B. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF TENURED ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (See also FSH 3190)

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a faculty member is performing below expectations, the unit administrator should consider the variety of possible causes, other than mere application of effort on the faculty member’s part, that might be responsible for the change.

It is not the unit administrator’s role to diagnose the cause of the problem but to suggest sources of appropriate professional help and to encourage the employee to seek such help [www.uidaho.edu/hrs/benefits/eap.html]. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the University Ombudsman and Human Resource Services.

B-2. FIRST ANNUAL OCCURRENCE.

1. In the event that a faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that the faculty member has performed below expectations (an overall summary score of 2), the unit administrator will offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for performance below expectations
   a. The faculty member and the unit administrator will review the current Position Description and revise it as necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion.
   b. The faculty member and the unit administrator will write a development plan that will assist the faculty member in improving his or her performance to meet expectations.
   c. The unit administrator will appoint a mentoring committee by selecting three individuals from a list of five faculty members nominated by the faculty member. The mentoring committee’s purpose is to help the faculty member improve performance. The members of the committee need not be drawn from the same unit as the faculty member.

The faculty member or unit administrator may request that the University Ombudsman attend this meeting.

2. In the event that a faculty member receives a score of 1, the provost can determine that further review of a faculty member’s performance is required. This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 B-4.

These steps will be taken within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

B-3. TWO CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of two consecutive annual evaluations concluding that the faculty member has performed below expectations (an overall summary score of 2 or 1) the unit administrator will arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and the Dean of the College. The faculty member or the unit administrator may request that the University Ombudsman attend the meeting.

The intent of the meeting is to review

   a. the current position description and revise it as necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion.
   b. the development plan implemented in the previous year and to identify why the plan did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance.

These steps will be taken within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

B-4. THREE CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL EVALUATION ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations below expectations or a pattern of below expectations evaluations over five years (an overall summary score of less than 2), the Dean shall initiate a formal peer review.

   a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee will consist of six (6) members, appointed as follows:
      i. The Faculty member will submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and three tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. The unit administrator will submit a similar list to the faculty member. From the list given to the
The committee members will select as chair another faculty member from within the unit.

iii. The Ombudsman or his/her designee shall be an ex-officio member of the committee.

b. **Timing of the Review.** The review and recommendation(s) will be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. **The Review.** The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member and the unit administrator's evaluation of that performance. To that end, the committee shall assess the reasonableness of the previous evaluations and the appropriateness of the development plans, as well as any material submitted by the faculty member and the unit.

The faculty member and chair will provide the following materials to the committee:

- Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member
- Position Descriptions for the past four years
- Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member for the past three years
- Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit head and the Dean for the past three years
- Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching for the past four years
- A self-evaluation of teaching
- A self-assessment summary of what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the past four (4) years, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. **Responses to Committee Report.** The faculty member, chair, and dean will receive the report and will have fifteen days from the report's date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee will send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. **Provost.** The Provost will be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution.