INITIATING THE PROCESS

• The faculty member has shared responsibility with the department chair to track the promotion and/or tenure timeline which is identified in the letter of offer. Years of credit, if any, will also be indicated.

• Department and college administrative support personnel have access to run a report (NWRSRDT) that indicates the year a faculty member is to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. We recommend that the dean’s assistant run the report 3 times per academic year.

• When going from Assistant to Associate Professor, the 3rd year review packet is a foundation for building the promotion and/or tenure packet.
### TIMELINE OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb/March</td>
<td>Faculty member begins to prepare materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Faculty member and dept. chair work to put together the external peer reviewer packet. Dept. chair sends request to reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Unit level processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>College level processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Finalization of packets and submission to the Provost’s Office&lt;br&gt;<strong>DUE: November 17, 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Final review of packets and access granted to University-level promotions committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>University-level promotions committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Final decisions and recommendations relayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWER PACKET ITEMS

By April 1 (recommended timeline):

- The following items are provided to external peer reviewers:
  - Faculty member’s CV
  - Faculty member’s portfolio
  - Faculty member’s sample scholarly work (up to 4 samples)
  - Faculty member’s position descriptions for the period under review
  - Department/college context statements
  - Department/college criteria for promotion and tenure

Review the guideline for external peer review found at [http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/policy-guidelines/tenure](http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/policy-guidelines/tenure)
FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

- Update/finalize University of Idaho Standard or Extension Educator CV Template
- Finalize professional portfolio
- Select up to 4 examples of scholarly work
- Develop a list of at least 5 potential external reviewers with rank higher than yours and if seeking tenure, reviewers must already be tenured.

All of the faculty member’s suggested reviewers are included in the full set of external peer reviewers.
DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITY

• The dept. chair ALSO develops a list of at least 5 potential external reviewers. External reviewers can be derived with input from the faculty member, other faculty in the discipline, dept. chair, and college dean. The full set of external peer reviewers includes both the faculty member’s suggestions and the department chair’s suggestions.

• According to unit and/or college by-laws, select at least 2-3 external peer reviewers from the faculty member’s list and at least 2-3 other reviewers identified from the full set of reviewers. **A total of between 3-5 reviews are required in the packet.**

• Assemble the faculty member’s position descriptions for all years of the review period, department/college criteria, and the relevant context statements.
## THE UNIVERSITY PACKET ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Included in the Packet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3560 and/or 3520 form(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/department bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Evals &amp; PDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked items above were prepared for the external reviewer packet or created from external peer review response.
FINALIZING THE UNIVERSITY PACKET

• Dept. admins and/or dept. chairs should work collaboratively with the faculty member to ensure that the components of the packet are accurate and correct.

• External peer reviews are confidential and will be kept anonymous (except from University reviewers) – these **should not be** placed in the university promotion packet until the faculty member approves the packet.

• Upon the faculty member’s approval of the university promotion packet, the faculty member should sign the 3560 and/or 3520 form to initiate the review process.

• Now enter the external review information (summary and review letters) in to the packet.
### RECOMMENDED TIMELINE AT THE UNIT LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks at the unit level</th>
<th>Due by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member has approved the packet, signed 3560 and/or 3520 forms, and dept. admin/chair has entered the external peer review information into the packet</td>
<td>Aug. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. admin makes packets available for unit level review. (Note, packets are placed on a secure S drive folder not accessible by the candidate.)</td>
<td>Sept. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty vote completed</td>
<td>Sept. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit committee has met and made judgement/recommendation</td>
<td>Sept. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair has written letter</td>
<td>Sept. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No committee member names and no identification of external reviewers disclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair provides faculty member with the unit level correspondence which includes a summary of strengths and weaknesses and the votes/recommendations by all reviewing groups at this level. Faculty member has one week to provide factual corrections/clarifications</td>
<td>Sept. 27 thru Oct. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. admin incorporates correspondence materials into the packet. The packet is forwarded for college level review. Dept. discloses the unit committee membership.</td>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT LEVEL COMMITTEE MAKE-UP

Refer to department and/or college by-laws for promotion and/or tenure committee make-up. FSH 3520 requires the make-up of the tenure committee to consist of:

- One or more tenured faculty members
- One or more non-tenured faculty members
- One or more persons from outside the unit
- And, in cases involving the evaluation or review of members of the instructional faculty, the inclusion of students shall be determined by the unit’s by-laws
- In cases involving the evaluation of individuals involved significantly in interdisciplinary activities, one or more members of the appropriate interdisciplinary program faculty shall be included
## RECOMMENDED TIMELINE AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks at the college level</th>
<th>Due by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s asst. reviews packet from the unit to ensure all votes and summaries are accurate</td>
<td>Oct. 6 thru Oct. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the packet is complete. Make packet available for college level review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College committee has met and made recommendation</td>
<td>Oct. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College executive leadership has met and made recommendations, if applicable</td>
<td>Oct. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean has written letter No committee member names and no identification of external reviewers disclosed</td>
<td>Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean provides faculty member with the college level correspondence which includes a</td>
<td>Nov. 3 thru Nov. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary of strengths and weaknesses and the votes/recommendations by all reviewing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups at this level. Faculty member has one week to provide factual corrections/clarifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s asst. incorporates correspondence materials into the packet and the promotion</td>
<td>Nov. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary workbook form. The packet is forwarded to the provost office. College discloses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the college committee membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PACKET PREPARATION
Cover Page

Promotion To:

PROFESSOR

Sally Smith
2016-17

Location: Boise

Tenured

Templates for the cover page are located on the Provost website. Page must indicate the following:

- Rank type (clinical, research, etc.)
- Promotion to: Sr. Instructor, Assoc. Professor or Professor
- Candidate’s full name and year of review
  - Job location
  - With tenure consideration, tenured, non-tenure track, etc.

Following the faculty life cycle: Assistant to Associate builds on the 3rd yr. review packet. Moving from Associate to Full, build a new packet with information since the last review.
Balot to be used by unit faculty for recommendation on promotion in rank

Each reviewing individual enters his/her evaluation and recommendation below. Reviewing faculty members must have a rank higher than the candidate. If there are any considerations that support these recommendations other than those contained in the records presented to the reviewers, a brief statement of those considerations should be appended.

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

_____ exceptional
_____ above expectations
_____ meets expectations
_____ below expectations
_____ unacceptable

I _____ recommend promotion
_____ do not recommend promotion

___________________________  __________________________ __________ ________________________
(Signature)  (Rank)  (Unit)

The 3560 form offers a sample ballot for your faculty vote. This is for your faculty vote only, not your unit promotions committee. Faculty must respond to BOTH statements. An incomplete ballot must be redone.
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 Signature Unit Administrator Signature

Copies of the documents referenced in E-2 a. 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.

Faculty located at the Centers must have the signature from the Center unit administrators.

______________________________
Unit Administrator Signature

______________________________
Unit Administrator Signature, (Faculty with joint appointments)

______________________________
Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate)

______________________________
Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate)
3560 Form Cont.

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

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

_________________________________________________

Unit Committee Chair Signature (or N/A if no committee)

All review committees shall be formed consistent with unit by-laws and must include tenure-track faculty. If the unit’s by-laws do not address review committee makeup, the structure of the tenure committee as described in FSH 3510 G-5 d. shall be used. (FSH 3560 E-2 c.) This is where the department committee recommendations are recorded, not the faculty vote. The dept. bylaws may prescribe a ballot form to be used by the committee or one should be created for committee use that addresses these responses.
There are ____ faculty members in the unit having a rank higher than that of the candidate, and ____ of these faculty have submitted evaluations of the candidate and recommendations on the proposed promotion. Of these evaluations, ____ evaluated the candidate’s performance of assigned duties to be exceptional, ____ above expectations, ____ meets expectations, ____ below expectations, and ____ unacceptable.

Moreover, ____ faculty members recommended promotion and ____ recommended against it.

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

The policy states only faculty who have a rank higher than the candidate’s current rank can vote on faculty promotion.
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.

__________________________________________________
College Committee Chair Signature

The unit administrators of this college ___ did or ___ 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.

__________________________________________________
Dean Signature

In each college there is a standing committee on tenure and promotion. The members serve for terms of not less than three years on a staggered basis. The membership of the committee and the method of selection are prescribed in the by-laws of the college. FSH 3560 F-2
A meeting of the unit administrators of the college is not required however, highly recommended.
If that committee is requested by the dean the votes must be tallied.
VERIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE

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

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

Candidate has completed ____ full years of probationary service at UI (not more than two years in rank of instructor at UI may be counted) by:

- serving ____ full years in the rank of ____________________ from ______________ to ______________, and
- serving ____ full years in the rank of ____________________ from ______________ to ______________, and
- serving ____ full years in the rank of ____________________ from ______________ to ______________;

and by being credited with not more than four years of equivalent service:

- for ____ full years in the rank of ________________________ at ______________________________, and
- for ____ full years in the rank of ________________________ at ______________________________.
REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Concurring with the foregoing statements and having reviewed the documents referenced in G-5-c, we concur in their completeness and accuracy. Other documentary material deemed to be pertinent has been appended to the curriculum vitae.

Copies of the documents referenced in G-5-c were made available to the persons or groups called upon to participate in the evaluation of the candidate and to make recommendations on the awarding of tenure.

________________________________________ _______________________ __________________________
Candidate Signature Unit Administrator Signature

Faculty located at the Centers must have the signature from the Center unit administrators.

_________________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature (for faculty w/joint appointment)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate)
Each reviewing person or group enters its recommendation below. If there are any considerations that support these recommendations other than those contained in the records presented to the reviewers, a brief statement of those considerations shall be appended.

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

______________________________
Unit Committee Chair Signature (or N/A if no committee)

Your numbers for this section must match the number of committee members in your tenure committee. Unit tenure committee make-up is directed by the unit by-laws or FSH 3520 G-5 d.
There are ____ tenured faculty members in the unit of the candidate, and ____ of these faculty submitted a recommendation on the award of tenure. There were ____ votes in favor of and ____ votes against recommending that tenure be awarded.

_______________________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature or person responsible for faculty vote

I ____ do ____ do not recommend that tenure be awarded.

_________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature

The 3520 does not come with a sample ballot. You will need to create your own or use the one described in your by-laws for your committee and faculty votes.
The college committee on tenure ____ does ____ does not recommend that tenure be awarded.

________________________________________
College Committee Chair Signature

In each college there is a standing committee on tenure and promotion. The members serve for
terms of not less than three years on a staggered basis. The membership of the committee and
the method of selection are prescribed in the by-laws of the college. FSH 3560 F-2
There is no formal account if the dean chooses to consult with the unit administrators of the
college for tenure.
ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendation letters/memos should summarize the case at the unit level and again at the college level; identify major points of strength and weakness, and report the administrator’s personal recommendation-- I recommend promotion or I do not recommend promotion.

- Information about the strengths and weaknesses as perceived at the unit level by both the unit committee and faculty eligible to vote and the votes/recommendations (college level committees also) must be provided to the faculty member.

- Do not disclose committee names or identifying information about external reviewers in the correspondence – only characteristics of committee make-up or external reviewer findings.
FACULTY MEMBER CLARIFICATION

• Faculty statements are to provide clarification on the unit committee, faculty, and department chair and dean and college level committee findings if there is a misrepresentation and need for factual correction/clarification.

• Faculty have one week to review the documents from the unit level and one week to review the documents from the college level to provide a statement of clarification.

• If there is no candidate statement, put a page in the packet that says “No Candidate Statement”.

University of Idaho
ANNUAL EVALUATIONS & POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

• The summary template for the packet can be found on the Provost’s website. If it is necessary to adjust the categories to accurately reflect the rating or work/effort, it is OK to change the template.

• The dept. admin or dean’s office will be able to obtain annual evaluations and position descriptions.

• In each section, separate the years with sub-bookmarks from newest to oldest.

• There will always be one extra year for position descriptions (2017 PD; 2016 Eval). If there are missing years for either evals or PDs, such as the first semester of employment, make a note.
## TEACHING EVALUATION SUMMARY

**SUMMARY OF TEACHING, INSTRUCTION AND/OR PRESENTATION EVALUATIONS FOR**

Dr. John Smith, Department of ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of courses</th>
<th>Semester/ Date</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Overall Instructor</th>
<th>Overall Course</th>
<th>Overall Instructor</th>
<th>Overall Course</th>
<th>Overall Instructor</th>
<th>Overall Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact for obtaining this information:

**Wes McClintick**
Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation (IEA)
208-885-7994
mcclintick@uidaho.edu
http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/iea

The student teaching evaluation report is obtained from IEA. This template may be relevant for use by Extension Faculty.
3rd YEAR REVIEW

Only include the correspondence from the 3rd year review process:

- Provost Letter
- Dean Letter
- Chair Letter
- Committee Letter

If already tenured, this section is not applicable.
COMMON CONCERNS & QUESTIONS

1. **Faculty Vote:** for promotion, faculty with a rank equal to or higher than the rank the candidate is seeking are allowed a vote. For tenure, only tenured faculty of the unit are allowed a vote. Ballots must be kept confidential and collected by the Dept. Admin. Ballots must distinguish between votes for promotion and votes for tenure. Sealed ballots travel with the promotion packet throughout the review and are submitted to the Provost’s Office for retention until the process is entirely completed.

2. **Promotion Unit Committee:** unit by-laws should prescribe the make-up of the committee. If the by-laws do not provide the committee make-up, the tenure committee make-up in FSH 3520 is used.

3. **Lack of Unit Committee Members:** When there are not enough faculty with higher ranks or tenure to fulfill the committee make-up, contact the Vice Provost for Faculty Office.
COMMON CONCERNS & QUESTIONS

4. **FSH and By-laws have different procedures:** Often a unit or college by-laws have procedures that are in conflict with the FSH. If the by-laws go into more detail and are not in direct conflict, units and colleges should follow their by-laws. If there is a specific and direct conflict between the by-laws and FSH, contact the Vice Provost for Faculty Office.

5. **Disclosure of Information:**
   * **Committees:** committee membership should not be disclosed until recommendations are forwarded to the next level.
   * **External Reviewers:** external reviewers are to remain anonymous and their identity is never disclosed. Do not put information that may identify external reviewers in any recommendation letters. Their identity must be held in confidence by all reviewing parties.

6. **External Reviewer Relationships:** select reviewers based on their familiarity with the discipline of the candidate and standards for the professional and scholarly activity in the discipline, not based on a personal or collaborative relationship with the candidate. Reviewers must have the rank or higher than the rank the candidate is seeking and must be tenured.
COMMON CONCERNS & QUESTIONS

7. An external reviewer says they cannot evaluate the faculty member without having access to the annual performance evaluations. Can we send them? – NO

8. Do I need to include all department/college by-laws in the packet or can I just include the P&T section? – Only the P&T sections and the department and college context statements are required.

9. Are faculty allowed to include articles and other publications, and narrative student evaluation information in the university promotion packet? – At the unit level faculty can provide this kind of supplemental information. This is removed prior to coming to the university level.

10. How long is the professional portfolio? – 12 pages

11. I inserted my teaching evaluations into my portfolio, do I need to have a separate summary? – YES. It is recommended that information in the packet not be duplicated. Teaching Evaluation Summaries are a required component of the promotion packet.
CONCLUSION & FINAL QUESTIONS

The Provost and Executive Vice President’s website for promotion and tenure provides detailed information and links to resources for conducting the process

http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/policy-guidelines/tenure

Questions for us:

Mary Stout
Joana Espinoza