University of Idaho
2018-2019 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #27

3:30-5:00 p.m. - Tuesday, April 23, 2019
Paul Joyce Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2018-19 Faculty Senate Meeting #26, April 16, 2019 (vote)

III. Consent Agenda.

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

VII. Other Announcements and Communications.

VIII. Committee Reports.
   
   Tenure & Promotion Policies (introduction)(Brandt/Lawrence)

IX. Special Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Aaron Johnson, Chair 2018-2019, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2018-2019 FS Meeting #26
Tenure & Promotion Policies
Senators should remind faculty and staff in their areas that the dependent eligibility verification audit for UI’s health insurance benefits is underway. Human Resources has prepared an FAQ regarding the audit.

The Faculty Secretary search is underway. The chair encouraged senators to talk to colleagues about the position. Questions should be directed to Vice Chair Terry Grieb who is chairing the search committee and to senators Morgan, Seamon and Jeffrey, members of the committee.

The University Faculty Meeting is scheduled for May 1 at 3:00 pm PDT. The chair emphasized that a quorum is required for two important matters on the meeting agenda and urged senators to encourage colleagues to attend the meeting.

General Policy Report #68 is currently being circulated. Petitions are due to Aaron Johnson, aaronj@uidaho.edu, by April 19.

The chair encouraged senators to take advantage of opportunities to learn more about the breadth of research being conducted at UI. Two specific events were offered:
- Senator Chantal Vella is conducting research on the “Effects of Sitting on Vascular Function.” Those interested in participating should contact exphys@uidaho.edu or 208-885-2007 for more information.
- The Biodiesel Lab is sponsoring a tour at 3:00 pm April 19 in JML Bay 72.

Provost Report. The provost was unable to attend due to conflicts with the State Board of Education (SBOE) Meeting. Vice Provost for Faculty Torrey Lawrence gave the report in his absence.

- The provost and deans met recently to discuss the faculty strategic hiring plan and consider the many requests to fill empty positions and/or create new positions. Given the current budget situation, hard decisions must be made. The provost’s decisions will be communicated to the deans next week.
- The plan for FY20 Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) is currently being formulated. The final plan will not be announced until after the SBOE has voted on tuition increases for the coming year. It appears that the university will have approximately $1.6 million for faculty salary increases. The emerging proposal is to allocate CEC as follows: 50% for market compensation and 50% to discretionary increases determined within the colleges for performance, and to address equity and compression. The goal is to address target salaries, but also to give the deans latitude to address the needs of the various colleges and departments. Lawrence stressed that the approach to faculty salaries is different in scope than the staff salary system.
Committee on Committees.

- **FS-19-076rev.**: FSH 1640.28 - Committee on Committees. Chair Johnson explained that the proposal in the senate packet contained an error. Section B of the proposal should read “B. STRUCTURE. Six faculty members, vice chair of the Faculty Senate (chair), Faculty Secretary (w/o vote) and the following or their designees: vice provost for faculty, a representative of staff council and ASUI president.” Vice Chair Grieb, Chair of the Committee on Committees, explained that the change is part of the revision of the Faculty Secretary’s responsibilities. The proposal passed unanimously.

- **FS-19-088**: FSH 1640.12 – Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and **FS-19-089**: APM 45.01 – Animal Care and Use (FYI). Craig McGowan and Blair Ehlert presented the proposal. Ehlert explained that the revisions better align UI’s policies to external policies and reduces administrative burden.

  A senator asked why some of the detail regarding the requirements for membership on the committee had been deleted. He pointed out that it would not be possible to know for certain whether an individual was eligible to serve based on the abbreviated information in the new policy. McGowan and Ehlert explained that UI is attempting to utilize one committee to meet several regulatory needs. The description of the committee is being simplified so that it is consistent with several different requirements. The faculty secretary explained that she normally would have asked that all the requirements for service be included in the committee structure. However, if the more detailed regulatory requirements are included, then UI policy must be revised anytime the regulations changed. Moreover, the committee is appointed by the research office which is responsible for regulatory compliance in this area. The revision is a compromise to meet the regularity needs, but minimize future changes and revisions.

  A senator asked whether the regulations on which the committee structure is based should be cited in the UI policy. The faculty secretary explained that the policy for the Faculty-Staff Handbook is to avoid such references as they frequently become out of date. Audrey Harris, Director of Research Assurances, who was in attendance at the meeting, pointed out that Administrative Procedures Manual 45.01, provided for information along with the proposed change in committee structure, references the regulations.

  The proposal passed unanimously.

Faculty Affairs.

- **FS-19-087**: FSH 4700 – General Responsibilities of Instructors. Vice Provost Lawrence presented the change. The proposal adds a requirement that faculty have a syllabus for their classes, provide the syllabus to their unit office at the beginning of the term, and ensure that the syllabus includes learning outcomes for the class. Lawrence explained that this provision was formerly part of the position description form. When the position description policy (FSH 3050) was revised, the requirement was eliminated because the whole approach to position descriptions was changed and the assessment language was deleted from UI policy. Lawrence noted that the policy is needed to comply with accreditation expectations. The proposal adds the required language to the general policy on the responsibilities of instructors (faculty included). The proposal passed unanimously.
President Athletics Advisory Council. Professor Richard Seamon, the faculty senate representative on the President’s Athletics Advisory Council and Prof. Brian Wolf, chair of the council and faculty athletics advisor, gave a report to senate. Wolf explained that NCAA rules required faculty participation in athletics policy. He serves as a liaison between the athletics department and the university’s academic programs. He fulfills three major responsibilities: reviewing policy to ensure that academic matters are dealt with appropriately, working to insure the academic integrity of athletics programs and looking out for the well-being of the student athletes. He commented that athletics can seem siloed within the larger university. He works to bridge the gap between athletics and academics. The role of the council is to advise the president on matters related to athletics. The group meets 3-4 times a year. In the past, it has been more of a “listening group” and less of an “advisory group.” However, last year the group became more engaged given the major issues arising at the time. Wolf believes that now is an ideal time for the council to evaluate its role as the UI goes through a transition in leadership.

A senator asked how the council transitioned from listening to advising. Wolf responded that the engagement of the council was a natural response to the emergence of issues regarding athletics. He reminded senators that these issues included placing the athletic director on leave and subsequently terminating his contract, as well as the announcement of plans to cut some sports such as women’s swim and dive, women’s soccer and women and men’s tennis. Members of the council were concerned that they had not been informed of and consulted on these issues in advance. Seamon added that another issue was the impact of the changes in sports on student sports scholarships. Wolf indicated that the administration listened to advice and comments from the council.

A senator asked what the major challenge will be for this group in the future. Wolf responded that the UI still faces challenges in athletic administration. We have an Interim Athletic Director and we are currently spending more than the SBOE cap on athletic expenditures. The move from Sunbelt Conference to the Big Sky Conference resulted in a loss of revenue. In his view, the biggest challenge is how to “right size” athletics for UI’s interests.

A senator asked what kind of incentives are used to encourage high academic performance by student athletes. Wolf responded that commitment by the department and individual coaches is crucial. He noted that the football coach came into a program that was on NCAA probation because of its academic performance. The coach made a commitment to turn the situation around. With the move to the Big Sky Conference, fewer football scholarships are available. Football has had to look into whether recruits can qualify for academic scholarships in order to supplement sports scholarships. Wolf pointed out that at UI the overall graduation rate for student athletes is higher than the student body as a whole. He noted that UI coaches use the quality of UI’s educational experience as a recruitment tool for athletes.

A senator thanked Wolf and Seamon for their service. He stated that he had previously served on the advisory council. He believes that faculty involvement is crucial particularly during difficult times.

A senator asked if Wolf knew the status of plans to search for a permanent athletics director. Wolf responded that this would be a priority for the new president. The senator commented that he hoped there would be faculty representation on the search committee for the new athletics director.
Benefits Advisory Group (BAG) Professor Mike McKellar, the senate representative on BAG, gave the report. BAG has been working on how to better communicate with faculty and staff both about annual enrollment and about the scope of UI benefits. HR is working to ensure that all employees participate in annual enrollment. They are also trying to make sure employees understand the full range of UI benefits. McKellar noted that he was interested in the fact that UI has a higher than average occurrence of cancer in our population of covered employees which has slightly increased the cost of our plan. He also indicated that the increased costs of the various health insurance options differ, but are spread evenly over all the plans so that employees have a choice of coverage options. Finally, he indicated that the employee payroll deduction for health care will be increasing. UI has been able to cover increases in the cost of our plans through the appropriation received from the state for health insurance. The cost of our plan is catching up and the buffer must be rebuilt. McKellar also indicated that BAG has discussed the dependent eligibility verification process. He pointed out that ineligible participants not only increase the cost of UI’s plan, but also jeopardize the tax status of the plan.

Extension Conference. McKellar also reported on the annual UI Extension Conference. He agreed to attend the conference on behalf of Faculty Senate as part of our efforts to reach out to faculty beyond the Moscow Campus. McKellar reported that he had many great interactions with Extension faculty at the conference. He emphasized the commitment of extension to building foundations for partnerships across the institution and throughout Idaho.

Campus Planning & Advisory Committee. Professors David Lee-Painter and Penny Morgan, the senate representatives on the committee gave the report. Both reported that service on the committee is very fascinating. The committee met twice each semester. In addition to participating in strategic discussions about future campus planning initiatives, committee members were able to tour new facilities such as the president’s house and the new WWAMI facilities on Sweet Ave. and at Gritman Hospital.

Term-Tenure Track Task Force Update. Secretary Brandt gave the report for the committee. Also attending the meeting was Prof. Dan Eveleth, Chair of the taskforce and member of FAC, and VP Lawrence who has actively participated in taskforce discussions and also is an ex officio member of FAC. Brandt reported that FAC is continuing to gather and consider input from across campus on the draft proposal that was circulated to senate at Meeting #24 on April 2, 2019. Once a new draft is developed considering campus input, it will be circulated over the summer for input from deans, unit administrators and other administrative staff. The goal is to present a final proposal to senate during the fall semester of 2019.

The agenda having been completed, a motion (Morgan/McKellar) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt,
Faculty Secretary & Secretary to the Faculty Senate
White Paper
Revised Tenure and Promotion Procedures
Spring 2019

What is the scope of the proposed policy? The proposed policy applies to the procedure for tenure and/or promotion. It does not apply to the substantive criteria for tenure and promotion. The proposed policy creates a single, unified process for tenure and promotion. If adopted, this procedure will apply at all levels (unit, college and university). It will supersede all provisions in college and department/program bylaws regarding the process for tenure and promotion. The policy brings together provisions that were spread out over four or five policies regarding the timing of tenure and promotion, extensions for promotion and tenure and the procedure (such as the required documents that must be submitted and the composition of committees).

Why do we need a revised tenure and promotion procedure policy? UI has developed a complex web of overlapping and inconsistent policies regarding the process for promotion and tenure. Not only have our policies on tenure (FSH 3520) and promotion (FSH 3560) become very complex, they also have subtly diverged from each other and become inconsistent with other UI policies such as the ranks and responsibilities policy (1565), the position description policy (3050), and the annual evaluation policy (3320). The complexity in the process makes it difficult for us to follow our own policies. We make mistakes on basic issues such as the composition and role of committees, and the timing of submissions.

The complexity also creates problems for faculty members seeking tenure and promotion. They often find the process daunting, off-putting and unnecessarily duplicative. It is too easy for candidates to make mistakes in their packets or to be victimized by unwitting mistakes made at their departments and colleges. The process gets in the way of candidates putting forth their strongest case for tenure and/or promotion.

The process is also unnecessarily time consuming and stressful for candidates and for faculty involved in reviewing candidates. It often requires an inefficient investment of faculty time in service on review committees and to mentor candidates by trying to figure out exactly what must be submitted, when, and by whom. Hours are wasted and delays occur, trying to reconcile policies and seeking clarification from department chairs, deans, the faculty secretary’s office, the provost’s office and general counsel.

The complexity of the process makes it difficult for the faculty secretary’s office, provost’s office, and general counsel to support faculty, departments and colleges as they work to advance candidates. The provost’s office is also placed in the confrontational position of having to “police” an overly complex and ambiguous process. Provost office staff must be familiar with every set of unit and college bylaws. The provost’s office often ends up intervening in the process after the fact, where bylaws are inconsistent with the FSH and/or unit and college bylaws are inconsistent with each other. This can upend a candidate’s application. Because of the complexity and diversity of college and unit procedures, the provost is unable to develop a single, coherent set of guidelines for candidates, departments and colleges to support tenure and promotion. It is also impossible for the provost’s office to provide effective training and support to unit and college administrators and staff. The result is that many mistakes are made every year.

The problems become the most severe when disputes arise. It is true that many faculty navigate the tenure and promotion process successfully. Other faculty present such strong cases for tenure and promotion that any mistakes in the process are harmless. The biggest problems with our process arise
when an application for tenure and promotion is perceived to be weak (legitimate or not). Then, mistakes and ambiguities in the process can become surrogate reasons to deny promotion and tenure, distracting from the substance of the application. The flip side of the problem is also true. Mistakes in the process can become the basis by which an un-meritorious candidate leverages additional time or opportunities to present a successful application.

The complexity of the process also undermines our internal faculty appeals process and creates problems for both faculty and the university when litigation erupts. Ambiguities and complex nuances in the system create increased numbers of cases in which the various review committees and administrators disagree with each other. Each party to such a dispute relies on different nuances in the policy, often resulting in impasse. The FAHB is placed in a difficult position as it tries to apply the various conflicting rules and procedures. It is often left with no clear way to interpret the web of policy implicated in a case. This can mean that the FAHB’s recommendation can appear to be unprincipled or capricious – just one more conflicting take along side all the other committees and administrators. As a result, in such cases, the president is more likely to decline the guidance of the FAHB and undertake his or her own independent evaluation. These problems are magnified, if litigation follows.

What policy changes are included in the proposal? The proposal includes many small changes in procedure. However, it also includes several relatively significant changes in UI policy and procedure regarding the tenure and promotion process.

1. **Promotion & Tenure Linked.** The new policy explicitly links promotion and tenure. Our current policy does not directly make this link, although, for the most part, our practice has been to link promotion and tenure. The goal of linking tenure and promotion in this policy is to reduce extra reviews, committees, and administrative overhead. The linkage will also resolve unusual situations that can arise such as what happens when an assistant professor is tenured but not promoted to associate professor.

2. **Promotion and Contract Renewal for Term Faculty Linked.** The proposed policy links contract renewal of term faculty with promotion – i.e. the policy provides that the university can’t renew the contract of a term faculty member who is not promoted from assistant to associate or from instructor to senior instructor. Again, a value judgment is involved. Promotion signals success at the responsibilities in a faculty member’s position description. If a faculty member is not successful in performing PD responsibilities, it is not in the institution’s interest to continue to renew that person’s contract. One argument against this approach is that such term faculty do not have time to go up for promotion. This argument opens the door to imposing unreasonable and unworkable responsibilities on a term faculty member.

3. **Review Committees Limited to UI Employees.** The proposed policy excludes students and individuals from outside the university from service on promotion and tenure committees. This exclusion is not a statement that student and/or external input is not important. Rather it is an attempt to respect the confidentiality of the personnel process. Individuals who are not UI employees are not bound by confidentiality rules and other UI employment responsibilities. We need to secure their input to the process through other methods such as student evaluation of teaching and external peer review of scholarship rather than through service on confidential personnel committees.
4. **Uniform committee structure across all units and colleges.** Each candidate will have the same committee structure, votes, and evaluation from the department level through the college and at the university level. This uniform process should minimize mistakes. It will allow the faculty secretary’s office, provost’s office, and general counsel to provide better support to departments and colleges.

5. **Uniform Tenure and Promotion Dossier.** The policy provides for one comprehensive tenure and promotion dossier containing all the documents/files/data needs to support third year reviews, tenure and promotion. Committees/reviewers at all levels of the university will have access to the entire dossier. The practice of making copies of publications and other evidence available as “supplemental materials” in the unit office has been eliminated. This practice was most likely a relic of paper T & P files and no longer serves an important purpose. Once a dossier is submitted, it cannot be changed except under limited circumstances.

6. **Extensions Clarified.** The proposal clarifies the process for obtaining extensions. It makes clear that the process applies to both tenure and to promotions. It clarifies that when an extension is granted for third year review, tenure/promotion are synced with the extended time-frame.

7. **Special Circumstances Clarified.** The processes are clarified for awarding credit toward tenure and/or promotion, making appointments with tenure or at rank, the impact of leaves of absence, time spent at another institution, breaks in service and transfers between departments and colleges.
Draft Promotion and Tenure Process
I. Provost Responsibilities

- This section combines and clarifies current policy.
- The only new provision in this section is part I.C. Under current policy it has sometimes been difficult to fill committees with appropriate required members. Where the Unit Administrator and/or Dean are unable to fill a committee position, this provision allows the provost to fill the opening.
II. Schedule for Tenure and Promotion

- This section unifies all UI provisions for the timing of promotion, tenure, special circumstances and extensions in one place.
- The revision removes ambiguity:
  - Tenure
    - during the 6th year
  - Promotion
    - Instructor to Senior Instructor: during the 6th year
    - Assistant to Associate: either at same time as tenure (which is during the 6th year) or during 6th full year of service
      - Failure to be promoted from assistant to associate for a term faculty member is treated the same as failure to be granted tenure.
      - Associate to Full during 6th full year in rank; if not promoted reconsideration in 5th full year after
  - Early consideration for promotion requires permission of provost
  - Special Circumstances. Generally, the impact on promotion and tenure of transfers between UI departments, appointment as an administrator, initial appointment with credit, and appointment with tenure require that the details be determined at the time of the transfer or appointment and be approved in writing by the provost.
  - Extensions. Clarifies that the extension policy applies both to tenure and to promotion, clarifies that an extension in 3rd year review automatically extends the time for tenure.
III. Tenure & Promotion Dossier

- Replaces what was commonly called the Tenure or Promotion packet.
- ALL evidence supporting tenure & promotion must be part of the dossier - no supplemental files in unit office. Each review level has access to the entire file.

  Faculty Member’s Responsibility
  - CV on required form
  - Personal Context statement
  - Personal Philosophy Statement
  - Evidence of accomplishment in each area of responsibility in PD (e.g. articles, recordings, photographs, teaching materials, evidence of excellent teaching, outreach materials and/or description of service as appropriate)

  Unit Administrator’s Responsibility
  - Unit Bylaw provisions regarding annual review process and unit criteria
  - PDs, Annual Evals and Student Evals of Teaching
  - External Peer Reviews (can be submitted late but must be submitted before evaluation begins)
  - Prior Reports (e.g. 3rd year review, report for promotion from assistant to associate, periodic reviews, etc.)

- Dossier must be submitted either prior to semester under which review is scheduled or prior to submission of materials to external reviewers. Dossier is final when submitted and may not be supplemented or altered after submission. Must have permission of provost to withdraw the dossier. Faculty member is not “considered” until a final decision of the president.
IV. Third Year Review

- Every faculty member must have a 3rd year review (this includes instructors and other term faculty).
- The review is formative
- 3rd Year Review committee: 3 faculty members
  - For tenure track = must be at least 2 tenured members
  - For term = must be at least two higher-ranked members
- Based on T&P Dossier
V.A Tenure and/or Promotion Review: Unit Level

- Standing committee appointed by Unit Administrator,
  - Chair appointed by unit administrator
  - 5 members,
  - 1 year term.
  - Three members must be tenured members of the unit.

- No third parties such as students or professionals on T & P committees

- Based on T & P Dossier

- Committee writes a report with recommendations for each candidate

- Tenured and/or Promoted Faculty in unit are polled and may submit evaluative comments

- The Candidate may provide a written response

- Transmission of all reports, responses and polling info to Dean
V.B College Level

- College Standing committee (in college with more than one unit)
  - Dean appoints chair,
  - 1 year terms,
  - Representatives of each unit.
- Based on T & P Dossier
- College Committee writes a report and makes recommendations
- Dean writes a report and makes recommendations
- Candidate may respond in writing
- All reports, polling information and responses are forwarded to provost
V.C. University Level

- University committee composition and selection method are not changed.

- The committee considers both promotion and tenure. In the case of a candidate with unanimous prior recommendations, the university committee shall defer to them unless new facts have emerged or unless prior recommendations were not made with due regard to university level requirements.

- Provost Recommendation: Provost writes a report and includes a rationale for each recommendation. This is what has happened in recent years in practice, but was not previously included in policy.
New Policy re Tenure & Promotion Process

I. Provost Office.

A. Delegation. The provost may delegate any of the responsibilities in this policy to a designee.

B. Provost Administrative Guidance. The process of tenure and promotion is administered by the provost. The provost shall, from time to time, publish guidance necessary for the administration of the tenure and promotion system that is not inconsistent with the Faculty Staff Handbook or the Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures (RGP). This guidance shall be mandatory. The provost’s administrative guidance shall include:

   1. Deadlines for tenure and promotion;
   2. Requirements for curriculum vitae;
   3. Requirements regarding the submission of tenure and/or promotion dossiers including format, order of evidence, page limits for evidence, etc.;
   4. Requirements for the selection of external reviews for scholarly work;
   5. The timing of appointments and relative representation of faculty from the various colleges on the University-level Promotion & Tenure Committee pursuant to section IV.C of this policy; and
   6. Such other matters necessary to ensure the appropriate administration of the tenure and promotion process.

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

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

II. Schedule for Tenure and Promotion.

A. Tenure.

   1. Timing of Tenure. A faculty member is considered for tenure during the sixth full year of probationary service. Consideration at that time is mandatory. When the appointment begins after the start of the academic year (for academic year appointments) or after the start of the fiscal year (for fiscal year appointments) then the timeline for tenure consideration begins the following year. Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed. (RGP IIG6).

   2. Denial of Tenure. A faculty member who is not awarded tenure shall be given written notice of denial of tenure. Such a denial of tenure constitutes a decision to not renew the faculty member’s contract of employment with the UI subject to FSH 3900. [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 7-05, ren. & rev. 1-10]

   3. Presidential Discretion. The president may in his or her sole discretion offer successive years of employment following a denial of tenure pursuant to RGP IIG6j.

B. Promotion.

   1. Timing of Promotion. Consideration of a faculty member for promotion is required according to the following schedule. When the appointment begins after the start of the academic year (for academic year appointments) or after the start of the fiscal year (for fiscal year appointments) then the timeline for promotion consideration begins the following year.
a. **Instructors.** Full-time instructors may be considered for promotion to senior instructor during their sixth year of continuous, full-time service as an instructor or thereafter with the approval of the dean and unit administrator. Part-time instructors are not eligible for promotion.

b. **Assistant Professors.**
   i. Assistant professors who are on a tenure track shall be considered for promotion at the same time they are considered for tenure and shall be promoted if they receive tenure. (See Section II. A above).
   ii. Assistant professors who are not on a tenure track shall be considered for promotion during their sixth full year as an assistant professor.
      1. A denial of promotion of an assistant professor constitutes a decision to not renew the faculty member’s contract of employment with the UI subject to FSH 3900.
      2. The president may in his or her sole discretion offer successive years of employment following a denial of promotion.

c. **Associate Professors.** Associate professors may be considered for promotion during their sixth full year of service as an associate professor. When an associate professor has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she may be considered again during their fifth full year of service after denial of promotion.

2. **Early Consideration for Promotion.** A faculty member may be considered for promotion at an earlier time than permitted by this policy with the approval of the Provost.

C. **Special Circumstances.**

1. **Transfer between Units.**
   a. **Approval process.** When a nontenured faculty member transfers to another unit within UI, the transfer must be approved by the provost in consultation with the units and college dean(s).
   b. **Impact on time to tenure and promotion.** The extent to which service in the first unit counts toward tenure and/or promotion in the new unit must be communicated to the faculty member in writing by the provost at the time of the transfer. (RGP IIG6lii-regarding transfer of non-tenured faculty).
   c. **Tenure Status not changed.** Tenure status is not changed when a tenured faculty member transfers from one unit to another within UI.

2. **Impact of Administrative Appointment on Tenure and/or Promotion.** A faculty member who serves as an administrator, retains membership in his or her academic department and his or her academic rank and tenure. The faculty member may resume duties in his or her academic department when the administrative responsibilities end.

3. **Credit toward Tenure and/or Promotion at Time of Appointment.** Credit toward tenure and/or promotion may be granted at the time of appointment, with the approval of the provost. Such credit must be documented in the letter offering the faculty candidate employment at UI. Credit toward tenure and promotion may be granted under the following circumstances:
   a. After review of the faculty candidate’s qualifications, the faculty in the unit affirm that the candidate meets UI criteria for the rank to be offered and/or is very likely to be awarded tenure and/or promotion at the appropriate time given the credit to be awarded; and
   b. The candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed through service at another institution, or have made substantial contributions to their field of specialization.

4. **Appointment with Tenure.** A faculty candidate may be initially appointed as an associate or full professor with tenure with the approval of the provost. Appointment with tenure may be offered under the following circumstances:
   a. The faculty candidate has attained tenure at another college or university;
   b. After review of the faculty candidate’s qualifications, the faculty in the unit affirm that the candidate meets UI criteria for tenure and the rank to be offered. If the candidate is appointed as an associate
professor, the faculty of the unit must also affirm that the candidate is very likely to be promoted to full professor in a timely fashion; and  
c. The candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed.

D. Extensions.

1. **Childbirth/Adoption:** A faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption, may request an automatic one-year extension of the timeline for tenure and/or promotion. Childbirth or adoption shall be considered an exceptional case justifying an extension. (RGP IIIG.(6)(d)(iv)(2).

2. **Other Circumstances:** An extension of the timeline for tenure and/or promotion may be granted in other exceptional circumstances, (RGP IIIG.(6)(d)(iv)(2), that may impede a faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure and/or promotion, including but not limited to significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care or disability/chronic illness. [rev. 7-11, ed. 7-17]

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

4. **Length of Extension.** In most cases, extension of the time to tenure and/or promotion shall be for one year. However, longer extensions may be granted upon a showing of need by the faculty member. Multiple extension requests may be granted. [rev. & ren. 7-17]

5. **Procedure for Requesting an Extension:**
   a. The faculty member must request the extension from the Provost in writing by March 15th of the year before the review process begins. The written request must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other exceptional circumstance. [rev. 7-17]
   b. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the Provost shall have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost shall, in his or her discretion, determine if consultation with the dean and/or department is appropriate. The provost shall notify the faculty member, department chair, and dean of the action taken. [ren. 7-17]

III. Tenure and Promotion Dossier. All evidence provided by the faculty member (“candidate”) and by the unit administrator shall be compiled together into a single dossier in the manner required by the provost. This dossier is the basis for all reviews required by this policy.

A. Evidence to be provided by the Faculty Member. The candidate shall submit the following evidence as provided in the provost guidance:

1. **Current Curriculum Vitae.** The curriculum vitae in the form required by the provost.
2. **Personal Context Statement.** A Personal Context Statement, written by the candidate, describing the candidate’s responsibilities within his or her academic unit as established in the position description. The personal context statement should also describe the expectations placed on the candidate by interdisciplinary programs or research centers, the requirements of joint appointments or other special circumstances. [rev. 1-10]
3. **Personal Philosophy Statement.** A Personal Philosophy Statement regarding the candidate’s professional activities relevant to his/her position description.
4. **Evidence of Accomplishment.** Evidence of accomplishment in each area of responsibility in the position description.

B. Evidence Provided by the Unit Administrator. The unit administrator shall submit the following as provided by the provost guidelines:

1. **Bylaw Sections.** Bylaw sections that cover the following areas:
   a. Annual review process and annual performance criteria.
   b. Unit/College criteria for tenure and promotion.
2. **Position Descriptions, Annual Evaluations and Student Evaluations of Teaching.** Copies of the candidate’s position description(s), annual evaluations, and student evaluations of teaching results. These documents shall be provided to the candidate at least five business days before the candidate’s evidence in support of tenure and/or promotion is due.

3. **External Peer Reviews.** Three to five External Reviews, except in the case of third year review, post promotion review, or faculty without responsibility for scholarship or creative activity as defined by FSH 1565 and pursuant to the faculty member’s position description. The unit administrator shall obtain evaluations of the candidate’s performance in the area of scholarly and creative activity as follows:

   a. **Qualifications of Reviewers.** External reviewers shall be tenured faculty members who have expertise in areas closely related to the candidate’s expertise. If the review is to be in support of promotion, each reviewer should be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking.
   
   b. **Selection.** The list of the reviewers to be solicited shall be developed in collaboration by the unit administration and the candidate. The unit administrator shall make the final selection of external reviewers, at least one review shall come from the candidate’s list.
   
   c. **Request Letter.** The letter of request shall be based on a template provided by the provost.
   
   d. **Review Criteria.**
      1. The review shall be limited to the candidate’s scholarly accomplishment in relation to the UI tenure and/or promotion standards and the faculty member’s position description(s).
      2. Reviewers may not be asked to evaluate the candidate pursuant to external standards such as the standards at the reviewer’s institution or other professional organizations.
      3. The unit administrator shall make every effort to keep the names of the reviewers confidential from the candidate.

4. **Prior Reports.** Copies of the third year review committee, periodic review reports, unit administrator and dean’s reports (as applicable) and any response(s) by the faculty member to the reports.

C. **Submission and Supplementation of Dossier.**

1. **Deadline for Submission.** A candidate’s dossier in support of tenure and/or promotion, containing all of the evidence described in section A and B above, must be submitted as provided by the provost’s guidelines either prior to the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to begin or prior to the submission of the candidate’s materials to the external reviewers, whichever is earlier.

   a. External peer reviews do not have to be submitted as part of the dossier prior to the deadline, but must be submitted, if required, prior to any consideration of the dossier.
   
   b. The dossier may be supplemented with actions taken after submission by external entities regarding scholarship or creative activity. Such scholarship must have been under review by the external entity prior to the submission deadline for tenure and/or promotion dossier and supplementation must be made pursuant to the provost guidelines.

2. **Finalization of Dossier.** Other than supplementation provided for in section 1(a) and (b) above, the dossier is final when submitted and may not be supplemented or altered after submission.

3. **Withdrawal of Dossier.** Except in extraordinary circumstances and with the approval of the provost, a dossier submitted for tenure and/or promotion consideration may not be withdrawn after submission.

4. **Consideration of Dossier.** A faculty member’s application for tenure or promotion does not qualify as being considered until the final decision of the president on the application.
IV. Third Year Review. In addition to the annual evaluation of faculty by the unit administrator, each faculty member who is not tenured shall be reviewed by a committee of colleagues during the 24 to 36 month period after beginning employment at UI. The purpose of this review is to provide the faculty member with detailed information regarding the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The review is formative in nature.

A. Third Year Review Committee. The third year review committee is appointed by the unit administrator.

1. Each committee shall consist of three faculty members.
2. In the case of a review of a tenure-track faculty member, at least two of the three members of the committee must be tenured members of the faculty member’s academic unit. The committee shall be chaired by a tenured faculty member from the unit who shall be appointed by the unit administrator. If there are not two tenured faculty members in the unit available to serve on the third year review committee, the unit administrator shall appoint, as necessary, one or two tenured faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are most closely related to the area of expertise of the faculty member under review. If necessary, a tenured faculty member from another unit may chair the third year review committee.
3. In the case of a review of a non-tenure-track faculty member, at least two of the three members of the committee must be faculty members holding a rank higher than the faculty member under review in the faculty member’s unit. The committee shall be chaired by a higher ranked faculty member from the unit who shall be appointed by the unit administrator. If there are no faculty members holding a higher rank in the unit available to serve on the third year review committee, the unit administrator shall appoint, as necessary, one or two other faculty members from the unit who are most familiar with the non-tenure-track faculty member’s area of expertise. If necessary, a higher ranked faculty member from another unit may chair the third year review committee.

B. Dossier and Basis for Third Year Review. The unit administrator shall provide the completed tenure and/or promotion dossier except external peer reviews to the chair of the committee. The review shall be based on the tenure and/or promotion dossier as well as on direct interactions of the committee members with the faculty member.

C. Third Year Review Report and Candidate Response. The committee shall write a report addressing the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each of the faculty member’s responsibility areas. The report shall provide direction to the faculty member regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may provide a written response to the report within five business days after receiving the report.

D. Unit Administrator Review. The chair of the committee shall forward the report and any response from the candidate to the unit administrator. The unit administrator shall provide a written review regarding the candidate’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The unit administrator shall provide the review to the candidate who shall have five business days to respond.

E. Forwarding Materials and Record-Keeping. The committee report, the unit administrator’s review, the candidate’s response(s), if any, and the tenure and/or promotion dossier shall be forwarded to the dean. The dean shall acknowledge receipt and shall forward the materials to the faculty member and to the provost’s office for recordkeeping.

V. Tenure and/or Promotion Review.

A. Unit Level

1. Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee. Each unit shall have a standing tenure and promotion committee appointed by the unit administrator. The unit administrator shall also appoint one of the committee members to serve as chair. The committee shall be composed of five members who serve for one year. At least three of the committee members must be tenured faculty members in the unit. If there are not three tenured faculty members available to serve on the committee, the unit administrator, in consultation with the dean, shall designate tenured faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are most closely related to the work of faculty in the unit. One such member may chair the
committee if there is not a tenured member from the unit available to serve as chair of the committee. Because the tenure and promotion committee is a personnel committee, students and non-university employees shall not serve on the committee. Neither the unit administrator nor the dean may serve as a member of the unit tenure and promotion committee.

2. Dossier. The unit administrator shall submit the completed tenure and/or promotion dossier to the chair of the unit tenure and promotion committee. The dossier must be made available to all committee members and faculty eligible to participate in polling at the unit level as set forth in sub-sections 4 and 5 below at least two weeks prior to the unit tenure and promotion committee meeting.

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

4. Polling of Tenured Faculty. In the case of tenure, based solely on the dossier, the unit administrator shall poll all tenured faculty members of the candidate’s unit regarding whether the candidate should be granted tenure. Such tenured faculty members may submit evaluative comments to the unit administrator.

5. Polling of Promoted Faculty. In the case of promotion, based solely on the dossier, the unit administrator shall poll all faculty members of the candidate’s unit at the rank to which the faculty member seeks promotion or a higher rank regarding whether the candidate should be promoted. Such faculty members may submit evaluative comments to the unit administrator.

6. Unit Administrator’s Report. The unit administrator shall prepare a written report after considering the tenure and/or promotion dossier, the unit tenure and promotion committee report, and the unit polling results. The unit administrator’s report shall include the administrator’s recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion in light of the university, college and unit criteria. In the event that the administrator submitting the recommendation has not had at least one year to evaluate the candidate, he or she 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.

7. Transmission of Reports to the Candidate and Written Response. The unit administrator shall provide copies of the administrator’s report, unit polling results and the report of the unit tenure and promotion committee to the candidate. The candidate may provide a written response to the reports and polling results within five business days after receiving the information.

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

B. College Level.

1. College Standing Committee. Each college having more than one unit shall have a standing committee on tenure and promotion. The members shall serve for one year terms and may serve consecutive terms. The members of the committee shall be appointed by the dean in consultation with the unit administrators within the college and shall represent each unit within the college. The dean shall appoint the chair of the committee.

2. College Standing Committee Recommendations. The committee shall review the completed tenure and/or promotion dossier including all reports, responses and polling information in light of the applicable
unit, college and university criteria. The committee shall write a report making recommendations to the dean regarding whether each candidate should be promoted and/or tenured. For each candidate, the report shall include a brief rationale for the committee’s recommendations and a record of the committee’s vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. The chair shall deliver the report to the dean.

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

4. **Transmission of Reports to Candidate and Written Response.** The report of the college committee and the dean’s recommendation shall be provided to the candidate. The candidate has five business days from receipt of the report and recommendation to provide a written response to the dean.

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

C. University Level

1. **Composition of University Tenure and Promotion Committee.** A University Promotion and Tenure Committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost, is appointed each year.

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

   b. **Membership.** The membership of the committee shall be as follows: the vice president with responsibility for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies and the provost’s designee with primary responsibility for faculty tenure and promotion shall serve on the committee *ex officio* (without vote). In addition, the final committee shall consist of two representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, and one representative from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large.

2. **University Tenure and Promotion Committee Recommendations.** The committee shall make recommendations to the provost regarding the tenure and/or promotion of each candidate with specific reference to the university criteria for tenure and/or promotion and to the criteria established by the unit and college of the candidate. If the recommendations of the unit and college committees, the unit administrator and the college dean are in agreement, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee (UTPC) shall defer to the recommendation unless new facts have emerged at the university-level review that were not considered in the unit or college reviews or unless the committee concludes that the prior recommendations were made without due regard to the university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The chair will conduct voting on candidates by closed ballots.

D. **Provost Recommendation.** The provost shall write a report to the president making a recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. The report to the president shall include a rationale for each recommendation and the results of polling from the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.
E. Presidential Approval. The president shall confer with the provost and make the decision regarding tenure and/or promotion for each candidate. The awarding of tenure and/or promotion to an eligible faculty member is made only by a positive action of approval by the president.

F. Notice to the Candidate. The president shall give notice in writing to the faculty member of the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion by May 1 of the academic year during in which the decision is made. (RGP IIG6g). The provost’s recommendation shall be forwarded to the candidate at that time. Notwithstanding any provisions in this section to the contrary, no person is deemed to have been awarded tenure solely because notice is not given or received by the prescribed times. 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, ren. & ed. 1-10]
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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, I-1 through I-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 January 2010 this section was again revised to reflect changes in the faculty position
description and evaluation forms intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary
activities into the evaluation process. In July 2011 changes to F-9 were made to make automatic the one year
extension for childbirth/adoption. In July 2012 the percentage requirement for student membership on tenure
committees was removed to better align this policy with Regent’s policy which states only that students be included.
In July 2013 Regent’s no longer required students on tenure committees, thus the university revised its policy to
allow units to determine and to note same in their by-laws. In July 2017 changes were made to clarify the language
in F-9 for tenure extensions. 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). [ed. 7-97, 7-02, rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-02, 7-05,
7-07, 1-08, 1-10, 7-11, 7-12, 7-13, 7-17]

CONTENTS:

A. General
B. Criteria for Tenure
C. Tenurable Ranks

A. GENERAL. Tenure is intended to protect academic freedom in order to maintain a free and open intellectual
atmosphere. The justification for tenure lies in the character of scholarly activity, which requires protection from improper
influences from either outside or inside the university. Tenure strengthens the UI’s ability to attract and retain superior
teachers and scholars as members of the faculty. A majority of the faculty in each unit excluding adjuncts shall be tenure-
track/tenured faculty unless the provost has authorized otherwise. [ed. 7-98, ed. & ren. 1-10]

B. 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 and consistent with university, college and unit criteria. The faculty
of each college and unit shall establish specific criteria for tenure consistent with the university requirements for tenure.
The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity and shall be included in college and
unit bylaws. [rev. 7-98, rev. & ren. 1-10].

C. TENURABLE RANKS. The tenurable ranks are: senior instructor, assistant professor, assistant research
professor, associate professor, associate research professor, professor, research professor, and librarian,
psychologist/licensed psychologist, and extension faculty all with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor,
and professor. 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 b.) [rev. 7-98, 7-01, ren. & rev. 1-10]
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 January 2010 this section was again revised to reflect changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. In July 2012 the university promotions committee makeup was revised to reflect current practice and align membership to college reorganizations. In July 2014 the cap on non-tenure-track faculty appointments in a unit was adjusted and promotion processes from FSH 1565 were moved into this policy and revised. Except where otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-00, 7-02, 7-07, 1-08, 1-10, 7-12, 7-14]

CONTENTS:

A. General
B. Criteria for Promotion

A. GENERAL. Promotion to a rank requires the faculty member to meet the requirements for that rank. Responsibility for the effective functioning of promotion procedures rests with faculty and administrators. Decisions are based on thorough and uniform evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in relation to the expectations as listed in his/her position description. Performance of university administrative duties as a unit administrator is not a consideration in promotion. [ed. 1-08, 7-14, rev. 1-10]

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