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With tenure consideration
FSH 3560 - REPORT OF EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION
FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK
[7-10]

Date ___________________________________

Name __________________________________ Unit __________________________________

Considered for promotion to the rank of ________________________________________________

Has served in the rank of ______________________________________ since __________________________

=================================================================

REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Having reviewed the 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) (Unit Administrator)

Copies of the documents as referenced in E-2 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.

____________________________________________________________________
(Unit Administrator)

____________________________________________________________________
(Unit Administrator, (Faculty with joint appointments)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator
(when appropriate)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator
(when appropriate)

=================================================================

RECOMMENDATIONS

Each reviewing individual 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:

_____ exceptional performance
_____ performance above expectations
_____ performance that meets expectations
_____ performance below expectations
_____ unacceptable performance

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

___________________________ __________________________ __________________________________
(Signature) (Rank) (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 exceptional, ____ above expectations, ____ meets expectations, ____ below expectations, and ____ unacceptable.

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.]

___________________________________
(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 unit administrators of this college (did) (did not) meet to consider collectively all of the recommendations submitted by the units. The vote of this 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 approve the promotion.

___________________________________
(President)
Section 8.3 Promotion and Tenure.

(a) Academic Unit Jurisdiction. Each academic unit of the College has initial jurisdiction over tenure, promotion, and retention decisions. While final determination over all such decisions rests ultimately with the dean and the president, the recommendations and decisions of the academic unit shall be accorded substantial weight and only overruled in extenuating circumstances and for just cause.

(b) General Considerations. All recommendations regarding tenure and promotion within an academic unit will be made in accordance with these bylaws and the rules and procedures of the University as set forth in the Faculty-Staff Handbook, Sections 3520 and 3560. The recommendations from the unit administrator of an academic unit and from the unit’s promotion and tenure committees will be forwarded to the dean and become part of the file of the candidate for tenure or promotion. Summaries of the recommendations will be provided to the candidate.

(c) Criteria for Tenure and Promotion. Although dismissal for cause after the award of tenure is a condition of a grant of tenure, the College and each academic unit are guided fundamentally by the assumption that tenure implies a life-time appointment. Tenure and promotion are the result of a reasoned assessment of the long-term value and effectiveness of the candidate as a member of his or her academic unit. Each academic unit will develop its own criteria for tenure and promotion, consistent with the Faculty-Staff Handbook, Sections 3520 and 3560.

(d) Tenure and Promotion Committees. The composition of the committees for tenure and promotion will be as provided in the Faculty-Staff Handbook, Section 3520 H-4 (Tenure) and Section 3560 E-3 (Promotion).

(e) Procedure and Timeline. Departmental consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure will occur during the fall semester. It is the responsibility of the unit administrator of each academic unit to apprise candidates for tenure or promotion of the tenure and promotion processes, including the annual and third-year reviews, and encompassing the areas of performance evaluated and the criteria used, soon after the faculty member’s tenure track appointment at the University. Unit administrators are responsible for periodically reminding faculty of all pertinent performance reviews and tenure and promotion processes. All necessary committees for performance review, including third-year review, periodic review, and promotion and tenure will be created by consultation between the academic unit administrator and the candidate for performance review. The unit administrator, again in consultation with candidates for tenure or promotion, and in accordance with Faculty-Staff Handbook, Section 3520 H-4b, will determine appropriate persons to serve as external peer reviewers. Candidates for tenure or
promotion will be provided, upon request, with copies of all external review letters, with all marks identifying the authors thereof removed, prior to the academic unit’s committee meeting(s) on tenure or promotion. Upon completion of the academic unit’s committee meeting(s), the unit administrator will promptly advise the candidate of the committee recommendations, providing the candidate an opportunity to withdraw his or her candidacy and halt the process. The candidate also may respond in writing to clarify the situation if he or she believes his or her record or the academic unit’s criteria were misinterpreted. Any such response letter will be forwarded with the rest of the candidate’s materials to the College.

(f) **External Peer Review.** Candidates for tenure and promotion will undergo external peer review following the procedures as described in the *Faculty-Staff Handbook*, Section 3520 H-4b.
ARTICLE VI. TENURE, PROMOTION AND REVIEW

Section 1. Departmental Jurisdiction. The Chemistry Department has initial jurisdiction over tenure, promotion, and retention decisions; final decisions rest ultimately with the dean and the president. Each department within the college has the authority to make recommendations which play a major role in such decisions. The Faculty-Staff Handbook shall be the definitive source of information about promotion and tenure and shall be used for the resolution of differences.

Section 2. General Guidelines. Granting of tenure is based on a reasoned assessment of the continuing value of the candidate as a member of the Chemistry Department. While dismissal for cause after the award of tenure is possible, the department must be guided by the assumption that tenure implies a lifetime appointment. The University of Idaho Office of the Provost Promotion/Tenure Guidelines (see Provost Office homepage) outlines the general procedures to be followed. The following criteria shall be used in making tenure and promotion recommendations.

A. Teaching: Demonstrated ability as a teacher as evidenced by the formal evaluation by students, informal commentary by students and colleagues, course content and examinations, ability to guide teaching assistants in their teaching assignments, and ability to guide research students through specialized research projects.

B. Scholarship: It is the policy of the Department of Chemistry to emphasize and promote quality research. Consequently, the evaluation of a departmental candidate for promotion and tenure includes this area in the overall assessment. This particular area of evaluation is based upon: 1) the quantity and quality of professional production with significant emphasis on refereed full articles in prominent chemical journals/books; 2) a demonstrated ability to maintain a viable research program based upon the procurement of sufficient external support; and 3) the candidate’s ability to attract, direct, and graduate students at the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. levels. Demonstration must be primarily by publication in prominent refereed journals (such as those of the American Chemical Society). It is expected that multiple-authored publications will be from ideas developed by the candidate and from work done during the probationary period at Idaho. While it is not possible to state precisely the amount of work that will be required, regular publication of full papers on an annual basis is expected. Formal presentations of scientific material at professional meetings are also expected. In all cases, external peer review is solicited on each candidate from schools with comparable resources and missions.

C. Service: Efforts include informal or formal student advising; service on department and university committees; student recruitment; mentoring newer faculty members; informal presentations of a professional nature to local and regional groups; reviews of manuscripts, books, or professional journal articles; service as an officer of a professional organization, etc.

D. External Funding: Candidates are expected to obtain sufficient external support to maintain a viable research program.

E. Job Description: The relative weighting of each of these areas will be in proportion to the corresponding percentage of the job description. For example, a research professor whose job description excludes teaching will be evaluated on criteria B and C and will be expected to be proportionately more productive in those areas than a faculty member whose research commitment is less. Conversely, a faculty member with a higher percentage of teaching in the job description will be evaluated more heavily on criterion A, although scholarly activity will still be expected in proportion to the percentage of the job description.
F. **External Peer Review.** In addition to an “internal” review by departmental members, an “external” peer review constitutes an essential component of the evaluation procedures. This external review will be conducted in accordance with Provost Office Guidelines for External Peer Review (see Provost Office homepage) and in the following manner. The department chair will send a copy of the candidate’s current vita and supporting documentation to faculty of chemistry departments at peer institutions, defined as those institutions included in the top 150 universities in external support funding listed by the National Science Foundation. The accompanying letter prepared by the chair asks each of the external reviewers to evaluate the candidate’s performance in (a) teaching, (b) publications, (c) research funding, and (d) departmental/university service and professional activities such as participation in scientific meetings, invited lectures, involvement in professional societies, etc. This letter also requests an answer to the question: Would this candidate be promoted and awarded tenure currently in your department based on his/her performance on points (a)-(d)? These external reviews are used to supplement the other information evaluated by the departmental committee, i.e., the candidate’s performance in the important areas of teaching, service, and collegiality.

**Section 3. Procedures.** Departmental promotion and tenure recommendations are made and competency reviews are carried out in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix 1 (“Department of Chemistry Criteria for Promotion and Tenure: Tenure Recommendation and Competency Review Committee,” approved October 17, 1975, revised September 8, 2000, and September 2004).

**Section 4. Third Year Review.** The tenured faculty of the department will conduct a third year review of all untenured faculty in accordance with Section 3520.H-3. of the Faculty-Staff Handbook. The departmental procedures for the third year review are outlined in Appendix 2 (“Department of Chemistry: Procedures for Third Year Review”). The purpose of this review is (1) to give the faculty member an early indication of his/her potential for tenure; (2) to remind the faculty member of the criteria on which tenure and promotion decisions are normally based, and to inform him/her of any other circumstances which might affect a decision in his/her case; (3) to inform the faculty member of any deficiencies which might lead to a negative tenure decision and to make suggestions, when appropriate, for correcting them; or (4) to recommend against reappointment. This will not be interpreted to mean that a faculty member’s contract cannot be terminated before the end of the third year, since all appointments at the university are for one year.
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
TENURE AND PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE

September 2004

SECTION I.  MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE

A. The tenure and/or promotion committee and competency review committee shall be composed of eight (8) members appointed by the departmental chair and selected as follows:

1. Four (4) members and three (3) substitutes chosen by lot from the tenured faculty, excluding the chair of the department. At least one member should have the rank of full professor, and at least one member should have the rank of assistant or associate professor.
2. One (1) member and three (3) substitutes from (a) the untenured faculty of the Chemistry Department, or (b) from the faculty of other science-related departments.
3. One (1) member and three (3) substitutes chosen by lot from among upper-division students majoring in chemistry.
4. One (1) member and three (3) substitutes from among the graduate students of the Chemistry Department, chosen by election by the graduate students.
5. One (1) member and three (3) substitutes from the tenured faculty of departments other than chemistry, selected by the chemistry faculty.

B. A faculty member under consideration by the committee shall have a right to challenge the appointment of up to three members of the committee without cause. The three challenges may include substitutes chosen after an initial challenge. He/She must exercise his/her challenge in writing delivered to the department chair at least three days ahead of the first meeting of the committee. A member of the committee who is challenged shall be replaced by the next substitute in his/her category.

C. The chair of the committee shall be selected by vote of the committee from among the tenured members of the Chemistry Department chosen for the committee.

D. A quorum of the committee shall be six members or their duly selected substitutes. Only a faculty member under consideration may raise a question as to a quorum.

SECTION II.  DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

The committee shall make a recommendation as to tenure and/or promotion of a faculty member (a) when the policy of the Board of Regents requires that he/she be considered for such, or (b) when requested by the chair or a majority of the tenured faculty of the department, or (c) when requested for himself/herself in writing delivered to the department chair.

SECTION III.  HEARINGS

A. If the committee members deem it necessary, they shall hold hearings for the taking of evidence with respect to the faculty member under consideration. The hearings shall be closed unless the faculty member under consideration desires that it be open. The committee chair may close a hearing to all persons except members of the committee and the faculty member under consideration if necessary to maintain order.
B. Evidence offered at the hearing should be related primarily to the job description developed for the faculty member in question and may include results of student evaluations.

C. A member of the committee or the faculty member under consideration may offer, or object to, evidence and may include evaluations from alumni or professional chemists outside the university.

D. A faculty member under consideration shall have the right personally to confront, and to cross-examine, each witness against him/her.

E. The chair shall rule conclusively for the committee on all procedural points and on the admissibility of evidence.

SECTION IV. MEETINGS

A. After evidentiary procedures are completed, the committee shall meet to decide, based on the evidence presented, whether to recommend the granting of tenure and/or promotion. The meetings of the committee shall be closed.

B. The chair of the committee shall preside at meetings and shall have a vote.

SECTION V. DETERMINATION OF RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

A. The committee members shall vote by secret ballot either for or against tenure and/or promotion with attached comments, as appropriate, supporting their decision.

B. The committee chair will then forward to the department chair all of the ballots along with a written summary of the committee’s deliberations.

C. The department chair will convene a meeting of all of the tenured faculty having rank higher than the candidate who will be informed of the committee decision. After a suitable period of discussion, the faculty will vote by secret ballot either for or against tenure and/or promotion with attached comments, as appropriate, supporting their decision.

D. The department chair will then forward the decisions of the committee and the voting faculty to the dean of the College of Science along with a written narrative outlining the relevant discussion points.
Date: December 1, 2013

To: Doug Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President

From: Dean, College of __

Subject: Promotion of Dr. John Smith, Department of __

Letters/memos should summarize the case, identify major points and report your (dean’s) recommend or do not recommend decision. This recommendation should be specific to the candidate, not a form letter. Please remember that in each stage of the process where a recommendation is made, a copy of the letter must be sent/shared with the candidate. The candidate has the right to respond in writing for the file. The candidate is allowed one week’s time to respond before the packet is sent forward to the next level of review.

Policy allows for the dean/joint administrator to incorporate the findings and recommendations of the college committee review, administrators of the college recommendation in his/her communication to the faculty member. It is important to ensure in such instances, that the candidate is aware of the process.
Date: December 1, 2013
To: Doug Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President
From: Joint administrator, Interdisciplinary administrator, CEO of ___
Subject: Promotion of Dr. John Smith, Department of ___

Letters/memos should summarize the case, identify major points and report your (joint administrator, interdisciplinary administrator, or center executive officer) recommend or do not recommend decision. This recommendation should be specific to the candidate, not a form letter. Please remember that in each stage of the process where a recommendation is made, a copy of the letter must be sent/shared with the candidate. The candidate has the right to respond in writing for the file. The candidate is allowed one week’s time to respond before the packet is sent forward to the next level of review.

Policy allows for the dean/joint administrator to incorporate the findings and recommendations of the college committee review, administrators of the college recommendation in his/her communication. It is important to ensure in such instances, that the candidate is aware of the process.
Date: December 10, 2010

To: Dean, College of __

From: Departmental Administrators of the College of __

Subject: Promotion of Dr. John Smith, Department of __

Letters/memos should summarize the case, identify major points and report the committee’s recommend or do not recommend decision (if applicable). This recommendation should be specific to the candidate, not a form letter. Please remember that in each stage of the process where a recommendation is made, a copy of the letter must be sent/shared with the candidate. The candidate has the right to respond in writing for the file.
Date: December 10, 2010

To: Dean, College of __

From: College of __ Promotion Committee

Subject: Promotion of Dr. John Smith, Department of __

Letters/memos should summarize the case, identify major points and report the committee’s recommend or do not recommend decision. This recommendation should be specific to the candidate, not a form letter. Please remember that in each stage of the process where a recommendation is made, a copy of the letter must be sent/shared with the candidate. The candidate has the right to respond in writing for the file.
Date: December 10, 2013

To: Dean, College of __

From: Chair, Department of __

Subject: Promotion of Dr. John Smith, Department of __

Letters/memos should summarize the case, identify major points and report your (department head’s/chair’s) recommend or do not recommend decision. This recommendation should be specific to the candidate, not a form letter. Please remember that in each stage of the process where a recommendation is made, a copy of the letter must be sent/shared with the candidate. The candidate has the right to respond in writing for the file. The candidate has one week’s time to respond.

The letter should also include information about candidate’s strengths and weaknesses as perceived at the unit level by both the committee and faculty eligible to vote.
Date: December 8, 2013

To: Dean and/or, Committee and/or, Chair of __

From: Dr. John Smith, Department of __

Subject: Clarification of Promotion of Dr. John Smith, Department of __

If applicable, candidate may address concerns or provide clarifications in writing for the record from any stage of the search where a recommendation is made. The candidate may respond in one week’s time.
Displays and Posters:

Powerpoint/Slide Presentations:

Courses Developed:

Non-Credit Classes, Presentations, Workshops, Seminars, Invited Lectures, etc.:

Honors and Awards:

SCHOLARSHIP ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, Recitals:

Refereed:

Books:

Book Chapters:

Journals:

Abstracts and Proceedings:

Peer Reviewed/Evaluated:

Extension Publications:

Journals:

Abstracts and Proceedings:

Research Reports:

New Curricula Developed:

Refereed/Adjudicated (in press or submitted):

Peer Reviewed (in press or submitted):

Other:

Impact Statements:

Abstracts and Proceedings:

Research Reports:

Thesis and Dissertations:

Scholarly Presentations and Other Creative Activities:

Slide Sets/Power Point:

Web pages:
Video Productions:
Displays and Posters:
Professional Meeting Papers, Workshops:

Patents:

Grants and Contracts Awarded:

Honors and Awards:

SERVICE:

Major Committee Assignments:

Professional and Scholarly Organizations:

Outreach Service:

Classes, Workshops, Seminars, Share Fairs and Tours Organized:

Miscellaneous Extension Publications:

Popular Press:

Interview Articles:

Media Presentations:

Web Pages:

Applied Research/Demonstration Trials:

Judging:

Review Activities:

Community Service:

Honors and Awards:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

Teaching:

Scholarship:

Outreach:

Administration/Management:
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE:
Annual performance evaluations by head of department and summary evaluation by dean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 2010</th>
<th>Year 2 2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2008</th>
<th>Year 4 2007</th>
<th>Year 5 2006</th>
<th>Year 6 2005</th>
<th>Year 7 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Department head |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Dean           |             |             |             |             |             |             |

Additional Notes:

Scoring key:
1=Unacceptable performance
2=Below expectations
3=Meets expectations
4=Above expectations
5=Exceptional performance

ANNUAL POSITION DESCRIPTION ALLOCATION:
Annual position description allocation of effort; the numbers are averages for fall and spring semester each year. The overall average is the average across the given years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 2010</th>
<th>Year 2 2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2008</th>
<th>Year 4 2007</th>
<th>Year 5 2006</th>
<th>Year 6 2005</th>
<th>Year 7 2004</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Total Effort   |             |             |             |             |             |             |

Additional Notes:
### ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM 1: EVALUATION OF FACULTY
(INCLUDES DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS FSH 6240)

**Confidential**

**Name:** ____________________________  
**Evaluator(s):** ____________________________

**Department(s):** ____________________________  

**NOTE:** Faculty and administrator(s) are to review and address the objectives as stated on the previous year’s position description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Description (PD) Responsibilities</th>
<th>PD %</th>
<th>Numeric Score*</th>
<th>PD% x score = total</th>
<th>COMMENTS INCLUDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS and IMPACTS WHEN APPLICABLE (Use back if necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING AND ADVISING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-1; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOLARSHIP and CREATIVE ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-2; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTREACH and EXTENSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-3, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY SERVICE &amp; LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-4 &amp; C-5, Strategic Action Plan Goal 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD%</th>
<th>Numeric Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising 50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50 x 4 = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship 35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35 x 2 = .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension 10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.10 x 3 = .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Service &amp; Leadership 5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 x 3 = .15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit Adm. Score (transfer total to box below) 3.15 = 3.2

Unit administrators and college deans may extend the weighted score one decimal place.  
**Rounding:** .5 and above round up; .4 and below round down.

(Continued on next page)
Interdisciplinary Activities: The unit administrator is responsible to solicit, discuss and consider evaluative comments from those interdisciplinary/center administrators listed in the faculty narrative attached to the position description used for this evaluation. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3320 A-1 d, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, and 3560 C, E-2d).

Unit Administrator’s Attachment: A narrative on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance is to be completed by all evaluators for all faculty using separate pages and attach to this form (if there is a disagreement, see FSH 3320 A-1 e&f). Include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service (FSH 1565 B). If the narrative(s) is/are not attached the form will be returned to the unit by the college.

Unit Administrator Signature/DATE

Unit Administrator (joint appointments if applicable)/DATE

Faculty Comments: 

Faculty Signature/DATE

Dean Signature/DATE

Dean’s Attachment: If there are any differences in any category of scoring between the department chair and college dean, a narrative shall be attached stating the reasons for these differences. The form with attachments must be returned to the faculty member for a second signature (if there is a disagreement, see FSH 3320 A-1 f). If the narrative is not attached the form will be returned to the College by the provost.

Second Faculty Signature (if applicable)/DATE

FSH 6240 Required Disclosure of Conflicts

You must complete this disclosure annually with your performance evaluation. If you have a conflict to disclose then you also will need to complete Form FSH 6240A. Likewise, if there is any change in your circumstance that may give rise to potential conflicts or eliminate potential conflicts previously disclosed, then you will need to complete Form FSH 6240A within 30 days of the change. University of Idaho FSH Policy 6240 Conflicts of Interest or Commitment is available at http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/6240.html. If you have any questions about the form or about specific potential or actual conflicts of interest, please contact your unit administrator or the Chair of the university’s Ethical Guidance and Oversight Committee. Disclose outside employment for compensation of more than 20 hours/week by completing FORM 6240 B – Disclosure of Outside Employment or Consulting for Compensation.

I have reviewed FSH 6240 and DO NOT have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts to report. Please sign and date below.

I have reviewed FSH 6240 and DO have conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts to report. Please, sign below, and fill out form FSH 6240A. Submit completed FSH 6240A to your unit administrator along with separate pages describing a plan to manage each conflict or apparent conflict.

Your signature below certifies that you have reviewed FSH 6240 regarding disclosure of conflicts, and that the information that you provide regarding disclosure of any conflict is accurate to the best of your knowledge as of the date of this document, and you commit to providing an update if a material change occurs in the information you have provided.

Faculty Signature/DATE

Unit Administrator/DATE
I. **TEACHING AND ADVISING:**

1. **Instruction** (FSH 1565 C-1 a; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1):
   
   a. Courseload:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Course Credits</th>
<th>Credit Responsibility*</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   * Percentage/or credit(s) of responsibility for a team taught course.
   **See summary table on back page.

   b. Describe additional instructional responsibilities (course redesign; introduction of new delivery methods; involvement in course, program, and university level assessment of student learning outcomes; etc.):

   c. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for teaching.

   *Est. Instruction Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____  Fall: _____  Summer: ________*

2. **Advising and/or Mentoring Students** (FSH 1565 C-1 b; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1):

   a. Advisees (#): Undergraduate (Approx): Major ___ Minor ___ Certificates ___
      Grad (Major Professor): Doctoral ___ Masters Thesis ___ Masters Non-Thesis ___
   Mentees (#): Graduate ___ Undergraduate ___

   b. Other Service to Students (organization/program advisers, masters/doctoral committees as opposed to major professor, etc.):

   b. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for advising and/or mentoring.

   *Est. Advising and/or Mentoring Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: ___  Fall: ___  Summer: ___

   **Total Teaching and Advising Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____  Fall: _____  Summer: _____**
   (carry forward to summary table)
II. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (FSH 1565 C-2; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2): [May include Teaching/Learning (FSH 1565 C-2 a), Artistic Creativity (FSH 1565 C-2 b), Discovery (FSH 1565 C-2 c), Integration (FSH C-2 d), and Scholarship of Outreach/Application/Engagement Activities (FSH 1565 C-2 e))]

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for scholarship and creative activities.

Est. Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____
(carry forward to summary table)

III. OUTREACH AND EXTENSION (FSH 1565 C-3, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3): [May include Extension (FSH 1565 C-3 b) Distance Education (FSH 1565 C-3 c) Service Learning (FSH 1565 C-3 d) Cooperative Education (FSH 1565 C-3 e) Technology Transfer (FSH 1565 C-3 f)]

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for outreach and extension.

Est. Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____
(carry forward to summary table)

IV. UNIVERSITY SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP:

1. Intramural Service (See FSH 1565 C-4 a):
   a. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for intramural service.

   Est. Intramural Service Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

2. Unit Administration (See FSH 1565 C-5):
   a. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for unit administration.

   Est. Unit Administration Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

3. Other Administration (See FSH 1565 C-4 b):
   a. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for other administration.

   Est. Other Administration Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

Total University Service & Leadership Percentage Responsibility: Spring: ___ Fall: ___ Summer: ___
(carry forward to summary table)
## Percentage of Responsibility Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Planned Percentage Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Advising</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship and Creative Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach &amp; Extension</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Service &amp; Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (All must equal 100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summer column should only be completed by faculty members who have a twelve month, fiscal year appointment. Academic year appointments (this includes all appointments less than 12 months) may attach a narrative for evaluation purposes with respect to their plans for additional activities undertaken in the summer that are outside their position description.

### Example Academic Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td>40% (x.5)</td>
<td>60% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Creative Act.</td>
<td>45% (x.5)</td>
<td>25% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td>10% (x.5)</td>
<td>10% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>5% (x.5)</td>
<td>5% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example Fiscal Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td>20% (x.375)</td>
<td>14% (x.375)</td>
<td>9% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Creative Act.</td>
<td>42% (x.375)</td>
<td>40% (x.375)</td>
<td>37% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td>23% (x.375)</td>
<td>33% (x.375)</td>
<td>44% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>15% (x.375)</td>
<td>13% (x.375)</td>
<td>10% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interdisciplinary Activities: Attach narrative.**

**If the above box is checked, the unit administrator is responsible to solicit comments from, and discuss with, the interdisciplinary/center administrators listed whether the interdisciplinary activities as stated are accurate. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, 3560 C, and E-2d, and 3320 A-1 d).

1. Faculty Member: I agree that this is a reasonable description of my responsibilities to the University of Idaho for the forthcoming calendar year.

   ___________________________________________________________
   Signature of Faculty Member/Date

2. Unit Administrator(s) (including faculty with joint appointments when appropriate): I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

   ___________________________________________________________
   Unit Administrator/Date

   ___________________________________________________________
   Unit Administrator (joint appointments if applicable)/Date

3. College Dean: I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

   ___________________________________________________________
   Signature of Dean/Date
Date: December 8, 2009
To: Doug Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President
From: Dean, College of __
Subject: 3rd Year Review of Dr. John Smith, Department of __

Include all of the following correspondence in this order as relevant to the faculty member; typically for those promoting from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

- Memo from Provost to Dean
- Memo from Dean to Provost
- Memo from Committee to Dean
- Memo from Chair/Department head to Dean
- Any communication from the faculty member at any stage of the review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Dept./College/Univ.</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Instructor's Performance</th>
<th>Course Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Anth 301</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 301</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 504</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Anth 301</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 301</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 101</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 424</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2005</td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 301</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 424</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Anth 301</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Anth 427</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 301</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's Avg.</td>
<td>Soc 427</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Instructor’s Avg.</td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td>Psyc 404</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor’s Avg.</td>
<td>DEPT. Avg.</td>
<td>CLASS Avg.</td>
<td>University Avg.</td>
<td>Bus 404.07</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR:

Dr. John Smith

(1) Reviewer Name
Department
Title
Institution

Three to five peer reviews are required and must be obtained by following procedures in FSH Section 3560 E-2b. Please briefly describe this reviewer’s relationship to the faculty member. Peer reviewers should be individuals who are independent, objective and should not have a special relationship with the candidate either in a professional role such as research collaborator, major professor, supervisor, former departmental colleague, or in any other role that may involve a conflict of interest. Reviewers should be of significant professional standing, from a comparable institution to the UI and holding senior academic rank. Additional recommendations by the Provost for this process can be found on the website.

(2) Reviewer Name
Department
Title
Institution

(3) Reviewer Name
Department
Title
Institution

(4) Reviewer Name (optional)
Department
Title
Institution

(5) Reviewer Name (optional)
Department
Title
Institution
SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWER
December 8, 2009

External Reviewer
1234 Thank you Lane
Faculty, ID 12345-1234

Dear External Reviewer:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for the University of Idaho’s process in considering Dr. John Smith for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. I recognize that completing an external review requires a considerable time commitment and I appreciate your willingness to serve in this capacity.

In your response, please confirm the nature of your acquaintance with the candidate and a review/critique of the faculty member’s scholarly activity (and other areas of professional activity), on the basis of standards in the discipline and the faculty member’s record.

Deans and chairs may also request on the basis of scholarly record, an assessment of the candidate’s recognition and standing among peers, whether their scholarship has had an impact on the discipline, whether it has earned for the candidate a national reputation, and whether the work collectively is likely to yield further significant advances in knowledge. Additionally you may request a judgment as to whether the candidate, in the quality and quantity of the scholarship produced, would be competitive for promotion/tenure at the reviewers’ institution and why. Additional information about this process should be reviewed on the Provost’s website.

The support materials to be supplied to reviewers will include the relevant context statements and department/college criteria, candidate’s vita, position descriptions for the relevant period, the professional portfolio, and up to four examples of the candidate’s scholarly work. These materials are selected by the chair after consultation with the candidate – i.e. the candidate may review the materials supplied to reviewers and suggest additions or deletions to the chair. College/department context statements and criteria for promotion and tenure are included as appropriate.

Your letter will be provided to departmental, college and university review committees and appropriate administrators; it will be held in confidence from the faculty member being reviewed during the review process. When all deliberations by the University have been completed, the essential content of peer review letters may be shared with the tenure/promotion candidate after every effort has been made to ensure the anonymity of the authors.

Thank you very much again for your time in this very important process.

Sincerely,

Dean
College of ___
Reviewer 1 Response Letter
Reviewer 4 Response Letter (optional)
PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO
Lorie Higgins
Assistant Professor
Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology, University of Idaho

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

My position as Assistant Professor of Rural Sociology in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology began in January 2002 and was initially a two-way split appointment with 60% of time allocated to Extension activities and 40% of time allocated to research. In 2006, my appointment was changed to an 80% allocation to Extension in order to accommodate increasing responsibilities and commitments to Idaho residents and Extension faculty. The delay in applying for Promotion and Tenure is due to the two years off the tenure clock, granted to me by CALS Dean John Hammel and the University, that resulted from the birth of my son in 2004, who has Down Syndrome and required multiple surgeries and therapies in the first three years of his life. My research, including my Hatch project, initially focused on community decision making, primarily related to natural resources. This focus evolved to include the theoretical and empirical implications of community conflict related to natural disasters such as wildfire. My research efforts are currently related to the impact of Extension-based community and economic development programs implemented in Idaho and economic development related to the arts and local foods. The majority of my professional life since 2002 has focused on working to build the capacities of communities and organizations throughout Idaho and providing leadership at the state, regional and national levels in the Extension community development profession.

I. POSITION CONTEXT STATEMENT


Research and Extension. The vacancy announcement for this position stated that “areas of focus include social and economic changes in Idaho’s rural communities in relation to agriculture and natural resources,” and that “responsibilities will include: (1) support of Extension faculty in rural development programming and implementation; and (2) development of applied research and extension programs to address social and community issues in rural Idaho.”

II. PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

EXTENSION. The dramatic changes experienced by Idaho’s rural communities in recent decades are often related to economic shifts, mostly away from a traditional resource-base such as logging or toward more concentrated ownership of agricultural lands. Economic and technological changes have resulted in new faces in the countryside, resulting in community conflict about issues such as recreation and forest management. In order to target my efforts at the issues most needing to be addressed in Idaho communities I developed my programs in
response to requests from constituencies and county Extension faculty. Most often, requests have come from underserved and low resource organizations, such as community service organizations.

Facilitation and Organizational Development – Building the Capacity of Extension and Communities. One issue that surfaced early on was the need for Extension faculty to increasingly arbitrate controversial issues in their communities. To help address these issues I developed training materials and conducted workshops on facilitation and conflict resolution. Building the capacity of service organizations ultimately benefits the communities they serve. Other organizations, such as economic development associations, weed management groups and Extension Districts, also needed development assistance in the form of strategic planning in order to better align missions and goals with contemporary needs in the communities they serve. In order to provide the most effective processes, I learned new techniques in strategic planning that I have since used with success to assist numerous organizations and efforts.

Leadership Development and Poverty Reduction. Since these early efforts I have also provided guidance and support to a leadership development and poverty reduction program called Horizons. The eight state program is funded by the Northwest Area Foundation and UI Extension is the delivery organization. Since the first phase in 2004 - 2005, nearly 50 communities have participated in the program. I directed Idaho’s program in the first, pilot phase, which involved five communities in north central Idaho. For the subsequent two phases I have provided both Extension and research support to Horizons, conducting trainings with community coaches, participating community groups and leading scholarship efforts among faculty involved in the program.

Water. At the same time, I have become involved with the UI Waters of the West graduate program, participating on a team of faculty and students focused on various aspects of water resource issues on the Nez Perce Reservation. I have been leading a team of graduate students in conducting a “situation assessment,” which involves interviewing the range of stakeholders in the Lapwai Creek Watershed to develop an understanding of perceptions of watershed issues and assess whether there are opportunities for cooperative action on behalf of the watershed. The report that is now being written will be disseminated broadly among various stakeholder groups. Feedback on the report and its recommendations will determine whether UI faculty will be needed to help stakeholders pursue some type of watershed planning process.

Art, Food, Heritage. My most recent major Extension effort is called Two Degrees Northwest: Where Art Meets the Land, a pilot rural development program in north central Idaho and southeastern Washington focused on building the food, wine and arts economy at a regional level. The program, which I direct, involves extensive work with communities to identify assets, help with economic development planning, and provides technical assistance for artists, such as entrepreneurship training, cooperative marketing, e-commerce and a brick-and-mortar marketplace for hands-on learning in Moscow. Central to the mission of the program is linking
more remote communities, small farmers, artisans and artists of the region to markets and resources in the urbanizing areas of the region as well as to external markets and opportunities. In the near future, a trail guide (formatted as a fold-out map) will help attract visitors who are interested in cultural, heritage and culinary tourism opportunities.

**Professional Leadership.** An important part of an Extension Specialist’s job is to provide statewide leadership in his/her area of expertise. For the past five years I have been co-leader of the Extension Community Development Topic Team. During my tenure, the membership has increased from 8 to 20, due to increasing appointments in community development among Extension Educators (county agents), but also due to increasing interest in community development among non-community development Educators. In 2006, I co-led a strategic planning effort to align our collective focus with a national community development initiative led by USDA.

**RESEARCH.** It took some time for me to figure out that in order to effectively balance an Extension/research split, I needed to develop research components of my Extension projects, which is sometimes more easily said than done. While directing the Horizons program, I was so involved in the day-to-day operations and details that to also think about the empirical and theoretical implications in a research framework was challenging. However, a graduate student in Conservation Social Sciences also worked on the project and he focused on his role as a community coach for his Ph.D. dissertation, and a co-authored article based on his dissertation has recently been published in the Journal of Community Development Society.

**Community Capitals.** After phase I of Horizons concluded, I opted not to continue in a primary leadership role in the program so that I could focus on research in the time remaining before going up for P & T. That is reflected in a greater emphasis on research in my 2008 position description. Thus, for the two subsequent phases of Horizons, I’ve been able to develop a more detailed research project that looks at the impact of the program from a community capitals framework – that is, how activities conducted as part of the program have altered levels of financial, social, political, cultural, environmental, built and human capitals in the community. The research is applied in that data collection involves a capitals mapping process with the participants of the program, where they learn about community capitals and how to think about their community in that context. They also learn how to use the mapping process to evaluate their efforts over time and to strategically plan future efforts (e.g., if they haven’t seen desired changes in a particular kind of capital, they can develop strategies for increasing that capital). Data has been collected in 18 communities so far and another mapping process will be conducted at the end of the Phase III program in the fall of 2009.

**Art, Food, Heritage.** The research component of the Two Degrees Northwest project extends emerging scholarship on rural development that indicates effective economic strategies for the most remote communities are built on the assets unique to these areas, and at a regional scale. This represents a re-emerging approach to economic development that focuses on cultivating entrepreneurs among existing residents, rather than recruiting firms from other places, diversifying an economy, rather than focusing on one industry, and on creating opportunities for more local consumption rather than only on export industries. Having networked with other similar programs in the country, I am working with economist, Phil Watson, and graduate
student, Angie Vanhoozer, to develop a model for evaluating the social and economic impact of rural arts development across the country. In the coming year, we, along with colleagues in Washington State, Missouri and North Carolina, intend to submit a research proposal for expanding the study to other sites.

**Fire.** Social theory is critical to good applied research. It not only advances scientific understanding of social phenomena, but also helps scientists understand how to help people solve problems. Since 2005, I have had the fortune of working with a rural sociologist in Washington state on a long-term project that examines the impact of wildfire events on rural communities. My role in the project has been to develop the theoretical model for understanding the social structural and interactive dynamics in communities struck by disaster. The first paper jointly published in 2005 was reported in the 2007 annual report to be one of the most cited *Society and Natural Resources* journal articles of 2005 and is regularly assigned in the social theory of natural resource management course at the University of Idaho. Our more recent work revisits the communities studied for the 2005 and 2006 articles, to examine long-term impacts to both tribal and non-tribal communities. An article based on this work is forthcoming in *Society and Natural Resources*.

**Video as a Tool for Research and Community Development.** In 2003 I received a small grant to create a participatory video about family farmers in northern Idaho. My idea was that what we know about the life and plight of the family farmer is determined by the researcher/storyteller, or in this case, the videographer. I wanted to engage in an open-ended process of documentation of the lives of family farmers. I identified three farm families willing to participate and purposely chose three very different types of operations in order to explore the range of experiences of contemporary farmers. After initial on-farm filming and interviews, I brought the three families together for a focus group discussion, which was also filmed and included in the finished product. Later, a rough cut of the video was screened by the participants to ensure their ideas were conveyed accurately. Two comments summarize their review:

“I like it because no one will feel sorry for us after watching it.”

“It needs more cows.”

In short, the end result was more a celebration of a rural lifestyle than a cataloguing of the myriad ways in which that lifestyle has changed and been threatened in recent times.
TEACHING. Although I have never had an official teaching appointment at UI, I enjoy working in a classroom environment and interacting with students, which is why for three years I taught a one-credit course on conflict management. Given my interest in community development I focused the course on community conflict and processes for making community decisions. The course was very “hands-on” and required students to observe real-world community decision-making and practice techniques for creating fair and effective group interactions. Many students had never been to a city council meeting or had assumed that Robert’s Rules of Order was the only way to manage meetings.

I have also worked with students in a number of other ways, such as serving on graduate committees, co-authoring papers, consulting on projects and speaking in graduate courses.

III. EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE

EXTENSION. It is challenging to capture the number and range of types of services I have provided in a table because the work I have done has almost always been tailored to meet the needs of a specific group or situation. I have very few “canned” workshops and presentations for this reason. I have developed numerous guides or manuals to use in my work, some of which are included in the supplemental materials to this packet, but have created them in a way that allows me to adapt them each time they are used. My ability to create colorful and engaging materials has evolved over time as have my computer design skills. Examples are included in the supplemental materials packet.

Table 1. Workshops and Facilitation; Community and Professional Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach Category</th>
<th>2002 – 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops organized</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops taught</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings facilitated</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension/University/Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops organized</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops taught</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitation Skills: Impacts on the Extension Audience

Selected Comments on Evaluations:

“I see lots of places where storyboarding can be an effective way to work with groups, generate priorities, etc.”

What is the most valuable skill or idea that you will take from this training? “How to use ground rules as a more powerful tool.”

Strategic Planning: Impacts on the Community Audience

A notable impact was in Emmett, where conflict and misunderstandings between numerous community groups, including city government, called for a series of facilitated discussions led by me, and with the assistance of staff from the Idaho Department of Commerce. The result was new collaborations, improved working relationships with the city, and monthly roundtable that has involved more than 20 organizations and has been sustained since 2004. Key to the success of the process was an impartial outside facilitator and preceding discussions with a situation assessment, which involve interviewing representatives of each group to understand sources of conflict and gather ideas for moving forward. Results of the assessment were compiled without attribution to individual respondents and framed in constructive terms in order to start the process off on a positive note. The assessment was particularly helpful in clearing up simple misunderstandings before diving into challenging community issues.

Small Business Workshop: Impacts on the Community Audience

Selected Comments on Evaluations:

Overall, what was the best part of the training? “Accessible + available educators + resource people. Chance to meet other entrepreneurs. Snacks + drinks were much appreciated.”

Did offering the training here [in your community], as opposed to Moscow or Lewiston, make a difference to your ability or willingness to attend? “Yes – Moscow or Lewiston is too far away. I have livestock to feed morning and evening. Fuel costs.”

Since launching a Main Street marketplace for locally produced goods as part of the Two Degrees Northwest program in the spring of 2009, 45 artists and artisans have a new venue for sales, an opportunity to network with other artists, participate in marketing efforts, training and services, and over $10,000 in sales means $7,000 has gone directly to artists and to the local economy in a difficult financial environment. We have been able to leverage the program’s limited funds by working with students and faculty at three universities to deliver services. For instance, a Moscow sculptor intending to become a professional artist worked with a marketing student we recruited to develop a business name, card and logo in July, 2009. In this way, we can keep our services at low to no-cost and continue to deliver services to underserved and non-traditional audiences.
Leadership Development: Impacts on Communities

The Horizons Program has been providing leadership and poverty reduction training to Idaho communities has had numerous impacts at the local and regional level. My role in Horizons has been as follows:

- Phase 1; 2004 – 2005: Co-PI (w/ P. Salant), Program Director and Leadership Trainer
- Phase 2; 2006 – 2008: Consultation with Director (M. Schmidt), coaches, communities and lead on scholarship development with coaches/educators
- Phase 3; 2008 – present: Consultation with Director (B. Petty) and coaches and lead on scholarship development with coaches/educators.

One year following the first phase of Horizons I returned to those communities to conduct focus groups with participants. These groups reported improved relationships and more productive networks in and between communities and groups. New leaders emerged too: “The study tour – Angie went and came back and gave a report and is now the president of UCCF [the Horizons group].” The program funded childcare so parents could attend training. “The Horizons babysitter – a young, single mom, is now working and engaged in community efforts.” In addition, the way communities think about and address poverty changed in numerous ways. First, communities came to understand poverty as more than a financial issue, but also as a quality of life issue that is especially relevant to youth development: “In early study circles, kids wanted to leave town. Now they are more hopeful – want to go away for an education and then come back. They have projects they are working on – a fountain. Conversations about poverty and how to address areas where people are lacking resources, relationships, and opportunities for things such as cultural enrichment, led to proactive attitudes: “We looked at our resources and realized there’s lots here.”

All of my work in underserved, rural communities has had probably the most important impact that required the least skill on my part. That is, the simple act of leaving campus and investing time and resources into people and communities helps bolster community identity. I have been told on numerous occasions that the fact that the University believed in the community enough to make those investments made people see their community in a new, more positive light. The simple act of creating opportunities for people to come together also facilitates community development. A woman who attended a series of non-profit workshops I organized during phase 1 of Horizons came up to me at an event a year or so later and thanked me for the workshops and said how much they impacted her work in youth development. I asked what it was about the workshops that was so helpful and she said it was the opportunity to meet other people from her community who are interested in similar issues. She was able to gain enough support and made the right contacts to get her program up and running. Participants in our spring, 2008 business trainings said the same thing – knowing that there were so many other people in their community wanting to start businesses bolstered their confidence to move forward with their plans. Moreover, they felt the workshops helped establish a local support network of entrepreneurs.

Grants and Contracts for Extension Work
It is challenging to accurately quantify the dollars acquired, leveraged and spent in support of the outreach and extension activities reported here. More often than not, rather than securing an actual grant or contract, expenses associated with a project were paid by a client or students were paid from grant dollars for interdisciplinary or other programs. For example, small business workshops implemented in northern Idaho in 2008 were partly funded by Horizons, Phase II, grant dollars. This was not my grant, but the funding was leveraged as a partnership to provide needed training in Horizons communities, while incorporating art and small food business training needed by clients of the Two Degrees Northwest Program. Nevertheless, total actual grant funding for my extension programs since 2002 totals close to half a million dollars.

Table 2. Grants for Extension Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants for Extension Programs since 2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Higgins portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizons, Phase I</td>
<td>$439,000</td>
<td>$216,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>$ 35,690</td>
<td>$ 29,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$474,000</td>
<td>$248,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publications and Presentations related to Extension Programs. As noted before, much of the written work I produce for Extension programming is not formally published because I prefer to adapt my materials for each group with which I work. For example, my facilitation skills manual exists in at least four different versions. Similarly, some of the applied research work results in lengthy reports created for and distributed to a select audience. This is the case with the situation and needs assessments that I have produced, a number of which are based on intensive face-to-face and telephone interviews. Formal publications directly related to my Extension programs includes one refereed publication, a peer reviewed publication, a 30 minute video documentary and two Impact Statements.

RESEARCH. My most fruitful research endeavors to date have been those that provide me with opportunities to develop theories that explain what we observe in the social world. As a graduate student I developed the theoretical concept of "ceremonial equity," which refers to public programs that give the appearance of creating equity among economic classes in society, but that in reality are appropriated in a piecemeal fashion over a period of time. More recently, my work with colleagues on community conflict in the aftermath of wildfire resulted in a better understanding of the roles of external forces, such as federal firefighting systems, and local community capacity in community conflict. I have co-authored another article on this topic, which is forthcoming in Society and Natural Resources. In all cases, my primary role has been to develop the theoretical analysis for each article. Some representative comments by reviewers about the theoretical elements of the work include:

The theoretical structure you establish for the paper is excellent, and welcome in a field where most researchers have been forced into "social science lite," writing at a level
everyone can understand – and one at which there is absolutely not hope of conveying the complexities and ambiguities of human social behavior. The theory you employ has the great advantage of being transparent enough that even those having their first exposure to communicative rationality can take something useful from the paper.

The subject is well within the areas of interest of large numbers of SNR readers. Many will find the results useful as a contribution to emerging theory on human social response to disturbance. I hope we will soon be able to organize our knowledge in this area and communicate it to line officers in resource management agencies and fire managers.

The 2005 publication I co-authored in Society and Natural Resources is one of the most cited articles from that year and is being regularly assigned in social theory courses related to natural resources. The impact factor of SNR in 2005 was 1.339 and ranked among other journals as follows:

Environmental Studies: 10/51
Planning & Development: 4/38
Sociology: 13/94

Other current work is focused in two directions: understanding the dynamics of change in communities engaging in community development programs and understanding the role and impact of “place-based,” entrepreneurial businesses and cooperative marketing in regional economic development. Both efforts are currently in the data collection phase. Next year I will collaborate with colleagues across the nation to submit a USDA AFRI proposal to evaluate place-based rural development efforts nationally (the 2010 cycle has a rural development emphasis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Grant Funding since 2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Higgins Portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2010. Art and Economic Development (Western Rural Development Center)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2007. Local Food Systems (Bureau of Public Affairs)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2004. Public Involvement in Water Quality Programs in Idaho and Montana (University of Idaho Seed Grant)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003. Participatory video project with family farmers (Western Rural Development Center)</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the near future, I anticipate numerous publications in partnership with Extension faculty who have been working on the Horizons project in Phases 2 and 3. I am currently working on a manuscript with phase 2 faculty about how the coaching role impacts their traditional roles as educators and anticipate submission in early 2010. I also anticipate preparing two additional
manuscripts in the coming year that focus on the community capitals framework as a tool for research and evaluation of community development programs. Phase 2 communities prepared capitals maps at the end of their program, but Phase 3 communities created baseline maps early in their program and will map program impacts in the spring of 2010.

The spider graph illustrates the result of capitals mapping – in this case, the impact of the Horizons program in a Phase 2 community. The method allows comparison across communities and programs and can reveal whether a program is having its intended impact or not. In the case of Phase 2 programs Horizons had a great deal of impact on social and human capital – building relationships and skills, but less immediate impact on financial capital. Introduction of the concept of community capitals and mapping impacts benefitted communities in that they were able to “see” how much had been accomplished and many participants observed that even though financial capital goals had not yet been met, they felt they now had the foundation and capacity to bring about additional changes. The purpose of mapping desired future changes (outer circle – lighter text) is to provide a way for communities to continue to use the mapping process to set goals, measure success and link past and current achievements with a desired future.

TEACHING. Though I have not had a formal teaching appointment, I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to teach in the classroom during my tenure at the University of Idaho. My one credit, community conflict management course was well received by students. They seemed to particularly like the format of the course, which involved a great deal of learning by doing.
They had numerous opportunities to role-play and practice techniques for effective group process and discuss their experiences with real-world decision-making processes. The following are comments from student evaluations about in-class exercises and discussions:

“Great! These made class fun.”

“Good discussion, the group was able to contribute all of their ideas, and reach conclusions.”


“This was very beneficial. I learned the most from this part of class.”

Students even seemed to enjoy the writing assignments:

“The writings were good because they helped us reflect on what we had learned.”

“Good opportunity to explore some of the topics.”

“The writing assignments helped me understand the readings better.”

Due to Extension and research commitments I’ve had to give up my own classes for the time being but continue to work closely with students in the Waters of the West program where I can provide them with a critical set of community engagement skills they need to effectively work with communities as natural resource management professionals. I also continue to work with college students outside the classroom and UI. Marketing students from LCSC, art students from WSU, and design and public relations students from UI are currently working on a range of projects in the Two Degrees Northwest program.