cause the number of faculty members with tenure to exceed 75 percent of the total number of faculty members.

**E-1.** Tenure is not awarded automatically, but only on the basis of explicit judgment, decision, and approval. A faculty member who is eligible for consideration for tenure must be evaluated by the departmental unit administrator, interdisciplinary leader and center administrator if appropriate, and dean, including all narratives, is forwarded to the president for review. In the event that the administrator submitting the recommendation has not had at least one year to evaluate the candidate, he or she will, except for reasons clearly stated in writing, rely on the evaluations and recommendations of the tenure-recommending committee when submitting his or her own recommendation. The candidate is responsible for demonstrating that she or he has met the criteria for tenure. The authority to award tenure rests with the board, which has Tenure is awarded by the board, which has delegated its authority the responsibilities to the president. Before attaining tenure, The burden of proving worth rests with the appointee/candidate. A faculty member eligible for tenure is to be informed in writing of his or her appointment (by preferred contract) or nonappointment to tenure not later than June 30 of the year of review for tenure. [See H-1-II-B-1] [rev. 7-02, 1-08]

**E-2.** The granting of tenure to a librarian, student counselor, other academic officer, or a member of the Cooperative University of Idaho Extension Service does not provide tenure in the particular position held.

**E-23.** To serve as the administrator of an academic department, the appointee must hold academic rank in a discipline. A departmental administrator is never unable to be granted tenure in his or her administrative
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FE-34. The Board defines academic administrators who are eligible for tenure as the chief academic officer of the UI (provost), deans, department chairs, and their associates and assistants of academic units. An academic administrator may be appointed with or without academic rank, except that an administrator of an academic department must hold academic rank in a discipline. [See E-2] If the appointment carries academic rank, evaluation for tenure is conducted by the department in which the rank is held. In such cases, tenure will be granted only upon favorable recommendation of the department or upon successful appeal of an unfavorable recommendation. In the event that tenure is not granted, the appointee may continue to serve in the administrative or service capacity (except as administrator of an academic department), but without academic rank. [rev. 7-02]

GF. TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE ELIGIBILITY.

GF-1. Probationary or term appointments may be for one year, or for other stated periods not exceeding one year, and are subject to renewal. [See 3900.] Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed. (RGP II(6).) Ordinarily a faculty member is not considered for tenure until the fourth full year of probationary service, and consideration is mandatory no later than the sixth full year of service. (RGP II(6).) Credit for prior experience may be given in accordance with the provisions in of GF-4. Faculty members initially employed as full professors can be appointed with tenure when this action is supported by a majority of the tenured faculty in the department or equivalent unit and by the university administration; otherwise, professors are considered for tenure during the fourth full year of service. In this context, unless otherwise specified, the term “year” means the appointment year, whether that is an academic, calendar, or fiscal year. When the appointment begins after January 1, then the following fiscal year date is the start date to begin counting for consideration for tenure. A faculty member who is not awarded tenure may be given written notice of non-reappointment, or be offered a one-year terminal appointment, or be granted an additional short-term probationary appointment for not more than a twelve-month period by mutual agreement between UI and the faculty member. The decision to offer employment following a denial of tenure is in the sole discretion of the president (RGP II(6)). [See 3900.] [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 7-05]

GF-2. Tenure evaluation procedures must be started in sufficient time to permit completion by the end of the time periods indicated in GF-1. When authorized by the president or his or her designee, the year in which the tenure decision is made may be the terminal year of employment if the decision is to deny tenure. (RGP II(6).) [rev. 7-02]

GF-3. Satisfactory service in any professorial-tenurable rank may be used to fulfill the probationary periods required for awarding tenure. A maximum of two years of satisfactory service in the rank of instructor at UI may be recognized in partial fulfillment of the time requirement in the professorial-tenurable ranks. For the purpose of tenure eligibility only, the rank of senior instructor is considered as a professorial rank.

GF-4. In cases involving prior equivalent service experience, tenure may be granted following less than the usual period of service. In particular, a new faculty members with comparable service experience (see 3050 Bi) from other institutions—educational, governmental, and others with comparable service in relation to the expectations set forth in his/her position description, instructional, research, or service positions—may be granted credit for such service experience up to a maximum of four years and may be considered for tenure after a minimum of one full year of service at UI. A faculty members initially employed as a full professors can may be appointed with tenure when this action is supported by a majority of the tenured faculty in the department or equivalent unit and by the university administration; otherwise, a full professors not appointed with tenure issue considered for tenure during not later than the fourth full year of service. [ed. 7-98]

GF-5. In the event that a nontenured faculty member’s period of service at UI has been discontinuous, prior years in the same or a similar position-tenurable rank may be counted toward tenure eligibility, subject to the limitations stated in F-3 with respect to instructors, and subject to the conditions that:

a. Not more than three years have passed since the person-faculty member left UI.
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b. Applicability of the prior service toward tenure must be stated in writing before reappointment.

c. At least one additional year is to be served before tenure is recommended.

F-76. If a tenured faculty member leaves UI and later returns to the same or a similar position after not more than three years, the appointment may be with tenure, or he or she may be required to serve an additional year before a tenure decision is made. Notification of probationary or tenure status is to be given in writing before reappointment.

GE-67. When a nontenured faculty member holding academic rank moves from one department to another within UI, the faculty member must be informed in writing by the provost, after consultation with the new department, as to the extent to which prior service will count toward tenure eligibility. (RGP IIG6l) [rev. 7-02].

GF-8. When a tenured faculty member moves from one position to another within UI, or accepts a change from full-time to part-time appointment, his or her tenure status does not change. While a tenured faculty member is serving as a departmental administrator, college dean, or in some other administrative or service capacity, he or she retains membership, academic rank, and tenure in his or her academic department. Should the administrative or service responsibilities end, the faculty member would take up his or her academic discipline.

GF-9. An extension of the probationary period for tenure probationary period may be granted in certain exceptional circumstances that may impede a faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure, including responsibilities with respect to childbirth/adoptions, significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care obligations, disability/chronic illness, or other exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member.

a. The procedures for requesting an extension are:

1. The faculty member provides a written request to the Provost.
2. Requests should be made in a timely manner, proximate to the events or circumstances which occasion the request. All requests should state the basis for the request and include appropriate documentation.
3. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the provost will have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost will, at his or her discretion, determine if consultation with the dean and/or department is appropriate. The provost shall notify the faculty member, department chair, and dean of the action taken.
4. In most cases, extension of the tenure probationary period will 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. All requests for tenure probationary period extensions shall be made prior to commencing with a tenure or contract renewal review.
5. If a tenure probationary period extension is approved, a reduction in scholarly productivity during the period of time addressed in the request should not prejudice a subsequent contract renewal decision. Any faculty member in probationary status more than the ordinary probation period specified in 3520-G-1 because of extensions shall be evaluated as if the faculty member had been on probationary status for the ordinary probation period.

HG. EVALUATION FOR TENURE.

HG-1. Departmental Unit Criteria. The faculty of each unit or equivalent unit establishes specific criteria for tenure, teaching, research, and service pertaining to tenure of their members. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role, value, and weight — described for each interdisciplinary activity. Departmental criteria are subject to review by the college committee on tenure and promotion for consistency with the college criteria. Such criteria may be changed or revised at any time by a majority vote of the departmental unit faculty, but any such revisions may not be retroactive but, for evaluation purposes, are considered proportionately in conjunction with criteria that were
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previously in force, **Unit criteria must be consistent with the college criteria and are subject to review by the college committee on tenure and promotion.** [rev. 7-06, 1-08]

**G-2. College Criteria.** College criteria must be consistent with university criteria.

**HG-2. Annual Review** (FSH 3320). All faculty members, tenured and nontenured, are reviewed each year by the appropriate departmental administrators (see 3320). In most cases, the principal basis for evaluation—the annual review—is performance in relation to the position descriptions for the period under consideration where such descriptions have been developed according to the policies stated in FSH 3050 and in relation to the unit criteria for tenure and promotion. In the case of members of instructional faculty, the annual student evaluation of teaching is carefully weighed in this review. Each college must have procedures that guarantee that the student evaluations are considered (college procedures are subject to review and approval by the president and the board). The unit administrator’s annual evaluations, including all narratives and any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments, together with the judgments of higher administrators, are used as one of the bases for recommendations concerning salary, reappointment, nonreappointment, promotion, tenure, or other personnel actions, as appropriate. The departmental administrator communicates in writing to each faculty member evaluated an assessment of strengths and weaknesses.

**HG-3. Third Year Review.** A more thorough review by a non-tenured faculty member’s colleagues is held during the 24 to 36 months period after beginning employment at UI. The candidate creates a professional portfolio (see FSH 3570). A committee is appointed, in accordance with procedures determined by each unit, to consider the progress of each faculty member. The detailed procedures for appointing the committee and conducting the third-year review are developed by the faculty of each department/unit and made a part of the unit bylaws. In case of a conflict, the below requirements in a. supersede college and department/unit bylaws. [rev. 7-98, 7-05, 1-08]

a. At a minimum, the candidate must submit the following materials:

1. Current curriculum vitae;

2. Annual evaluations and other progress reviews from unit administrator, department chair(s), dean(s), and center executive/administrator(s) where applicable; i.e., in the case of joint appointments and appointments where interdisciplinary activities are part of the faculty member’s position description, or in cases where faculty are located at Centers or offsite locations, the secondary unit administrator department chair(s) and dean and/or center executive/administrator(s)’ evaluative comments shall also be included;

3. Context statement written by the faculty member (limited to two pages) and approved by the department/college administrator(s), and center executive as applicable. Statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research institutes, interdisciplinary departments or centers, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances;

4. Teaching portfolio (includes goals, responsibilities, evaluations, results and appendix, or exhibits), the narrative is limited to five pages;

5. Research and service. Research and service statements as needed. These areas are often adequately represented in the vita; and

3. Professional Portfolio (see FSH 3570);

6. Supporting materials. For example, it is appropriate to include a statement on progress from the faculty member’s mentor. At the candidate's discretion, additional material may be prepared and made available to all who are evaluating his/her suitability for tenure and/or promotion. Materials from the following areas, should also be included as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service.
UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK
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b. In case of a conflict, these requirements supersede college and department bylaws. The non-tenured faculty member is given a copy of the committee’s report and is informed in writing by the unit administrator of strong and weak points that are brought out by this review. The following materials are then submitted to the Provost’s Office:

1. Analysis, and recommendations and narratives from:
   a) Dean,
   b) Department/Unit chair and, where applicable, interdisciplinary program leaders/administrators/leaders (those listed on the faculty member's narrative attached to his/her position description) and center administrators, and/or administrators of faculty in joint appointments, and
   c) Review committee(s).

2. Complete portfolio of 3rd year review materials.

HG-4. Formal Tenure Review.

a. The formal evaluation for the granting of tenure is made on the basis of the faculty member’s potential requires assessing the faculty member’s performance in meeting the criteria for tenure, effectiveness as a continuing member of the UI community. To initiate the formal evaluation for the granting of tenure to a faculty member, the departmental/unit administrator (or college dean if the departmental/unit administrator is under consideration for tenure) obtains the position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all narratives) for the relevant period, the third-year review (all maintained in the departmental/unit office), the professional portfolio (from the non-tenured faculty member, see FSH 3570), summary scores of student evaluations from all classes taught (Institutional Research and Assessment), and the curriculum vitae, and reviews all of the latter-previous listed documentation as to for its completeness and accuracy with the person concerned/candidate. [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 1-08]

b. Except in the case of senior instructors, The departmental/unit administrator will request an evaluation of the candidate’s performance of every candidate for tenure from three to five appropriate external reviewers, who should include tenured faculty at peer institutions. Persons asked to write peer reviews should be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking. The names of at least two of these reviewers will be selected from a list will have been suggested by the non-tenured faculty member/candidate. (See also External Peer Review Guidelines on the Provost website at http://www.promo-tenure.uidaho.edu/default.aspx?pid=100100.) Final selection of external reviewers should take place at the unit level, in accordance with college policy. The letter of request will include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions (including all narratives) for the relevant period, the professional portfolio, and up to four examples of the candidate’s scholarly work. In addition, the letter of request shall include instructions that the candidate be evaluated in relation to the candidate’s personal context statement and unit and college criteria. When all deliberations within the university have been completed, the responses to these requests external reviewers’ evaluations will be shown to the faculty member after every effort has been made to ensure the reviewer’s anonymity of those authors has been made. [add. 7-98, rev. 7-02, 1-08]

c. Copies of position descriptions, unit tenure criteria, annual evaluations, the third-year review, including all narratives, the curriculum vitae, and outside peer review letters are forwarded to each person participating in the review at the departmental/unit and higher levels. Additional Supplementary material, supplied by the faculty member, if any, should shall be available for review in the departmental/unit office. The results of the student evaluations of teaching must be carefully weighed and used as a factor in judging the teaching component in tenure determinations. It is expected that the departmental/unit administrator making the recommendation concerning tenure will, insofar as practicable, solicit and address in his/her summary, have sought and considered the evaluative comments regarding the candidate made from all tenured faculty members of the department/unit, and from interdisciplinary leaders program directors and/or center administrators (if appropriate/applicable), and from the department/unit tenure-recommending committee (see HG-4-d). Any person having a familial or other similar significant relationship with the candidate's faculty member's spouse is
not permitted to serve in any capacity in the review process. Each departmental unit is responsible for developing procedures in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (departmental unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). A copy of the form that is to be used in transmitting the recommendations made at each stage of evaluation for tenure appears as the last two pages of this section.

Included in the criteria for formal evaluation is participation in international activities. [See also 3380 D.] [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 1-08]

d. The departmental unit tenure-recommending committee includes the following, each with full vote: one or more tenured faculty members, one or more nontenured faculty members, one or more persons from outside the departmental unit, and, in cases involving the evaluation or review of members of the instructional faculty, one or more students sufficient to ensure equity of representation and who have had experience in the departmental unit with which the faculty member being evaluated is associated. In cases involving the evaluation of individuals involved significantly in interdisciplinary activities, one or more members of the appropriate interdisciplinary program(s) faculty shall be included on the committee. Students are to comprise no less than 25 percent and no more than 50 percent of the committee. No faculty member serves on the departmental unit tenure-recommending committee when it is considering his or her own case. Nor is the dean is permitted to attend/exclude the departmental unit committee’s process/deliberations. Each unit is responsible for developing procedures, including protocols for voting, in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). [rev. and ren. 1-08]

HG-5. Forwarding Materials. The departmental unit administrator forwards his or her completed copy of the recommendation form for each person being considered to the dean along with the recommendation of the departmental unit tenure committee, including all narratives and external review letters. A summary of votes, and any The individual comments recommendations submitted by tenured faculty members are also forwarded. Before forwarding the materials to the college, the findings of the departmental unit faculty and departmental unit administrator are relayed in writing to the candidate indicating strengths as well as weaknesses as perceived at the departmental unit level. The candidate has one week from receipt of the findings to respond in writing to clarify the situation/provide written clarification if he or she believes his or her record or the departmental unit criteria for tenure have been misinterpreted. Any such written clarification is forwarded with the rest of the candidate’s materials to the college. [rev. 7-98]

HG-6. Departmental Unit Administrator under Review for Tenure. If a departmental unit administrator is under consideration for tenure, the forms completed by the departmental unit tenure committee and the tenured faculty members concerned are forwarded directly to the dean and the dean is responsible for making the summary. (See also FSH 1420 E-6)

III. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL.

HII-1. College Standing Committee. In each college there is a standing committee on tenure and promotion. The members serve terms of not less than three years on a staggered basis. The membership of the committee and the method of selection are prescribed in the bylaws of the college. [ed. 7-98]

HII-2. College Criteria. Each college shall have bylaws adopted committee on tenure and promotion recommends, for adoption by the college faculty, specifying criteria consistent with FSH 1565 C, in teaching, research, and service for granting tenure (and promotion to specific ranks) in that college. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the relative weight ascribed to interdisciplinary activity. College criteria must be compatible with the university-wide criteria as specified in FSH 1565 and C, 7 above, and are subject to approval by the provost. The dean of the faculty (by petition of 20 percent or more of the faculty members of the college) may initiate consideration for revision of the criteria at any time. [ed. 7-98, 7-01, rev. 7-06]

HII-3. College Standing Committee Recommendations. The College standing committee makes recommendations to the dean and the provost on the tenure of individual faculty members. [rev. 1-08]
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HI-4. Dean’s Recommendation. The dean considers the recommendations made by the college’s committee on tenure and promotion and makes his or her own recommendations. It is advisable that the dean confer collectively with the departmental unit administrators about the merits of the faculty members whom they are recommending for tenure. Before forwarding the materials to the provost, the findings of the college committee(s) and the dean are relayed to the candidate in writing indicating strengths as well as weaknesses as perceived at the college level. The candidate has one week from receipt of the findings to respond in writing to clarify the situation. The letter of clarification is forwarded with the rest of the candidate’s materials to the provost. [rev. 7-98, 1-08]

JI. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL.

JI-1. The individual recommendations, together with the summary recommendations of the departmental unit executive administrator, the recommendations of the college committee and those of the dean, including all narratives, are forwarded for review by the provost. Any individually signed recommendations are placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. [rev. 7-02]

JI-2. The awarding of tenure to an eligible faculty member is made only by a positive action of approval by the president. The president gives notice in writing to the faculty member of the granting or denial of tenure by proffered written contract, of appointment or nonappointment to tenure not later than June 30 (see also FSH 3900 B) after the academic year during which the decision is made. (RGP IIG6c). 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. No faculty member may construe the lack of notice of denial of tenure as signifying the awarding of tenure. If the president has not given notice to the faculty member as provided herein, it is the duty of the faculty member to make inquiry to ascertain the decisions of the president. [rev. 7-02]

JI-3. The board requires the president to provide a list of the faculty members granted tenure in the university’s regular semi-annual report to the board. (RGP IIC4b). [add. 7-02]

(Form on next two pages)
REPORT OF EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION
FOR AWARDING OF TENURE

Candidate’s Name ____________________________

Rank _________________________________________

Date ____________________________

Candidate’s Name ______________________________________________________________________________

Rank ________________________________________________________________________________________

Department or Unit _____________________________________________________________________________

VERIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE

Criteria of eligibility for tenure are met as follows:

_______ Candidate holds a tenure-track position and a tenurable rank [see section 3520 E of the Faculty-Staff Handbook].

_______ Candidate has served one full year, or more, at UI in the rank of senior instructor or above.

Candidate has completed ____ full years of probationary service at UI by serving ____ full years in the rank of ________, ____ full years in the rank of ________ (from __________ to __________), ____ full years in the rank of ________ (from __________ to __________) [not more than two years in rank of instructor at UI may be counted]; and by being credited with not more than four years of equivalent service for ____ full years as ________ (rank) at ________ (institution) and ____ full years as ________ at ________.

We concur in the foregoing statements:

__________________________________ ___________________________________
(Candidate)   (Departmental Unit Administrator)

REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Having reviewed the documents as referenced in G-4 c, candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all narratives), we concur in their completeness and accuracy. Other documentary material deemed by either of us to be pertinent has been appended to the curriculum vitae.

__________________________________ ___________________________________
(Candidate)   (Departmental Unit Administrator)

Copies of the documents as referenced in G-4 c, curriculum vitae, position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all narratives) and supplementary material and attachments, if any, were made available to the persons or groups called upon to participate in the evaluation of the candidate and to make recommendations on the awarding of tenure. Statistics and comments derived from student evaluations of the candidate’s teaching performance were furnished to the same persons and groups. Files of student evaluations were made available for inspection in the college or departmental office.

__________________________________ ___________________________________
(Departmental Unit Administrator)

__________________________________ ___________________________________
(Departmental Unit Administrator, (faculty with Joint Appointment))

__________________________________ ___________________________________
Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

__________________________________ ___________________________________
Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)
RECOMMENDATIONS

Each reviewing person or group enters its recommendation below. If there are any considerations that support this conclusion, other than those contained in the records presented to the reviewers, a brief statement of those considerations should be appended.

The departmental tenure-recommending committee does not recommend that tenure be granted: there were votes in favor of and votes against recommending that tenure be granted, and there were abstentions.

(Committee Chair)

The tenured faculty members of the department do not recommend that tenure be granted: there were votes in favor of and votes against recommending that tenure be granted, and there were abstentions.

(Departmental Administrator)

I do not recommend that tenure be granted.

(The Departmental Administrator)

The college committee on tenure does not recommend that tenure be granted.

(Committee Chair)

I do not recommend that tenure be granted.

(Dean)

I do not recommend that tenure be granted.

(President)
FACULTY PROMOTIONS

PREAMBLE: This section discusses promotion in rank and the procedures by which a faculty member is evaluated, at the department, college, and university level, for a possible promotion. In particular the charge of the University Level Promotions Committee is given (subsection G). This section was an original part of the 1979 Handbook and has been revised in very minor ways several times since. In July 1994 it was more substantively revised: subsections A and B were largely rewritten to emphasize the faculty’s responsibility for promotion. G-2 (add a “presumption in favor” of the candidate under certain conditions at the university level) and the last sentence of H (providing feedback to the candidate) added. Again in July 1998 there were substantial revisions to E-2 (making formal the requirement and procedures for an external review), and E-5 and F-5 (providing a feedback loop between candidate and subsequent evaluators). In July 2000 section B was revised to make clear that eligibility for promotion in rank necessitated a history of position descriptions that required activities consistent with the criteria for that rank. In July 2002 section D was edited to clarify promotion schedules at each rank. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 the section underwent some minor editing and revising to bring it into greater conformity with other sections of the Handbook. – In July 2008 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms that were intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. Except where otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1998. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448) and the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [rev. 7-00, 7-02, 7-07, 1-08]

CONTENTS:

A. General
B. Bases of Evaluation
C. Responsibility
D. Schedule
E. Evaluation and Recommendation at the Departmental-Unit Level
F. Review of Recommendations at the College Level
G. Review of Recommendations at the University Level
H. Report of Recommendations Forwarded
I. Appeal
J. Annual Timetable for Promotion Consideration

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 the faculty member’s position description, teaching, scholarship, and service. [1565 A-2, A-3, A-4, A-5, and A-6] Performance of university administrative duties as a unit administrator is not a consideration in promotion. [ed. 1-08]

B. BASES OF EVALUATION. Promotion in rank is granted only when there is reasonable assurance, based on performance, that the faculty member will continue to meet the set standards for promotion. The faculty member’s position description, [see FSH 3050], covering the period since appointment to his or her current rank, provides a frame of reference for the departmental unit expectations for satisfactory performance. When the appointment occurs after January 1, the following fiscal year is the first year of the promotion consideration period. In order to form a basis for promotion in rank, the position description must require activity consistent with the criteria for that rank as stated in FSH 1565. The faculty member’s professional portfolio and other documents are ability and performance, judged in the context of unit and college by-laws as well as the documents listed in E-2 a and b below, these position descriptions constitute the principal bases for evaluation of the faculty member for promotion. Evidence of teaching, scholarship, creative accomplishments, and service shall be considered in this evaluation process, using annual performance evaluations and other documents. [see also 1565 A-2, A-3, A-4, A-5, and A-6]. [rev. 7-00, ed. 1-08]
C. RESPONSIBILITY. The responsibility for submitting recommendations in accordance with the prescribed schedule [see D] falls on the departmental-unit administrator or on the dean of the college if the college is not departmentalized. Small departmental-unit or divisional units may be joined with others for this purpose. The intent is to secure an adequate body of recommendations from those concerned and qualified to participate in the evaluation. The procedure involves successive considerations of the candidate, beginning with the faculty member’s colleagues at the departmental-unit level, and proceeding through the college level to the university level. Interdisciplinary team leaders and center administrators are to be included as appropriate. [rev. 1-08]

D. SCHEDULE. Consideration of each faculty member for promotion is required according to the following schedule:

D-1. Instructors. Instructors are considered for promotion before the end of the third (in exceptional cases, the fourth) year of full-time service in this rank. Part-time service is not considered in determining the time for mandatory consideration for promotion. Periods of full-time service need not be consecutive; however, if there is an interruption of more than three years’ duration in an instructor’s full-time service, the instructor and the departmental-unit administrator may agree on an adjustment in the amount of full-time service that must be completed before consideration must be given to the instructor’s promotion, such adjustment being subject to approval by the provost. If an instructor who is serving full-time with primary responsibilities in teaching is not promoted by the end of the year in which consideration for promotion is mandatory, the following year will be his or her terminal year. The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the rank of senior instructor, which is, except in very rare instances, a terminal rank that does not lead to promotion to the professorial ranks. [See 1565 D-1 b(5), ed. 7-00, 7-04]

D-2. Assistant Professors. Assistant professors are considered for promotion before the end of their sixth year in that rank. When an assistant professor has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she will be considered again no less frequently than at five-year intervals. The review may be delayed upon the request of the assistant professor and the concurrence of the department-unit administrator and the dean. Assistant professors who have served eight years in that rank shall be considered for promotion following the process established in this policy [ed. 7-97, ed. 7-02]

D-3. Associate Professors. Associate professors are considered for promotion before the end of their seventh year in that rank. If review for promotion to full professor is scheduled during the fifth, sixth or seventh full year after the award of tenure then the promotion review may, if it meets substantially similar criteria and goals of the post tenure review, take the place of the periodic performance review required by the board of regents. (RGP IIG 6g) When an associate professor has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she should be considered again within five years. The review may be delayed upon the request of the associate professor and the concurrence of the department-unit administrator and the dean. [ed. 7-02]

D-4. Early Consideration for Promotion. In addition to those whose consideration is mandated by this schedule, any faculty member may be considered for promotion at an earlier time if nominated for consideration by a faculty member of the recommending unit whose rank is higher than that of the nominee. It is suggested that the faculty member proposing to make the nomination confer with the administrator concerned on the merits of giving early consideration to the nominee. If it is determined that the nomination is to be made, the evaluation process is initiated by the recommending faculty member using a copy of the form that appears at the end of this section. The remainder of the evaluation process is the same for these additional candidates as it is for those regularly scheduled for consideration. A faculty member may request consideration of himself or herself for promotion but such a request does not require that the evaluation and recommendation process be carried out. [ed. 7-97, rev. 1-08]

D-5. Credit for Prior Service Experience. In cases involving prior equivalent service experience, promotion may be considered following less than the usual period of service. In particular, a new faculty member with comparable experience (see 3050 B) from other institutions--educational, governmental, and others with comparable service in relation to the expectations set forth in his/her position description instructional, research, or service positions--may be granted credit by the provost for such service experience up to a maximum of four years.

E. EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION AT THE DEPARTMENTAL UNIT LEVEL. [ed. 7-97]

E-1. Departmental-Unit Criteria. The faculty of each departmental-unit or equivalent unit establishes, as appropriate for the unit, specific criteria that are consistent with criteria in 1565 C—in teaching, research, and service pertaining to promotion in rank of their members. The criteria shall include a statement regarding departmental-unit criteria are subject to review by the college standing committee on tenure and promotion for consistency with the college criteria. Such criteria may be changed-revised at any time by a majority vote of the departmental-unit faculty, but they must be reviewed
E-2. Formal Promotion Review.

a. The formal evaluation for promotion requires assessing the faculty member’s performance in meeting the criteria for promotion. To initiate the formal promotion evaluation for promotion of a faculty member, the departmental unit administrator (or college dean if the departmental unit administrator is under consideration for promotion) obtains the position descriptions for the relevant period (maintained in the departmental unit office), annual performance evaluations, and the third year review if conducted while in the current rank, including all narratives, the professional portfolio (from the faculty member), summary scores of the student evaluations of all classes taught (from Institutional Research and Assessment), and the curriculum vitae, and reviews the latter at least for completeness and accuracy with the faculty member concerned. [ren. & rev. 1-08]

b. The departmental unit administrator will request an evaluation of the candidate’s performance of every candidate for promotion from three to five appropriate external reviewers, who should include faculty at peer institutions. Persons asked to write peer reviews should be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking, holding at least the rank of associate professor. The names of at least two of these reviewers will have be selected from a list suggested by the candidate for promotion. (Also see External Peer Review Guidelines on the Provost website at http://www.promo-tenure.uidaho.edu/default.aspx?pid=100100.) Final selection of external reviewers should take place at the unit level, in accordance with college policy. The letter of request will include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions for the relevant period (including all narratives), the professional portfolio, and up to four examples of the candidate’s scholarly work. In addition, the letter of request shall include instructions that the candidate be evaluated in relation to the candidate’s personal context statement and unit and college criteria. When all deliberations within the university have been completed, the external reviewers’ responses evaluations to these requests will be shown to the faculty member after every effort has been made to ensure the reviewers’ anonymity of these authors has been made. [ren. 1-08]

c. Copies of these documents referred to in E-2 a are furnished available to each person participating in the review at the departmental unit and higher levels. Additional Supplementary material, if any, supplied by the faculty member should shall be available for review in the departmental unit office. [See also 3380 D.] The results of the student evaluations of teaching must be carefully weighed and used as a factor in judging-assessing the teaching component in promotion decisions. [rev. 7-98, ren. 1-08]

d. A promotion committee shall be formed consistent with unit by-laws. If one is not specified, the structure of the tenure committee as described in FSH 3520 G-4 d. shall be used.

dg. Members of the faculty of the candidate’s departmental unit (or group of small units/departments joined together for this purpose) whose ranks are higher than that of the candidate are afforded an opportunity to submit their opinions and recommendations on the candidate’s promotion on the lower portion of the front page of the prescribed form. It is expected that the departmental unit administrator making the recommendation concerning promotion will, to the extent practicable, solicit and address in his/her summary, to have sought and considered, the evaluative comments regarding the candidate from all faculty members (within the candidate’s unit) of a higher rank than the candidate of the department, from interdisciplinary program directors (if applicable), and/or center administrators (if applicable). Any person having a familial or other similar significant relationship with the candidate the faculty member’s spouse is not permitted to serve in any capacity in the review process. Each departmental unit is responsible for developing procedures in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (departmental unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). A copy of the form that is to be used in transmitting the recommendations made at each stage of evaluation for promotion appears as the last two pages of this section. Included in the criteria for formal evaluation is participation in international activities. [See also 3380 D.] [rev. & ren. 1-08]

df. The departmental unit administrator completes the first section on the back of the recommendation form. In arriving at his or her conclusion, the administrator carefully considers and gives weight to the following (particularly as they relate to the factors listed in B): the information obtained from the curriculum vitae, the position descriptions (including all narratives), the conference with the candidate, the recommendations solicited from the candidate’s colleagues, the external reviewers, interdisciplinary
administrators and/or center administrators (if applicable) and the results of annual student evaluations of teaching (in the cases of teaching members of the faculty). [ren. 1-08]

E-3. Forwarding Materials.

a. Before forwarding the materials to the college, the unit administrator shall forward the following to the candidate:
   • the written findings of the unit faculty and/or committee’s report and vote.
   • the department his or her administrator’s written report which shall include indicating strengths as well as weaknesses as perceived at the unit department level.

   The candidate has one week from receipt of the above to respond in writing to clarify the situation. If he or she believes his or her record or the departmental unit criteria for promotion have been misinterpreted. Any such clarification is forwarded with the rest of the candidate’s materials to the college.

b. The departmental unit administrator then forwards the following items to the dean:
   • his or her completed copy of the recommendation form for each person considered to the dean.
   • the forms submitted by individual faculty members, including responses from external reviewers, interdisciplinary administrators and/or center administrators (if applicable)
   • a summary of votes and any comments
   • Any clarification received from the candidate as noted in “a” above are also forwarded to the dean.

E-4. The names of the members of the unit committee are made public after the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded.

E-5. Departmental Unit Administrator Under Review for Promotion. If a departmental unit administrator is under consideration for promotion, the forms completed by the faculty members concerned, are forwarded directly to the dean and the dean is responsible for making the summary. (See also FSH 3320 C-2) [ren. 1-08]
misinterpreted. Any such letter of clarification is forwarded with the rest of the candidate’s materials to the provost. [rev. 7-98]

**F-6.** The names of the members of the college committee are made public after the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded.

**G. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL BY THE PROMOTIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE.** [rev. 1-08]

**H-1.** All individual recommendations, together with the summary recommendations of the unit administrator, the recommendations of the college committee and those of the dean, including all narratives, are forwarded for review by the provost. Any individually signed recommendations are placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. [rev. 1-08]

**H-2.** A University-level Promotions Review Committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost, is named each year. The committee reviews each promotion recommendation with specific reference to university guidelines and the criteria established by the department-unit and college of the faculty member concerned and reflected in the faculty member’s position descriptions for the relevant period; this review involves full consideration of the material that was used in making the recommendations at the departmental-unit and college levels.

- **a.** One-third of the committee’s membership is randomly selected by the provost from the previous year’s committee; the remainder of the members are selected by the provost and the chair and vice chair of the Faculty Council-Senate from nominations submitted by the senate. The random selection of carryover members is done one week before the senate makes its nominations. The delegation representing the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences on Faculty Council Senate nominates six faculty members who should be representative of the breadth of the disciplines within the college from the college--two each from (a) the social sciences and humanities, (b) the natural sciences, and (c) communication, music, and theatre arts. The delegation representing the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences on Faculty Council Senate nominates four faculty members from the college--two each from (a) faculty with greater than 50% teaching and research appointments and (b) faculty with greater than 50% Cooperative-University of Idaho Extension Service appointments. The delegations from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large each nominates two faculty members from their constituent colleges.

- **b.** Membership of the committee, including carryover members, consists of the provost (chair), three representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, one representative from each of the other constituent colleges, the vice president for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies, and the vice provost for academic affairs. The provost, the vice president for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies, and the vice provost for academic affairs shall be ex-officio members without vote. A subcommittee designated by the provost of the Promotions Review Committee is given the particular responsibility of evaluating recommendations for promotion. Applications of faculty members being considered for promotion from the University Library, Law Library, Counseling and Testing Center, and the Cooperative University of Idaho Extension will be presented by the University Promotions Committee’s representative whose own position most closely matches that of the applicant. Service. The names of the members of the departmental and college advisory committees are made public after the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded. The names of the members of the University Promotions Committee will be made public as soon as the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded. The chair will conduct voting on candidates by closed ballots. [rev. 7-97, ren. 1-08]

**H-3.** A presumption in favor of promotion shall exist for each candidate who comes to the University-level Promotions Review Committee with a favorable recommendation from all of the committees which have considered the matter at the departmental-unit and college level, from the department-unit chair and dean directly involved, and from a majority of the faculty members who submitted a recommendation pursuant to section E-2.d.3 above. Upon showing that the lower level recommendations were made without due
regard for the university criteria for the rank sought pursuant to section 1565, Faculty Ranks and Responsibilities, the presumption shall be overcome, and in such case the University Promotions Review Committee shall state in writing the reasons for the decision. [ed. 7-98, ren. 1-08]

I. APPEAL. When a person is informed (after the recommendations of the University Promotions Review Committee have been considered) that there has been a decision not to recommend his or her promotion to the regents, he or she has the right of appeal. [See 3840.]

J. ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION CONSIDERATIONS. The process of promotion considerations is carried out annually. The unit level evaluation for promotion begins summer/early fall and shall follow the according to the following approximate timetable provided by the provost and published on his website:

November: Promotion evaluations begin at the departmental unit level.

December: Departmental Unit administrators must have sent their promotion recommendations to their deans. Each candidate must have been notified of the nature of the departmental unit administrator’s recommendation.

December: Deans must have sent their recommendations to the provost. Each candidate and the departmental unit administrator concerned must have been notified of the nature of the dean’s recommendation.

February: The university-level Promotions Review Committee meets. [See FH?2 above.]

March: Candidates for promotion and their deans and departmental unit administrators are notified as to whether their promotions in rank will be recommended by the president provost to the president/regents.

[ed. 7-99]

(Form on next two pages)
REPORT OF EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION
FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

Date ___________________________________

Name __________________________________
Department or Unit _____________________________

Considered for promotion to the rank of _____________________________

Has served in the rank of _____________________________ since _____________________________

REQUAIREO ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Having reviewed the candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all narratives), and annual reviews, we concur in their completeness and accuracy. Other documentary material deemed by either of us to be pertinent has been appended to the curriculum vitae.

(Candidate) (Departmental Unit Administrator)

Copies of the documents as referenced in E-2 curriculum vitae, position descriptions, and annual evaluations (including all narratives) and supplementary material, if any, were made available to the persons or groups called upon to participate in the evaluation of the candidate and to make recommendations on his or her promotion. Statistics and comments derived from student evaluations of the candidate’s teaching performance were furnished to the same persons and groups. Files of student evaluations were made available for inspection in the college or departmental office.

(Departmental Unit Administrator)

(Departmental Unit Administrator, Faculty with joint appointments)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Each reviewing person enters his/her recommendation below. If there are any considerations that support this conclusion, other than those contained in the records presented to the reviewers, a brief statement of those considerations should be appended.

I judge the candidate’s performance of the duties assigned in his or her position description to be:

_____ excellent
_____ good
_____ average
_____ poor
_____ unsatisfactory

I ______ recommend
I _____ do not recommend
I _____ abstain from making a recommendation on the proposed promotion.

(Signature) (Rank) (Department/Unit)

(Recommendations continue on back of form)
Evaluations of the candidate and recommendations on the proposed promotion have been submitted by ____ faculty members. Of these, ____ judged the candidate’s performance of assigned duties to be excellent, ____ judged it to be good, ____ average, ____ poor, and ____ unsatisfactory.

Moreover, ____ recommended promotion, ____ recommended against it, and ____ abstained from making a recommendation.

I ____ do ____ do not recommend that the candidate be promoted. [It is suggested that a narrative statement in support of the recommendation be appended.]

___________________________________
(Departmental Unit Administrator)

The college committee on promotions ____ does ____ does not recommend the proposed promotion. The committee’s vote was: ____ in favor of, and ____ against the promotion, and there were ____ abstentions.

___________________________________
(Committee Chair)

The departmental unit administrators of this college (did)(did not) meet to consider collectively all of the recommendations submitted by the unit departments. The vote of this body group was: ____ in favor of, and ____ against the promotion, and there were ____ abstentions.

I ____ do ____ do not recommend that the candidate be promoted. [It is suggested that a narrative statement in support of the recommendation be appended.]

___________________________________
(Dean)

In the university-level review committee, the votes were: ____ in favor of, and ____ against the promotion, and there were ____ abstentions.

___________________________________
(Provost)

I ____ do ____ do not recommend that the candidate be promoted.

___________________________________
(Provost)

I ____ do ____ do not recommend that the candidate be promoted.

___________________________________
(President)
PREAMBLE: This section was introduced to the Handbook July 1998 as section B of 1565. For better ease of access it was made its own section in January 2008. In July 2008 this section was revised to reflect recent changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms that were intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. More information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448), or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151).
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A. INTRODUCTION. Evidence of effective teaching, and scholarship and creative activities, in the areas of teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery, and application/integration, outreach and extension, and organizational leadership (FSH 1565 C) are to be provided within the framework of a professional portfolio submitted by the faculty member for the third year review (FSH 1565 GH-3) and when under consideration for tenure and promotion. The professional portfolio should be designed to complement the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae and position descriptions. For evaluative purposes, individual faculty members may also prepare and submit a portfolio on an annual basis. The professional portfolio should address all aspects of the individual faculty member’s responsibilities. The preparation of a portfolio encourages one’s growth and development in all relevant areas. Through the collection and organization of a variety of materials in combination with self-reflection, one gains an overview of one’s responsibilities as a member of the academic community. An individual faculty member understands best what he or she does and the portfolio 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 of the professional portfolio is a matter of faculty choice. When this portfolio is included with the files of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, the page limits indicated below should be followed. At the candidate’s discretion, though a more comprehensive portfolio can be prepared and made available to colleagues in the unit evaluating his/her suitability for tenure and/or promotion. 

B. PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW, TENURE, AND/OR PROMOTION.

Diversity rather than uniformity is encouraged since the portfolio serves to reflect the academic discipline and position description of each faculty member - the context within which each faculty member does his/her job. The following listing represents the minimal-minimum requirements of items that are to be included in the contents of a professional portfolio. The faculty member may provide additional material that offers further insight into individual his/her responsibilities and accomplishments. (The portfolio that is forwarded for tenure and promotion is limited to twelve pages. At the candidate’s discretion, additional material may be prepared and made available to those who are evaluating his/her suitability for tenure and/or promotion. This additional material, if any, is available for review in the departmental office, but is not forwarded with the packet.)

B-1. Personal Context Statement describing the faculty member’s scholarly responsibilities within his or her academic unit. The personal context statement is written by the faculty member (limited to two pages) and reviewed by the relevant approved by the department/college/administrator(s), and center; administrators for accuracy, applicability. The statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research institutes, interdisciplinary programs or research departments, or centers, the requirements of joint appointments or other special circumstances.

B-2. Personal Philosophy Statement regarding the faculty member’s professional activities relevant to his/her position description.
B-3. Evidence not included in the curriculum vitae (as appropriate to the position description) of the faculty member’s productivity, scholarly ability, and student success.

B-4. Evidence of professional growth in the faculty member’s areas of responsibility.

B-5. Other supplementary materials distinct to the individual faculty member.

C. ACADEMIC UNIT CONTEXT STATEMENT

C-1. An Academic Unit Context Statement is included in the package of materials sent to external peer reviewers (see FSH 3520 G-4 b and 3560 E-2 b). It is intended to inform reviewers about the academic environment at the University of Idaho so that reviewers may consider the similarities and differences between their own academic units and that of the candidate for tenure or promotion. The Academic Unit Context Statement shall be developed and approved by the faculty of the academic unit and reviewed regularly for accuracy. Each faculty member may clarify their unique responsibilities within their Personal Context Statement (see B-1 above).

C-2. The Academic Unit Context Statement is included with other materials used in the review process at levels beyond the unit, but is distinct from the Personal Context Statement described in B above.

C-3. The Academic Unit Context Statement describes relevant features of the university, college and academic unit. The context statement should cover the following areas:

a. The usual allocation of effort as described in the position descriptions of faculty in the academic unit.

b. A description of the annual review process and annual performance criteria.

c. [Unit College criteria for promotion and tenure]

d. Resources available to support scholarly activity such as travel, teaching assistants, etc.

e. Other information deemed useful to those outside the academic unit.
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PREAMBLE: This section defines the various academic ranks, both faculty and non-faculty (e.g. graduate student appointees and postdoctoral fellows), and their responsibilities. Subsections A, C, D, E, F, and I should be read in conjunction with the policy and procedures concerning granting of tenure and promotions in rank which are contained in 3520 and 3560 (subsection I only in conjunction with 3560). Most of the material assembled in this section was a part of the original 1979 Handbook. The material in section I was added July, 1987. The definitions of ‘postdoctoral fellow’ (J-5), ‘graduate assistant’ (K-3) and ‘research fellow’ (K-4) were revised in July 1996. Section J-1, voting rights for lecturers, was changed in July 2001. Section A was substantially revised in July 1994, so as to underline better the importance of both teaching and scholarship. At that time the so-called ‘Voxman Amendment’ (the addition of ‘in the classroom and laboratory’ to the list of possible venues wherein the evaluation of scholarship might take place) made its first appearance. Section A underwent additional substantial revision in July 1998 and July 2006, always with the hope of creating greater clarity in a complex subject. Extensive revisions along those same lines were made to B (entirely new and in 2008 B was moved to 3570), C, D, and E, in July 1998. Further, less extensive revisions were made to C-1, D-1, and D-2 in July 2000. In July, 2008, this section was reorganized to better reflect classifications as stated in FSH 1520 Article II, no substantive changes were made to policy. In 2008 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms that were intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into evaluation processes. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448) or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151).

A. INTRODUCTION.

A-1. The principal functions of a university are the preservation, advancement, synthesis, application, and transmission of knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The University of Idaho, therefore, strives to recruit and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

In order to carry out its functions and to serve most effectively its students and the public, the university supports the diversification of faculty roles. Such diversification ensures an optimal use of the university’s faculty talents and resources.

Diversification is achieved through developing a wide range of faculty position descriptions that allow the faculty to meet the varying responsibilities placed upon the institution, both internally and externally. While the capabilities and interests of the individual faculty members are to be taken into account, it is essential that individual faculty position descriptions are consonant with carrying out the roles and mission of the university, the college, and the department. Annual position descriptions are developed by the department head in consultation with the department faculty and with the incumbent or new faculty member. In each college, all position descriptions are subject to the approval of the dean and must be signed by both department head and faculty member. If the faculty member, department head, and dean are unable to reach agreement on the
position description, the faculty member may appeal the department head’s decision to the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board [3840].

As indicated in Sections 3320-A.1.d, 3520-H.2, 3560-A.1.h, faculty performance evaluations that are used for yearly reviews as well as for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure decisions are to be based on faculty members’ annual position descriptions. [ed. 1-08]

Faculty members shall conduct themselves in a civil and professional manner (see FSH 3160 and 3170);

B. DEFINITIONS:

B-1. Advancement: focuses on fostering relationships, building partnerships, creating awareness and generating support with alumni, donors, leaders, business partners, legislators and the community for the university’s mission in academics, scholarship and outreach (see the office of University Advancement at http://www.uidaho.edu/advancement/).

B-2. Cooperative education: a structured educational strategy that blends classroom studies with learning through productive work experiences. It provides progressive experiences for integrating theory and practice. Co-op education (including internships and externships) is a partnership between students, educational institutions and employers, with specified responsibilities for each party.

B-3. Distance education: the process through which learning occurs when teachers, students, and support services are separated by physical distance. Technology, sometimes in tandem with face-to-face communication, is used to bridge the distance gap.

B-4. Extension Service: Extension is an outreach activity that generally involves non-formal educational programs that transfer knowledge from the university to help improve people’s lives through research in areas like agriculture and food, environment and natural resources, families and youth, health and nutrition, and community and economic development.

B-5. Extramural Professional Service: refers to activities that extend service beyond the university and can include elements of service, outreach, scholarship, and/or teaching.

B-6. Interdisciplinary: “an activity that involves teams or individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or field of research practice.”

B-7. Professional Development: a learning process that expands the capacity of the faculty member to advance in the responsibilities as defined in his/her position description and aligns with the university’s goals. Examples include but are not limited to participation in conferences, continuing professional education (including credit and noncredit courses) and other activities that enhance a faculty member’s expertise and ability.

B-8. Service learning: an activity that integrates student learning with service and civic engagement to meet real community needs and achieve learning outcomes. Service-learning can be used in curricular settings (i.e. academic courses) or co-curricular settings, e.g. ASU’s volunteer/civic engagement programs.

B-9. Technology transfer: a process through which knowledge, technical information, and products developed through various kinds of scientific, business, and engineering research are provided to potential users. Technology transfer encourages and accelerates testing and using new knowledge, information and products. The benefit of technology transfer may occur either at the community (public) or firm (private) level.
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C. RESPONSIBILITY AREAS: Faculty members are expected to contribute in each of the four major responsibility areas (C-1 through C-4 below). Expectations are more specifically defined in the individual position description and are consistent with unit by-laws. Each responsibility area may include activities in advancement, extramural professional service, interdisciplinary, and/or professional development.

C-1. TEACHING AND ADVISING: The university’s goal is to engage students in a transformational experience of discovery, understanding and global citizenship. Faculty achieve this goal through effective instructing, advising and/or mentoring of students.

a. Instruction: Effective teaching is the foundation for both the advancement and transmission of knowledge. The educational function of the university requires the appointment of faculty members devoted to effective teaching. Teaching may take many different forms and any instruction must be judged according to its central purposes and the conditions which they impose. Active participation in the assessment of learning outcomes is expected of all faculty at the course, program, and university-wide levels. Individual colleges and units have the responsibility to determine appropriate teaching loads for faculty position descriptions. Teaching appointments must be reflected by hours and level of effort spent in teaching activity, and justified in position descriptions. Any adjustments to a teaching appointment (e.g. teaching unusually large classes, team-teaching, teaching studios or laboratories, intensive graduate or undergraduate student mentoring, technology-enhanced teaching, and others) must be documented in the position description. [rev. 7-06]

The validation of instruction may include Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET’s), peer evaluations, self assessment, documentation of effective or innovative teaching, teaching recognition and awards, and teaching loads.

b. Advising and/or Mentoring Students: Advising students is also an important faculty responsibility and a key function of academic citizenship. Student advising may include: (1) overseeing course selection and scheduling; (2) seeking solutions to conflicts and academic problems; (3) working with students to develop career goals and identify employment opportunities; (4) making students aware of programs and sources for identifying employment opportunities, (5) facilitating undergraduate and graduate student participation in professional activities (e.g. conferences, workshops, demonstrations, applied research); and (6) serving as a faculty advisor to student organizations or clubs. Advising also includes attendance at sessions (e.g. workshops, training courses) sponsored by the university, college, department, or professional organizations to enhance a faculty member’s capacity to advise. [add. 7-06, rev. 1-08]

Effective advising performance may be documented by: (1) the evaluation of peers or other professionals in the department or college; (2) undergraduate or graduate student advises’ evaluations; (3) level of activity and accomplishment of the student organization advised; (4) evaluations of persons being mentored by the candidate; (5) number of undergraduate and graduate students guided to completion; and (6) receiving awards for advising, especially those involving peer evaluation. [add. 7-06]

C-2. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES: Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is communicated and validated. The creative function of a university requires the appointment of faculty members devoted to scholarship and creative activities. The university promotes an environment that increases faculty engagement in interdisciplinary scholarship. The university’s Carnegie designation as “research university high”, fosters an emphasis on scholarly and creative activities that support the university’s strategic themes and land grant mission, and strategically important graduate and professional programs.

Scholarship takes diverse forms and are characterized by originality and critical thought. Scholarship must be validated through internal and external peer review or critique and disseminated in ways having a significant impact on the university community and/or publics beyond the university. Active scholarship is an ongoing obligation of all members of the faculty. [rev. 7-06]

The basic role of a faculty member at the University of Idaho is to demonstrate and validate continuing sound and effective scholarship in the areas of teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery, integration, and
outreach/application/engagement. While these areas may overlap, these distinctions are made for purposes of defining position descriptions and for developing performance standards. Units and colleges shall adopt criteria for the evaluation of scholarship and creative activities. Demonstrated excellence that is focused in only one of these scholarship and creative activity areas is acceptable if it is validated and judged to be in the best interests of the institution and the individual faculty member. [rev. 7-06]

A.4. Assessment of scholarship, in self-evaluation and peer-evaluation, is an ongoing expectation for faculty members of the university. Assessment of scholarship within and across disciplinary boundaries requires standards for evaluation that adequately describe the phases of scholarship. In assessment of scholarship, faculty members are encouraged to use the following six standards (from Glassick, et al. Scholarship Assessed: An Evaluation of the Professoriate 1997):[add. 7-06]

1. “Clear goals—Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?”

2. “Adequate preparation—Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?”

3. “Appropriate methods—Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?”

4. “Significant results—Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?”

5. “Effective presentation—Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?”

6. “Reflective critique—Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?”

a. Scholarship in Teaching and Learning: can involve classroom action research (site-specific pedagogy), qualitative or quantitative research, case studies, experimental design and other forms of teaching and learning research. It consists of the development, careful study, and validated communication of new teaching or curricular discoveries, observations, applications and integrated knowledge and continued scholarly growth. Evidence that demonstrates this form of scholarship might include: publications and/or professional presentations of a pedagogical nature; publication of text books, laboratory manuals, or educational software; advancing educational technology; presentation in workshops related to teaching and learning; development and dissemination of new curricula and other teaching materials to peers; and individual and/or collective efforts in securing and carrying out education grants. [ed. 7-00, rev. 7-06]

The validation of scholarship in the area of teaching and learning is based in large measure on evaluation by the faculty member’s peers both at the University and at other institutions of higher learning. [rev. 7-06]

b. Scholarship in Artistic Creativity: involves validated communication and may be demonstrated by significant achievement in an art related to a faculty member’s work, such as musical composition, artistic performance, creative writing, mass media activity, or original design. [rev. 7-06]

The validation of scholarship in the area of artistic creativity is based in large part on the impact that the activity has on the discipline and/or related fields as determined by the peer review process. Many modes of dissemination are possible depending on the character of the art form or discipline. For example, a published novel or book chapter for an anthology or edited volume or similar creative work is regarded as scholarship. Each mode of dissemination has its own form of peer review that may include academic colleagues, practitioner or performance colleagues, editorial boards, and exhibition, performance, or competition juries. [rev. 7-06]
c. Scholarship in Discovery: involves the generation and interpretation of new knowledge through individual or collaborative research. It may include: novel and innovative discovery; analyzing and synthesizing new and existing knowledge and/or research to develop new interpretations and new understanding; research of a basic or applied nature; individual and collaborative effort in securing and carrying out grants and research projects; membership on boards and commissions devoted to inquiry; and scholarly activities that support the mission of university research centers. [rev. 7-06]

Evidence of scholarship in this area may include: publication of papers in refereed and peer reviewed journals; published books and chapters; published law reviews; citation of a faculty member’s work by other professionals in the field; published reviews and commentary about a faculty member’s work; invited presentations at professional meetings; seminar, symposia, and professional meeting papers and presentations; direction and contribution to originality and novelty in graduate student theses and dissertations; direction and contribution to undergraduate student research; awards, scholarships, or fellowships recognizing an achievement, body of work, or career potential based on prior work; appointment to editorial boards; and significant scholarly contributions to university research centers. The validation of scholarship in the area of discovery is based on evaluation by other professionals in the faculty member’s discipline or sub-discipline. [rev. 7-06]

d. Scholarship of Integration: often interdisciplinary and at the borders of converging fields, is the serious, disciplined work that seeks to synthesize, interpret, contextualize, critically review, and bring new insights into, the larger intellectual patterns of the original research. Similar to the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration can also seek to investigate, consolidate, and synthesize new knowledge as it integrates the original work into a broader context. It often, but not necessarily, involves a team or teams of scholars from different backgrounds working together, and it can often be characterized by a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary investigative approach. The consolidation of knowledge offered by the scholarship of integration has great value in advancing understanding and isolating unknowns. Beyond the differences, the scholarship of integration can include many of the activities of scholarship of discovery and thus may be rigorously demonstrated and validated in a similar manner. [add. 7-06]

e. Scholarship of Outreach/ Application/ and Engagement: These activities apply faculty members’ knowledge and expertise to issues that impact individuals, communities, businesses, government, or the environment. Examples may include: economic development; environmental sustainability; stimulation of entrepreneurial activity; integration of arts and sciences into people’s lives; enhancement of human well-being; and resolution of societal problems. Like other forms of scholarship and creative activities, the scholarship of outreach/application/engagement involves active communication and validation. Examples of validation may include (but are not limited to): peer reviewed or refereed publications and presentations; patents, copyrights, or commercial licensing; adoption or citation of techniques as standards of practice; invited presentation at a seminar, symposium or professional meeting; and citations of the faculty member’s work. The acts of application and engagement often occur simultaneously, but may occur independently. Application and engagement often follow discovery, however they can and should initiate new discovery. It may be demonstrated by: transfer of new knowledge, new technologies and new integrated understandings into broader societal application; acceptance and adoption of new or modified practice with positive outcomes; licensing and commercialization of new technologies, processes or other intellectual property; and application and engagement of one’s scholarly expertise to serve society through cooperative relationships with individuals, groups, and agencies. [add. 7-06]

Broadly, the scholarship of application and engagement seeks to identify, analyze, and solve problems of citizens, communities, businesses, and governmental units; to contribute to the economic development and general well-being of people; to enhance environmental quality and sustainability; to stimulate entrepreneurial activity; to integrate the arts and social sciences into people’s lives; and creatively to apply standard or novel techniques to address emerging or ongoing problems. Like other forms of scholarship activity, the scholarship
of application and engagement involves active communication and validation. The scholarship of application and engagement is rigorously demonstrated by peer reviewed or refereed professional publications and presentations; patents, copyrights and commercial licensing; and adoption or citation of newly developed or derived practices as format; documented standards of practice in general or specific applications (e.g. best management practices, regulatory rules, codes of practice, standard methods, best available technologies, and others) and may also include citation of a faculty member’s work, invited seminar, symposium, professional meeting papers and presentations. The validation of scholarship in the area of application is based on evaluation by other professionals in the faculty member’s discipline or sub-discipline.

C-3. OUTREACH and EXTENSION: is an essential component of the University’s land-grant mission. Outreach activities are originated by every unit on UI’s Moscow campus and from each of the University’s physical locations around the state.

Outreach and Extension includes a wide variety of activities, such as, but not limited to, (a) extension (see 1565 B); (b) teaching, training, certification, volunteer development, unpaid consultation, and other dissemination of information to the general public, practitioner, and specialty audiences; (c) volunteer development and establishment/maintenance of relationships with private and public industries/organizations; and (d) unpaid extramural consultation and other professional services to individuals, organizations, and communities. Delivery mechanisms include distance education, service learning, cooperative education, technology transfer, noncredit courses, and publications. Most of the examples provided, such as distance education, are not exclusively outreach. Instead, they lie at the intersection of outreach and teaching or research. Likewise, professional services may be associated with teaching, scholarship, or university service and leadership. A faculty member’s position description specifies where his or her outreach activities will be counted, as well as governmental agencies. Outreach and Extension activity may include (1) teaching non-credit classes, workshops and short courses; (2) recruiting, training and supervising paraprofessionals and volunteers; (3) providing unpaid consultation to individuals, businesses, and other professionals; (4) providing information or technology transfer support through mass media; (5) providing leadership, facilitation, or subject-matter expertise in community coalitions and faculty teams; (6) developing or adapting extension education materials; and (7) publishing in trade magazines.

Evidence of effective outreach and extension activities programs may include, but are not limited to, (1) result when needs assessment leads to well-planned, carefully implemented, and well-documented efforts; Documentation of the process by which needs were identified and what steps were taken to deliver carefully planned and implemented programs; (2) numbers of individuals and types of audiences affected; (3) evaluation by participants in extension outreach activities; (4) other measures of significance to the discipline/profession, state, nation, region and/or world; (5) quantity and quality of outreach extension publications and other mass-media outlets; (6) numbers and types of audiences impacted; (7) evaluation of the program’s effects on participants and stakeholders; and (8) extension awards, particularly those involving peer evaluation; (9) letters of commendation from individuals within organizations to whom service was provided; (9) service in a leadership role of a professional or scientific organization as an officer or other significant position; and (10) other evidence of professional service oriented projects/outputs.

Extramural Service: Service is an essential component of the University of Idaho mission and extramural service is the responsibility of faculty members in all units. Service by members of the faculty to the university, state, nation, and world in their special capacities as scholars should be a part of both the job description and annual performance review.

Extramural service can include clinical service, routine support, and application of specialized skills or interpretations, and expert consultancies. The beneficiaries of these forms of service can be citizens, clients, collaborators, private and public organizations and their representatives, and government.

Extramural service also includes participation in professional and scientific organizations both as an elected office holder and/or a member, serving as a reviewer or editor for scientific or trade journals, serving as a paid consultant to individuals, businesses, agencies, and non-governmental organizations; representing the University/college or the
Effective performance in extramural service may be documented by a variety of means. Examples include: (1) numbers of individuals and types of audiences impacted as well as measures of significance to the discipline/profession, state, nation, region and/or world; (2) letters of commendation from individuals from within organizations to whom your service was provided; (3) service in a leadership role of a professional or scientific organization as an officer or other significant position; (4) professional service-oriented projects/outputs; and (5) receiving service awards from external organizations, especially those involving peer evaluation.