I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   • Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 11 (November 5, 2019) Attach. #1

III. Consent Agenda

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Committee Reports

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   • FSH 3500 proposal from Faculty Affairs Committee Attach. #2
     Alexandra Teague (Faculty Affairs Committee Chair)
     Torrey Lawrence (Vice Provost for Faculty)
   • UI Solar Initiative
     Jeannie Matheison (Director, Sustainability Center) Attach #3

VIII. Special Orders

IX. New Business

X. Adjournment

Attachments:
   • Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 11 (November 5, 2019)
   • Attach. #2 FSH 3500 Proposal from Faculty Affairs Committee
   • Attach. #3 UI Solar Initiative
University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval

Meeting # 11

Tuesday, November 5th, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bacon, Bridges, Caplan, Chapman, Chopin, Cosens, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice- Chair), Lee-Painter, Luckhart, Paul, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, R. Smith, Tibbals, Wiencek (w/o vote). Amin Mirkouei (Proxy for Michael McKellar).

Present via Zoom: Kern, Tenuto, Sears.

Absent: Lockhart, McKellar.

Guests: 16.

Speakers/Discussion Leaders: Scott Green (President of the University of Idaho)
                            John Wiencek (Provost and Executive Vice-President)
                            Terry Grieb (Faculty Senate, Chair)
                            Chad Neilson (Staff Council, Chair)

I. Call to Order: Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:31 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote): There was a motion to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 10 (October 22, 2019) (Dezzani/Tibbals). The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda: There was none.

IV. Chair’s Report
   • Nominations for University Level Promotion Committee are due Friday, Nov. 8th. Please see email from last week and earlier today. Contact Mary Stout for more information and for submitting requests.
   • The ISUB and TLC remain closed until further notice due to flooding in the basement. Updates on re-opening and rescheduling are available at the ISUB updates website.
   • The budget open forum is scheduled for 3pm Thursday, Nov. 7th in the International Ballroom of the Pitman Center. Note the new location due to temporary closure of the ISUB.

Chair Grieb asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

V. Provost’s Report: Unless there are specific questions for him, Provost Wiencek said he will not make a report, in consideration of the fact that President Green has another engagement at 4:30pm.
VI. **Committee Reports:** There were none.

VII. **Other Announcements and Communications:** Budget and Financial Planning.

Scott Green (President of the University of Idaho), John Wiencek (Provost and Executive Vice-President), Terry Grieb (Faculty Senate, Chair), and Chad Neilson (Staff Council, Chair).

Chair Grieb welcomed the President. In turn, President Green thanked the Senate for the invitation. He also acknowledged the support received for the organization of Leadership Weekend. The Envision event was a success thanks to the help of many. Alumni visited from all over the country. President Green thanked Sodexo for their services.

President Green referred to the memo that was sent out campus-wide last week, October 30, 2019. He reminded everyone of the open forum on Thursday, November 7, 2019. He proceeded to say that there is not much specific to report yet, other than the process that’s being set up. This is the beginning of a broader conversation. There will be frequent communication, more memos, and more open forums. The President said he welcomes any opportunity to communicate with the Senators and their constituencies. After the memo went out, considerable feedback was received, also from students, who were concerned about the potential closure of programs. To put their minds at ease, the President’s Office called the Argonaut and responded very quickly to the students’ concerns. He continues to be open to questions and comments.

A Senator asked the President to clarify the best way to provide input into the process. Should one provide, for instance, written comments to the various committees? President Green referred to the Budget Update Talking Points from October 29, 2019. He emphasized that we need to be institutionally mindful, as a whole. Chair Grieb displayed the flow chart contained in the presentation attached to the meeting binder and started to explain the role of the various committees. During the past couple of weeks, the President, Provost, Faculty Senate Leadership, and Staff Council have been talking about developing “structures” to help with the decision-making process as we move forward. The Policy Review Committee will focus on the policy part including FSH, APM, and any SBOE-mandated policies. This group will work with the Policy Coordinator to ensure compliance from the start. The Tools Ranking Taskforce will review the (8) strategies listed in the President’s memo as well as identify additional tools to be used in the reallocation process. Those tools will be placed in “bins”, ranked from “desirable” to “least desirable”. This group will consist of 3 senators and 3 staff members from the Moscow campus, 1 senator from outside Moscow and 1 staff member from outside Moscow. The Tools Ranking Taskforce and the Policy Review Committee (the two “ovals” on top of the flow chart), are charged by Senate and will work during the Fall Semester. The Faculty Senate and Ul Leadership will act as “check-in” points. The two components on the lower part of the flow chart, next to the two-way arrows and question marks, are the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group (SFMWG) and the Administration components of the process. The SFMWG will meet again next week and will deliver their final work in January. As this semester’s work wraps up, the administrative work will proceed in the Spring. The academic and non-academic components of the Program Prioritization Committee will be charged by and will report to IPEC.

A Senator suggested that one Dean should be included in the Taskforce. There was positive feedback concerning this suggestion, since Deans are already engaged in similar “binning” processes. Different efforts should be coordinated as much as possible.
Another Senator inquired about the timeframe for the Tools Ranking Taskforce. Looking at the items in the Budget Update Talking Points, she noticed some overlap among those strategies. She wondered whether more information will be provided to better define those items, which are certainly very important categories for the “bins”. Provost Wiencek replied that we are in a fluid situation and we still need to figure out all the details of a path forward.

A Senator asked the meaning of IPEC. Chair Grieb responded that it stands for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC). Provost Wiencek clarified that IPEC is essentially a Program Prioritization Committee.

A Senator inquired about the origin of the cost-reducing strategies currently listed. President Green replied that they originate partially from the Cabinet. He added that he will be happy to extend the list and consider additional strategies. Suggestions are welcome.

A Senator remarked that we need more information to make intelligent choices. President Green concurred. The estimated shortfall is $22 million, including $14 million in budget reductions which are already in progress and $8 million in anticipated additional cuts. When more information is available about where the cuts are going to be, that information will be passed on to the Deans who will then be expected to take appropriate actions.

Provost Wiencek added that a complete plan is not going to be revealed all at once. Information will come in smaller chunks. There will be some kind of final announcement, but first one needs to know, for instance, how many people may leave voluntarily.

Another Senator brought up the issue of the “right size” of the Administration as was discussed earlier in the Senate. It would help the morale if talks of streamlining the Administration, for instance, VPs, were also on the table. President Green replied that they will be looking at all options. However, there are some things he will not consider, such as, for instance, combining colleges in order to save deans’ salaries.

The conversation moved again to the Policy Review Group. It was clarified that the available tools would be different under the policy of financial exigency. The President reiterated that the financial exigency is currently not on the table.

The focus shifted to the timeline for the process. A Senator wondered whether we are rushing into decisions which will impact the institution for a long time. He asked whether we will continue talking while we make progress. President Green cited as an example the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group. They will complete their task by January, but their recommendations will not have a major impact until 2021. Early retirements will also happen over a period of time. Our cash reserves are low, and we must act now. A big unknown is that the Governor can ask to hold money back. This is something that the President cannot control. If we wait too long, we may get ourselves “deeper into the hole”.

A Senator asked about whether the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group (SFMWG) reports to the President or to Senate (like the Fiscal Emergency Committee did formerly). Chair Grieb went back to the flow chart and pointed that the first two committees are charged by the Senate whereas IPEC is charged by the Administration. The SFMWG also reports to the President.
President Green reiterated that everything from the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group will be transparent. Representatives from this group will come and speak to the Senate.

In conjunction with the Fiscal Emergency Committee, a Senator mentioned the Financial Exigency Policy and Staff-Reduction Procedures in FSH 3970. Another Senator argued that FSH 3970 is not related to the functions of a Fiscal Emergency Committee. In his understanding, the SFMWG is a strategic body, involved with the revenue generating part of the institution.

Chair Grieb said that IPEC needs to identify metrics to reallocate resources. The Sustainable Financial Model Group is in charge of a long-term model, namely how we will operate year to year forward. To come up with a clear set of rules that everybody understands and follows, and which colleges and units will keep over time. President Green added that Program Prioritization is SBOE-mandated. We need to refresh the process, but our accreditors require that we go through it. Therefore, we do need a Program Prioritization process to guide the closure of programs.

A Senator inquired about the best channel to provide ideas and feedback. It was replied that any feedback should be forwarded to the Provost, Senate Chair Grieb, or Staff Council Chair Neilson.

The discussion moved to IPEC and whether it will work differently than in the past. President Green welcome the idea of more faculty on the committee but did not think that too large a committee would be helpful. Provost Wiencek mentioned that he is committed to work closely with Faculty Senate Leadership and Staff Council. There will be strong representation of faculty and staff. Deans will be included as well. Previously there were 8 faculty and 4 staff members on the committee. The non-academic part included Centrally Provided Services, Students and Faculty Support Services, Research Centers and Institutes. The academic sector will be addressed first, in anticipation of program closures.

A Senator expressed concerns about timelines for decisions not to grant tenure or to let faculty go, which can place them in a very difficult position. Provost Wiencek replied that there are some protection mechanisms for second-year faculty. If they do not get a notice by July 15, they will have another year. He noted that there is no desire to lay off faculty on short-notice. University General Counsel Kent Nelson pointed out that, if a program is closed, tenured faculty can also be let go.

A Senator pointed out that we are now being judged according to a new standard. This makes it difficult to plan in a stable way. President Green said that is precisely the goal of the SFMWG, namely, to develop a reliable and stable model for the future.

A Senator asked about the impact on the plan to have U of I move to an R1-level university. President Green replied that we cannot execute an R1 strategy at the moment. However, they are looking into strategic investments towards financial stability of our resources. Chair Grieb recalled that Janet Nelson wishes to come to Senate soon and talk about R1 strategies.

Chair Grieb invited Staff Council Chair Chad Neilson to speak. Neilson said he is pleased with how things are going so far. He thinks that good communication and good shared-governance work are going on. Although there is anxiety among people, he is hopeful.
Chair Grieb went back to the “committee flow-chart” to clarify the meaning of the question marks at the bottom of the chart: they refer to what IPEC and SFMWG will be doing, and how the various “pieces of the puzzle” need to come together and fit into one holistic piece. The question mark on the right refers to communication between Senate and Administration.

Provost Wiencek emphasized that we are on this journey together. It will be necessary to hand-in some non-renewals in January/February to move forward. There will be a shared discussion, although not in a public setting. There will be a series of iterations. Voluntary separations and early retirements will be “at the top”. Next, the process will have to get more specific, with more local conversations. During the process, we will need to ensure that our students continue to be served well. It is important to realize that all policies which are being considered apply to both faculty and staff in a holistic way.

Making reference to the recent memo of October 31, 2019, from VP Brian Foisy about outsourcing, the Provost noted that, while outsourcing may be a strategy for some non-academic areas, they would not consider outsourcing academics. Addressing a question by Chair Grieb about SBOE potentially requiring centralization of some processes, the Provost said that all presidents of the Idaho higher ed institutions have a unified front and that they do not see a benefit to the proposed centralization. He also commented that communications from the presidents group is helping maintain a positive and collaborative relation with SBOE.

The Provost said that an opportunity to streamline may exist if the ratio of reports to supervisors (namely, how many people report to a supervisor) increased. In business, a value of 10 to 1 is standard. In higher education, it is more like 3 or 4 to 1. This raises the question of, possibly, too many middle-level managers in administration and reconnects with an earlier comment by a Senator about reducing the size of the administration as a possible cost-saving strategy.

The issue of UI moving to R1 level was raised again by a Senator, in the context of how Scott Green (and others, such as Deans, the College of Graduate Studies, and the Library) had felt strongly about it. Another Senator pointed out that R1 and undergraduate research are not separated. 60% of our undergraduate students are involved in research, and the research we do is important to the state. At this time, we need to worry about tuition revenues. That is something we have some control on. As Janet Nelson will explain, there is more than one path to R1.

The discussion moved to the issue of Athletics. It does not make money, in fact we put money into it. On the other hand, many students would not come here if it wasn’t for athletic scholarships. Athletics is an important part of our campus life, and it is important for our Alumni, but it does not generate money.

Chair Grieb moved to the next item on the agenda.

VIII. Special Orders: There were none.

IX. New Business: Committee on Committees Appointment Survey.
Barbara Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair Faculty Senate & Chair of Committee on Committees)
The Committee on Committees Appointment Survey went live on Monday (November 4, 2019). There were some changes made in the survey that are self-explanatory. Vice-Chair Kirchmeier reminded everyone that, when faculty fill up and return the survey, they are making a commitment to serve on a committee. The appointments will be announced at the end of the Spring semester.

A Senator asked whether it is possible to sign up a second time for a particular committee. Vice-Chair Kirchmeier responded that FSH 1640 does not prohibit it.

X. **Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn (A. Smith/ DeAngelis) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca  
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 8, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Torrey Lawrence, Vice Provost for Faculty
       Diane Whitney, University Policy and Compliance Coordinator

RE: New Promotion & Tenure Policy

As we have already discussed, our current procedure for evaluating promotion and tenure (P&T) applications is a complex web of separate policies that are overlapping, inconsistent, and incomplete. They contradict other UI policies as well as unit/college bylaws. This complexity makes it difficult to understand and even more challenging to follow properly.

There have been further revisions to the policy since our discussion at the October 14 faculty senate meetings. Significant changes are “tracked” on the versions presented below.

Changes were based on feedback from faculty senate, FAC, and university counsel. We also gathered feedback from faculty at large by sending a link to the new policy to all university faculty on Friday, October 18. That webpage was viewed by 913 people in seven days. Feedback was collected through an online survey October 18-25.

The attached policy changes were approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) on Tuesday, October 5, 2019. Due to the significance and complexity of these changes we have attached the following documents to assist in your evaluation.

- New policy FSH 3500
- New policy FSH 3510
- Deleted policy FSH 3520
- Revised policy FSH 3530
- Deleted policy FSH 3560
- Deleted policy FSH 3570
- New/old policy map
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
- Feedback received from the online survey

We look forward to discussing the proposed policy with you.
Proposed Policy Changes Regarding Promotion & Tenure  
(v.18 – Approved by FAC on 11/5/19)

Notes:

1. Three existing sections of FSH chapter 3.5 will be deleted from policy. They are FSH 3520, 3560, 3570, and associated forms.

2. To avoid confusion with previous policy numbers, this new policy will be added in two new chapters: FSH 3500 and 3510. Section 3530 remains, but with changes.

3. Changes “tracked” below are revisions since version 11 that was sent to all faculty on Friday, Oct. 18, 2019.

4. The highlighted text in 3500 E-2-a-6 was suggested by general counsel after the approval by FAC. It should be considered as a possible friendly amendment.

FSH 3500
PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. INTRODUCTION.

A-1. Definitions.

a. Academic Administrator. For purposes of this section, “academic administrator” means the president, provost, vice provosts, deans, associate/assistant deans, and department chairs/directors of academic units, and vice president for research, and shall not include persons occupying other administrative positions. (RGP II.G. 6.i.i.)

b. Board. As used throughout this section, “board” refers to the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho.

c. Faculty Member. For the purposes of this section and certain other sections that contain references to this subsection, “faculty member” is defined as any member of the university faculty who holds one of the following ranks: instructor, senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

d. Period under Review. The “period under review” includes all years since appointment to the candidate’s current rank.

e. Unit. For the purposes of this policy, “unit” means a school, division, or department (i.e., the first organizational unit below the college level), but the College of Law shall be considered a unit. -For Extension educators, the unit shall be the Extension district.

f.d. Unit Administrator. The “unit administrator” is the administrator of the unit that holds the promotion and/or tenure candidate’s appointment. In the case of an interdisciplinary appointment, the administrator of the unit that holds the majority of the appointment shall be considered the unit administrator.

g. University. As used throughout this section, “university” and “UI” refer to the University of Idaho.

A-2. Faculty Promotion.

a. General. Promotion to a rank requires the faculty member to meet the requirements for that rank. Responsibility for the effective functioning of promotion procedures rests with faculty and administrators. Decisions are based on thorough and uniform evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in relation to
the expectations listed in his/her position description and the criteria for promotion established in the unit and college bylaws.

b. Criteria. Promotion is awarded only to faculty members who effectively perform in the responsibility areas contained in FSH 1565 C and meet university, college and unit criteria. Promotion in rank is granted only when there is reasonable assurance, based on performance, that the faculty member will continue to meet the criteria for promotion. Each faculty member shall be evaluated based on the faculty member’s individual position description. The faculty of each college or unit or both shall establish substantive promotion criteria for all types of faculty existing within that unit or college (e.g., regular faculty, clinical faculty, research faculty, etc.), consistent with the university requirements. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity and shall be included in college or unit bylaws (see FSH 1590).

c. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion. Full-time Non-tenure track positions at the assistant and associate professor level are eligible for promotion to the next rank. Full-time instructors are eligible for promotion to senior instructor. Senior instructor is not a rank from which a faculty member may be promoted (FSH 1565 D-1-b).

A-3. Faculty Tenure.

a. General. Tenure is intended to protect academic freedom in order to maintain a free and open intellectual atmosphere. The justification for tenure lies in the need for protection from improper influences from either outside or inside the university. Tenure strengthens UI’s ability to attract and retain superior teachers and scholars as members of the faculty. UI’s tenure policy improves the quality of the faculty by requiring that each faculty member’s performance be carefully scrutinized before tenure is granted.

b. Definition. Tenure is a condition of presumed continuing employment accorded to a faculty member, usually after a probationary period, on the basis of an evaluation and recommendation by a unit committee and administrator, a college committee and dean, a university committee, the provost, and the president. Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed (RGP II.G.1.b). After tenure has been awarded, the faculty member’s service can be terminated only for adequate cause, the burden of proof resting with UI (FSH 3910), except under conditions of financial exigency as declared by the board (FSH 3970), in situations where extreme shifts of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position, or where the board has authorized elimination or substantial reduction in an academic program (RGP II.G.6.a).

c. Criteria. Tenure is granted only to full-time faculty members (RGP II.G.6.a) who demonstrate that they have made and will continue to make significant contributions in their disciplines through effective performance in the responsibility areas contained in FSH 1565 C as specified in their position description and consistent with university, college and unit criteria. The faculty of each college or unit or both shall establish substantive tenure criteria consistent with the university requirements for tenure. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity and shall be included in college and/or unit bylaws (see FSH 1590).

d. Tenurable Ranks. The tenurable ranks are senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Senior instructors, research professors, extension faculty, psychologists, and licensed psychologists can be either tenure track or non-tenure track. See FSH 1565. [Comment: Changes to ranks in FSH 1565 are being considered by QTT (aka Non-Tenure Track Task Force) and are beyond the scope of this P&T process. This provision reflects current practice.]

A-4. Consideration of Tenure or Promotion Alone. The procedures in this policy apply to all cases including applications for only tenure or only promotion.

B. ROLE OF THE PROVOST.

B-1. Delegation. The provost may delegate any of his or her responsibilities in this policy to a designee.
B-2. Provost’s Administrative Guidance. The process of promotion and tenure is administered by the provost. The provost shall publish guidance necessary for the administration of the promotion and tenure system that is consistent with the Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH) and the Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures (RGP). This guidance shall be mandatory. The provost’s administrative guidance shall include:

a. Deadlines for the promotion and tenure process;
b. The forms required to document the promotion and tenure process (e.g. dossier submission form, unit voting forms, etc.);
c. Procedures for requesting early consideration for promotion;
d. Requirements for curriculum vitae;
e. Requirements regarding the submission of promotion and tenure dossiers including format, order of materials, page limits for materials, etc.;
f. Requirements for the selection of external reviews for scholarly work;
g. Procedures for collecting feedback from faculty, staff, and students to be used by committees in this process;
h. The timing of appointments and relative representation of faculty on the university promotion & tenure committee pursuant to section G-1 herein; and
i. Other matters necessary to ensure the appropriate administration of the promotion and tenure process.

B-3. Committee Problem Resolution. If the unit administrator and/or the college dean is not able to fill membership on a committee required under this policy, the provost, in consultation with the dean, shall appoint an appropriate faculty member to fill any opening in order to comply with the requirements of this policy. If the provost takes such action under this provision, documentation of the action shall be maintained by the provost.

B-4. Procedural Error Remediation. In the event of a procedural error, the provost, dean, unit administrator, and candidate shall confer and attempt to come to an agreement that resolves the error. The provost shall decide the resolution of the procedural error. If the candidate agrees to the resolution, he or she may not later object to the resolution. If the candidate does not agree to the resolution, he or she retains the right to appeal the final institutional decision based on that procedural ground (see H-3 herein).

C. SCHEDULE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE CONSIDERATION.

C-1. Promotion.

a. Timing of Promotion. A faculty member shall apply and be considered for promotion according to the schedule below.

1. Instructors. Full-time instructors shall be considered for promotion to senior instructor during their sixth year of continuous, full-time service as an instructor. Part-time instructors are not eligible for promotion.

2. Tenure Track Assistant Professors. Assistant professors who are on a tenure track shall be considered for promotion at the same time they are considered for tenure and shall be promoted if they receive tenure (C-2-a herein).

3. Non-Tenure Track Assistant Professors. Assistant professors who are not on a tenure track shall be considered for promotion during their sixth full year of service, or thereafter, as an assistant professor.

4. Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track Associate Professors. Faculty may be considered for promotion during their sixth full year of service, or thereafter, as an associate professor.

b. Early Consideration for Promotion. A faculty member may be considered for promotion at an earlier time than permitted by this policy with the approval of the dean based on the faculty member’s record of
accomplishments. The process for requesting early consideration for promotion shall be set forth in the provost’s administrative guidance pursuant to B-2 herein.

c. Reconsideration for Promotion. When a faculty member has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she may be apply and be considered again during their third full year of service or later after denial of promotion unless earlier consideration is approved in writing by the dean.

C-2. Tenure.

a. Timing of Tenure. A faculty member shall apply and be considered by the university for tenure during the sixth full year of probationary service. Consideration at that time is mandatory (RGP II.G.6.b.ii.). If an associate or full professor is not appointed with tenure, they are considered for tenure during the fifth full year of service. Satisfactory service in any tenurable rank may be used to fulfill the probationary period

b. Early Consideration for Tenure. A faculty member may be considered for tenure at an earlier time than permitted by this policy (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.1), with the approval of the provost based on the faculty member’s record of accomplishments. The process for requesting early consideration for tenure shall be set forth in the provost’s administrative guidance pursuant to section B-2 herein.

C-3. Special Circumstances.

a. Late Appointments. When the appointment begins after the eighth week of the start of the academic year (for academic year appointments) or after the eighth week of the fiscal year (for fiscal year appointments) then the timeline for promotion and tenure consideration begins the following year.

b. Transfer between Units.

   1. Approval Process. When a non-tenured faculty member transfers to another unit within UI, the transfer must be approved by the provost in consultation with the units and college dean(s).

   2. Impact on Time to Promotion and Tenure. The extent to which service in the first unit counts toward tenure and/or promotion in the new unit must be communicated to the faculty member in writing by the provost at the time of the transfer. (RGP II.G.6.1.ii)

   3. Tenure Status. Tenure status does not change when a tenured faculty member transfers from one unit to another within UI.

c. Effect of Lapse in Service. A non-tenured faculty member who has left the institution and is subsequently reappointed after a lapse of not more than three (3) years may have his or her prior service counted toward eligibility for the award of tenure. Eligibility for the award of tenure must be clarified in writing before reappointment. A tenured faculty member who has left the institution and is subsequently reappointed after a lapse of not more than three (3) years must have tenure status clarified in writing by the president before appointment. The faculty member may be reappointed with tenure, or may be required to serve additional years before being reviewed for tenure status. (RGP II.G.6.1.i)

d. Credit toward Promotion or Tenure at Time of Appointment. Credit toward tenure and/or promotion may be granted at the time of appointment with the approval of the provost. Such credit must be documented in the letter offering the candidate employment at UI. Where credit toward tenure and/or promotion is approved, all evidence of success in the faculty member’s areas of responsibility having arisen during the years for which credit is given shall be included in the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion dossier and must be considered in evaluating whether the candidate has demonstrated success in the applicable areas of responsibility. Credit toward promotion and tenure may be granted under the following circumstances:

   1. After review of the candidate’s qualifications, the faculty in the unit vote that the candidate meets UI criteria for the rank to be offered, and
2. The candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed through service at another institution, or has made substantial contributions to their field of specialization, and

3. The candidate must complete one full year of employment at UI prior to applying for promotion or tenure.

e. Appointment with Tenure. A candidate may be initially appointed as an associate or full professor with tenure with the approval of the provost and president. (RGP II.G.6.i.iii) If an administrative appointment carries academic rank, evaluation for tenure is conducted by the unit in which the rank is held.

Appointment with tenure may be offered under the following circumstances:

1. The candidate has attained tenure at another college or university, and

2. After review of the candidate’s qualifications, the faculty in the unit vote that the candidate meets UI criteria for tenure and the rank to be offered, and

3. The candidate has demonstrated performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed.

f. Administrative Appointment. The role of an administrator is not tenurable. A faculty member who serves as an academic administrator retains membership in his or her academic department and his or her academic rank and tenure. (RGP II.G.6.i.ii) The faculty member may resume duties in his or her academic department when the administrative responsibilities end. (RGP II.G.6.i.iv)

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

h. Conflicts of Interest. A faculty member who is a “related individual” to the candidate as defined in FSH 6241-A shall not participate in the process of promotion and tenure.

C-4. Extensions.

a. Childbirth or Adoption: A faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption, may request an automatic one-year extension of the timeline for tenure and/or promotion. (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.2.)

b. Other Circumstances: An extension of the timeline for tenure and/or promotion may be granted in other exceptional circumstances (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.2) that may impede a faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure and/or promotion, including but not limited to significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care, child care and/or custody, disability or chronic illness or such other reasons deemed by the provost to be exceptional and likely to impede the faculty member’s progress.

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

d. Length of Extension. In most cases, extension of the time to tenure and/or promotion shall be for one year; however, longer extensions may be granted upon a showing of need by the faculty member. Multiple extension requests may be granted.

e. Option to Shorten Extension. A faculty member may choose to be considered for promotion and/or tenure on his or her original timeline, even if an extension has been granted.

f. Procedure for Requesting an Extension:
1. The faculty member must request the extension from the provost in writing by March 15 of the calendar year in which the review process begins, as set forth in the provost’s administrative guidance in B-2 herein. The written request must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other exceptional circumstance.

2. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the provost shall have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost shall, in his or her discretion, determine if consultation with the dean and/or unit administrator is appropriate.

3. The provost shall notify the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean of the action taken. No information regarding extensions shall be included in the candidate’s dossier.

g. Effect of Extension. If an extension is granted, the expectations for tenure and/or promotion remain the same.

D. PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER. All materials provided by the candidate and by the unit administrator shall be compiled together into a single dossier in the manner prescribed by the provost’s administrative guidance (B-2 herein).

D-1. Materials to be Provided by the Faculty Member. The candidate shall submit the following materials:

a. Current Curriculum Vitae. The curriculum vitae in the required UI format.

b. Candidate Statements. This section is limited to eight pages.

1. Context Statement. A Context Statement, written by the candidate, describing the candidate’s academic unit and the candidate’s responsibilities within his or her unit as established in the position description. It is intended to inform reviewers about the candidate’s academic environment so that reviewers may consider the similarities and differences between their own academic unit and that of the candidate. The context statement should also describe the expectations placed on the candidate by interdisciplinary programs or research centers, the requirements of joint appointments or other special circumstances. If applicable, the candidate shall indicate his or her choice of unit criteria for promotion and tenure under which to be evaluated, pursuant to D-2-a-2.

2. Personal Statement of Accomplishment. The candidate has an opportunity to interpret their record of accomplishment relevant to the responsibilities in their position description and the criteria for promotion and/or tenure, but should not duplicate other materials in the dossier. The statement may explain and analyze materials submitted and include a philosophical vision as it relates to the broader impact of accomplishments. The statement explains the nature of the faculty member’s activities so that others will understand them fully for purposes of assessment. The format and method of presentation is a matter of faculty choice.

c. Evidence of Accomplishment. Evidence of accomplishment may be provided for each area of responsibility in the position description. Evidence could include examples of scholarly work, teaching evaluation materials, letters of support, etc. This shall not include additional narrative written by the candidate regarding promotion or tenure. This section has no page limit.

D-2. Materials Provided by the Unit Administrator. The unit administrator shall provide the following materials to the candidate, in the format prescribed by the provost’s administrative guidance (B-2 herein), at least 10 business days prior to the deadline specified in D-3-a herein:

a. Bylaw Sections. College and unit bylaw sections that cover the following areas:

1. Annual review process and annual performance criteria.
2. Criteria for promotion and tenure. If criteria change during the period under review, the candidate shall choose the version of the criteria by which he or she will be evaluated. If a candidate does not select a version, the version in effect at the time of submission shall be used.

b. Position Descriptions and Annual Evaluations. Copies of the candidate’s position description(s) (FSH 3050) and annual evaluations (FSH 3320) for the period under review.

c. Teaching Effectiveness. If teaching is included in the candidate’s position descriptions, copies of all of the candidate’s student course evaluation summaries (RGP II.G.6.e) for the period under review and peer evaluations of teaching for the period under review as prescribed by the provost’s administrative guidance (B-2 herein). The candidate may supplement this section to include other evidence of teaching effectiveness as outlined in FSH 1565 C-1-a.

d. Prior Reports. Copies of any third year review committee reports and periodic review reports made during the period under review, along with the associated unit administrator’s and dean’s reports (as applicable) and any responses by the faculty member to the reports.

e. External Peer Reviews. The unit administrator shall obtain three to five external reviews of the candidate’s performance in the area of scholarly and creative activity, except in the case of third year review or faculty without responsibility for scholarship or creative activity as defined by FSH 1565 C-2. All review letters received shall be included in the dossier.

1. Qualifications of Reviewers. External reviewers shall be tenured faculty members who have expertise in areas closely related to the candidate’s expertise. If the review is to be in support of promotion, each reviewer shall be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking. Because reviewers are asked to provide independent and objective review, reviewers shall not have a personal or professional relationship with the candidate that could prevent an unbiased assessment.

2. Selection. The reviewers to be solicited shall be chosen by the unit administrator, but at least one two reviewers shall come from a list of at least eight qualified reviewers provided by the candidate in writing to the unit administrator by the deadline provided in B-2 herein. If the unit administrator cannot obtain letters from two reviewers on the candidate’s list, the unit administrator shall ask the candidate to identify further potential reviewers. The candidate may also provide the unit administrator with the names of up to two individuals who shall be excluded from consideration as an external reviewer. If the candidate fails to submit either list, the unit administrator shall select reviewers without that input from the candidate. These lists shall not be included in the dossier but shall be kept on record by the unit administrator.

3. Request Letters to the External Reviewers. The letters of request to the reviewers shall be based on a template provided by the provost.

4. Materials Provided to the External Reviewers. The unit administrator shall provide only the candidate’s CV, position descriptions for the period under review, candidate statements from D-1-b herein, and up to four examples of the candidate’s scholarly and creative activity chosen by the candidate. The unit administrator shall not provide the complete dossier or any additional materials to external peer reviewers.

5. Criteria for External Review.

a) The review shall be limited to the candidate’s scholarly and creative activity in relation to the applicable tenure and/or promotion criteria and the faculty member’s position description(s).

b) Reviewers may not be asked to evaluate the candidate pursuant to external criteria such as those at the reviewer’s institution or other professional organizations.
The university shall make every effort to keep the names of the reviewers confidential from the candidate. The candidate may request to view the external reviewers’ anonymized evaluations after the final institutional decision is made. Such requests shall be directed to the provost.


1. In the case of interdisciplinary appointments, administrators of units holding the minority of the candidate’s appointment (see A-1-d herein) may provide an additional review letter.

2. In the case of a candidate based at a UI center, the center executive officer shall may provide an additional review letter.


a. Deadline for Submission. A candidate’s dossier in support of tenure and/or promotion, containing all of the materials described in section A, must be submitted to the unit administrator either prior to the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to begin or prior to the submission of the candidate’s materials to the external reviewers, whichever is earlier. In the event a unit administrator fails to provide materials within the timeline referenced in D-2 above, the candidate’s deadline for submission shall extend to ten days after the provision of materials by the unit administrator.

1. External peer reviews need not be submitted as part of the dossier prior to the deadline, but must be submitted/received, if required, prior to any consideration of the dossier.

2. The dossier may be supplemented with scholarship or creative accomplishments occurring after submission. Supplementation must be made pursuant to the provost’s administrative guidance.

b. Finalization of Dossier. Submission is final when the faculty member has signed a dossier submission form and provided the signed form to the unit administrator. Other than supplementation provided in D-3-a herein, the dossier is final when submitted and may not be supplemented or altered after submission.

E. UNIT LEVEL REVIEW.

E-1. Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee.

a. Membership. The unit administrator faculty shall constitute elect a promotion and tenure committee for each candidate according to the criteria below. The unit faculty may delegate the selection of committee members to the unit administrator.

1. The committee shall be composed of five faculty members. At least three members shall be tenured faculty members in the unit, who shall elect a chair from among their tenured members. At least three of the committee members must be tenured faculty members in the unit. At least one member shall be a tenured faculty member from outside the unit.

2. The committee shall elect a chair from among their tenured members.

3. Because the promotion and tenure committee is a personnel committee, students and non-university employees shall not serve on the committee.

4. In cases considering promotion to full professor, unit administrators are encouraged to include full professors in the committee.

5. Neither the unit administrator nor the dean may serve as a member of a unit promotion and tenure committee.
6. If there are not three tenured faculty members available to serve on the committee, the unit administrator, in consultation with the dean, shall designate tenured faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are closely related to the work of faculty in the unit. One such member may chair the committee if there is not a tenured member from the unit available to serve as chair.

7. Upon request by the candidate to the unit administrator, the unit administrator shall provide the candidate with the names of the committee members.

b. Basis for Evaluation. The unit administrator shall submit the completed dossier to the chair of the unit promotion and tenure committee. The review shall be based on the dossier as well as feedback collected by the committee from faculty, staff, and students in the unit. The process for requesting such feedback shall be set forth in the provost’s administrative guidance pursuant to section B-2 herein. The committee shall not meet until the dossier and feedback have been available to all members for at least two weeks. The committee may provide the candidate with the opportunity to present evidence from the dossier to address the committee in support of his or her application for tenure and/or promotion. The committee shall evaluate the promotion and tenure dossier and candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The unit administrator shall make the dossier and feedback available to all committee members at least two weeks prior to their first meeting.

c. Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee Report. The committee shall write a report recommending whether the candidate should be promoted and/or tenured. For each candidate, the report shall include a brief rationale for the committee’s recommendations and an anonymized record of the committee’s vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. Abstentions are not allowed. The chair of the committee shall deliver the report to the unit administrator. The report shall not be shared with faculty who are not members of the college or university promotion and tenure committees.

E-2. Unit Faculty Voting.

a. General.
   1. The dossier must be made available at least two weeks prior to any voting.
   2. Faculty who are eligible to vote may assemble to deliberate prior to voting.
   3. Voting shall occur using a signed, written ballot in a format provided in the provost’s administrative guidance in B-2 herein.
   4. Faculty members may submit evaluative comments as part of their ballot to the unit administrator for their consideration.
   5. Unit faculty voting results shall not be shared with the candidate’s promotion and tenure committee.
   6. Faculty are not required to vote but are encouraged to do so.

b. Voting by Tenured Faculty. In the case of tenure, the unit administrator shall solicit the vote of all tenured faculty members of the candidate’s unit regarding whether the candidate should be granted tenure. Non-tenured faculty shall not be eligible to vote. The unit administrator shall poll tenured faculty members of the candidate’s unit regarding whether the candidate should be granted tenure.

c. Voting by Promoted Faculty. In the case of promotion, the unit administrator shall solicit the vote of all faculty members of the candidate’s unit of the same or higher rank as that to which the candidate seeks promotion. Faculty members of lower rank shall not be eligible to vote. The unit administrator shall poll all unit faculty members of rank to which the faculty member seeks promotion or a higher rank regarding whether the candidate should be promoted.

E-3. Unit Administrator.

a. Unit Administrator’s Report. The unit administrator shall prepare a written report after considering the tenure and/or promotion dossier, the unit promotion and tenure committee report, and the unit voting results. The unit administrator’s report shall include the anonymized voting results as well as the administrator’s recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. In the event that the administrator submitting the
recommendation has not had at least one year to evaluate the candidate, he or she shall disclose this as part of the report, except for reasons clearly stated in writing, defer to the evaluations and recommendations of the committee when submitting his or her own recommendation.

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

E-4. Forwarding Materials. The unit administrator shall forward the tenure and/or promotion dossier and all reports and the candidate’s response, if any, to the dean.

F. COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEW.

F-1. College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each college having more than one unit shall have a standing promotion and tenure committee. The members shall be tenured and shall serve staggered three-year terms. Each unit shall have one representative elected by the unit faculty. The committee shall elect its chair from among its members or may elect the dean or associate dean to serve as chair without vote. For the College of Business and Economics each major area shall serve as a “unit” for purposes of section F. Names of committee members shall be provided to the candidate upon request to the dean.

F-2. College Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation and Report. The committee shall evaluate the dossier in light of the unit, college and university criteria. The committee chair shall write a report for each candidate recommending whether the candidate should be promoted and/or tenured. For each candidate, the report shall include a brief rationale for the committee’s recommendations and an anonymized record of the committee’s vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. Abstentions are not allowed. A tie vote will result in a recommendation of “undecided.”

F-3. Dean’s Report. The dean shall evaluate the candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion then make a written recommendation as to whether each candidate should be promoted and/or tenured after considering the materials presented in the dossier (including all reports, responses and polling information), and advice of the college committee. The dean may also confer individually or collectively with unit administrators about the qualifications of the candidate.

F-4. Transmission of Reports to Candidate and Written Response. The dean shall provide the candidate with copies of the dean’s report and the college promotion and tenure committee report. The candidate may provide a written response to the reports within five business days after receiving the reports.

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

G. UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW.

G-1. University Promotion and Tenure Committee Composition. A university promotion and tenure committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost without vote, is appointed each year.

a. Nominations. One-third of the committee’s membership shall be randomly selected by the provost from the previous year’s committee; the remaining members shall be selected by the provost and the chair and vice chair of the Faculty Senate from nominations submitted by the senators. The delegation representing the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members who should be representative of the breadth of the disciplines within the college. The delegation representing the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members from the college comprising two each from (a) faculty with greater than 50% teaching and research appointments and (b) faculty with greater than 50% University of Idaho Extension appointments. The Faculty Senate delegations from the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large each nominate two faculty members from
their constituencies. If senators from a college do not submit nominations by the deadline announced by the provost, the provost shall appoint members from that college, as specified in G-1-b-2 herein.

b. Membership. The membership of the committee shall be as follows:

1. The vice president for research, the dean of the College of Graduate Studies and the provost’s designee with primary responsibility for faculty promotion and tenure, to serve *ex officio* (without vote).

2. Two representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, and one representative from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large.

3. The committee shall include at least one tenured faculty members (RGP II.G.6.e).

4. Upon request by the candidate to the provost, the provost shall provide the candidate with the names of the committee members.

G-2. University Promotion and Tenure Committee Vote. The committee shall deliberate and vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Abstentions are not allowed.

G-3. Provost’s Report. The provost shall write a report to the president making a recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion of each candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The report shall include a rationale for each recommendation and the anonymized results of voting from the university promotion and tenure committee.

H. DECISION.

H-1. Presidential Approval. The president shall confer with the provost and make the decision regarding tenure and/or promotion for each candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The awarding of tenure and/or promotion to an eligible faculty member is made only by a positive action of approval by the president.

H-2. Notice to the Candidate. The president shall give notice in writing to the candidate of the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion by May 1 of the academic year in which the decision is made. (RGP II.G.6.c.) The provost’s recommendation shall be forwarded to the candidate at that time. Notwithstanding any provisions in this section to the contrary, no person is deemed to have been awarded tenure solely because notice is not given or received by the prescribed times. If the president fails to notify the candidate of the decision within the required timeframe, it is the responsibility of the candidate to inquire as to the decision.

H-3. Appeals. Appeals regarding promotion or tenure may be filed only after the final decision of the president, which shall be considered the institutional decision (see FSH 3840 B-2).

H-4. Denial of Tenure. If a faculty member is not awarded tenure, the president, at his or her discretion, may:

a. Notify the faculty member that the *contract* year in which the tenure decision is made is the terminal year of employment (RGP II.G.6.k.), or

b. Issue a contract for a terminal year of employment following the year in which the tenure decision is made (RGP II.G.6.j), or

c. Issue to the faculty member contracts of employment for successive periods of one (1) year each. Such appointment for faculty members not awarded tenure must be on an annual basis, and such temporary appointments do not vest in the faculty member any of the rights inherent in tenure and there shall be no continued expectation of employment beyond the annual appointment (RGP II.G.6.j).
I. IMPLEMENTATION.

I-1. Effective Date. This policy shall be effective April 1, 2020.


   a. The provisions of section C herein (Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Consideration) shall apply to faculty hired after the final approval of this policy.

   b. Faculty hired before the adoption of this policy shall be governed by the provisions of section C herein unless written notice of election not to be governed by Section C is provided to the unit administrator, dean and provost prior to April 1, 2020.

   c. Faculty who elect not to be governed by the provisions of section C herein are subject to the corresponding policies regarding the timing of promotion and tenure in place immediately prior to the adoption of this policy, specifically those in FSH 3520 and FSH 3560. These previous policies shall remain available on the provost’s web page.
FSH 3510
THIRD YEAR REVIEW

A. GENERAL. In addition to the annual evaluation of faculty by the unit administrator, each full-time, untenured faculty member shall be reviewed by a committee of colleagues during the 24- to 36-month period after beginning employment at UI. The committee shall provide the faculty member with a detailed report regarding the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The third year review process shall not include a vote of the committee or unit faculty.

B. THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE. The third year review committee shall be created<formed is appointed by the unit administrator in accordance with the process outlined in FSH 3500 E-1-a.

B-2. In the case of a review of a tenure-track faculty member, at least three of the four members of the committee must be tenured members of the faculty member’s academic unit. The committee shall be chaired by a tenured faculty member from the unit who shall be appointed by the unit administrator. If there are not two tenured faculty members in the unit available to serve on the third year review committee, the unit administrator shall appoint, as necessary, one or two tenured faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are most closely related to the area of expertise of the faculty member under review. If necessary, a tenured faculty member from another unit may chair the third year review committee.

B-3. In the case of a review of non-tenure-track faculty member, at least three of the four members of the committee must be faculty members holding a rank higher than the faculty member under review in the faculty member’s unit. The committee shall be chaired by a higher ranked faculty member from the unit who shall be appointed by the unit administrator. If there are no faculty members holding a higher rank in the unit available to serve on the third year review committee, the unit administrator shall appoint, as necessary, one or two other faculty members from the unit who are most familiar with the non-tenure-track faculty member’s area of expertise. If necessary, a higher ranked faculty member from another unit may chair the third year review committee.

C. BASIS FOR EVALUATION. The unit administrator shall provide the completed dossier (FSH 3500 D), excluding external peer reviews, to the chair of the committee. The review shall be based on the dossier as well as feedback collected by the committee from faculty, staff, and students in the unit in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The process for requesting such feedback shall be set forth in the provost’s administrative guidance pursuant to FSH 3500 B-2. One function of this review is to provide formative feedback; therefore, it shall not include a vote of the faculty.

D. COMMITTEE REPORT AND CANDIDATE RESPONSE. The committee shall write a report evaluating the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each of the faculty member’s responsibility areas. The report shall provide direction to the faculty member regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may provide a written response to the report within five business days after receiving the report. The chair of the committee shall forward the report and any response from the candidate to the unit administrator.

E. UNIT ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT AND CANDIDATE RESPONSE. The unit administrator shall write a report evaluating the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each of the faculty member’s responsibility areas in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The report shall provide direction to the faculty member regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may provide a written response to the report within five business days after receiving the report.

F. DEAN’S REPORT AND CANDIDATE RESPONSE. The committee report, the unit administrator’s report, the candidate’s response(s), if any, and the tenure and/or promotion dossier shall be forwarded to the dean. The dean shall write a report evaluating the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each of the faculty member’s responsibility areas in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The report shall provide direction to the faculty member regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may provide a written response to the report within five business days after receiving the report.
G. FORWARDING MATERIALS. The dean shall forward all materials to the faculty member and to the provost's office for recordkeeping.

H. IMPLEMENTATION. This policy shall be effective July 1, 2020.
FACULTY TENURE

PREAMBLE: This section defines tenure and sets out the procedure by which a faculty member is evaluated, at the department, college, and university level, for a possible award of tenure. In general, the material gathered here was all an original part of the 1979 Handbook. The material that provides the first sentence of what is now subsection E, H-1, I-1 through I-3 was added in July 1987. At that time what is now subsection D (criteria for tenure) and subsections I-4 and J-1 (specifying review at the university level) were added and what is now H-4 (concerning the formal tenure review process) greatly enlarged. Substantial revisions to D, H-3, H-4, H-5, and J-4 were made in July 1998. The tenurability of lecturers and senior instructors was clarified (Section E) in July 2001. Subsections E, G, and H were revised and J-3 added in July 2002, G-1 and H-3 were substantially revised July 2005. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. Minor rearrangements and clarifications were made January 2008. In January 2010 this section was again revised to reflect changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. In July 2011 changes to F-9 were made to make automatic the one-year extension for childbirth/adoption. In July 2012 the percentage requirement for student membership on tenure committees was removed to better align this policy with Regent’s policy which states only that students be included. In July 2013 Regent’s no longer required students on tenure committees, thus the university revised its policy to allow units to determine and to note same in their by-laws. In July 2017 changes were made to clarify the language in F-9 for tenure extensions. Except where specifically noted, the rest of the text was written in July 1996. More information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [ed. 7-97, 7-02, ed. & ren. 7-98, 7-01, 7-02, 7-05, 7-07, 1-08, 1-10, 7-11, 7-12, 7-13, 7-17]

CONTENTS:

A. General
B. Definitions
C. Criteria for Tenure
D. Tenurable Ranks
E. Tenure Eligibility
F. Time Requirements for Tenure
G. Evaluation for Tenure
H. Review of Evaluations at the College Level
I. Review of Evaluations at the University Level

A. GENERAL. Tenure has as its fundamental purpose the protection of academic freedom in order to maintain a free and open intellectual atmosphere. The justification for tenure lies in the character of scholarly activity, which requires protection from improper influences from either outside or inside the university. A tenure policy strengthens the capability of a university to attract and retain superior teachers and scholars as members of the faculty. UI’s tenure policy improves the quality of the faculty by requiring that each faculty member’s performance be carefully scrutinized before tenure is granted and on an annual basis thereafter [see FSH 3320]. [ed. 7-98, ed. & ren. 1-10]

B. DEFINITIONS.

B-1. Board. As used throughout this section, “board” refers to the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho. [ren. 1-10]

B-2. Tenure. is a condition of presumed continuing employment accorded a faculty member by the board, usually after a probationary period, on the basis of an evaluation and recommendation by a faculty committee, by the faculty member’s unit administrator, by the college dean, and by the president. After tenure has been awarded, the faculty member’s service can be terminated only for adequate cause; the burden of proof resting with UI [see FSH 3910], except under conditions of financial exigency as declared by the board [see FSH 3970], in situations where extreme shifts of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position, or where the board has authorized the elimination of, or a substantial reduction in, an academic program. [ed. 7-98, rev. & ren. 2-10]
B-3. University. As used throughout this section, “university” and “UI” refer to the University of Idaho. [rev. 1-10]

B-4. Faculty Member. For the purposes of this section and certain other sections that contain references to this subsection, “faculty member” is defined as any member of the university faculty who holds one of the following ranks: instructor, senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

C. CRITERIA FOR TENURE. Tenure is granted only to faculty members who demonstrate that they have made and will continue to make significant contributions in their disciplines through effective performance in the responsibility areas (FSH 1565 C) as specified in their position description. The college and unit criteria [see G-1 and H-2] must also be met. [rev. 7-98, rev. & ren. 1-10].

D. TENURABLE RANKS. The tenurable ranks are: senior instructor, assistant professor, associate research professor, associate professor, professor, research professor, and librarian, psychologist/licensed psychologist, and extension faculty all with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The rank of senior instructor can be used with either a tenure or non-tenure track position but it is not a rank from which a faculty member may be promoted (see FSH 1565 D 1 b.). [rev. 7-98, 7-01, ren. & rev. 1-10]

E. TENURE ELIGIBILITY. The granting of tenure is based on the criteria formulated and described below and follows the procedures specified in subsections E, F, G, H, and I. Full-time faculty members who hold tenurable ranks are eligible for appointment to tenure under the conditions and through the procedures described in this section. [rev. & rev. 1-10]

E-1. Tenure is not awarded automatically, but only on the basis of explicit judgment, decision, and approval. A faculty member who is eligible for consideration for tenure must be evaluated by the unit tenure recommending committee [see G-4] in accordance with the schedule in G-1. That committee’s recommendation, together with the recommendations of the faculty member’s unit administrator, interdisciplinary leader and center administrator if appropriate, and dean, including all narratives, is forwarded to the president for review. In the event that the administrator submitting the recommendation has not had at least one year to evaluate the candidate, he or she will, except for reasons clearly stated in writing, rely on the evaluations and recommendations of the tenure-recommending committee when submitting his or her own recommendation. The candidate is responsible for demonstrating that she or he has met the criteria for tenure. The authority to award tenure rests with the board, which has delegated its authority to the president. [rev. 7-02, 1-08, ren. & rev. 1-10]

E-2. A unit administrator is unable to be granted tenure in his or her administrative capacity. A faculty member with tenure in an academic department who is appointed to an academic administrator position retains tenure in that department. (RGP IIG6) [rev. 7-02, ren. & rev. 1-10]

E-3. The Board defines academic administrators who are eligible for tenure as the chief academic officer of the UI (provost), deans, department chairs, and their associates and assistants of academic units. An academic administrator may be appointed with or without academic rank, except that an administrator of an academic department must hold academic rank in a discipline. If the appointment carries academic rank, evaluation for tenure is conducted by the department in which the rank is held. In such cases, tenure will be granted only upon favorable recommendation of the department or upon successful appeal of an unfavorable unit recommendation. In the event that tenure is not granted, the appointee may continue to serve in the administrative or service capacity (except as administrator of an academic department), but without academic rank. [rev. 7-02, ren. & ed. 1-10]

F. TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE ELIGIBILITY.

F-1. Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed. (RGP IIG6). Ordinarily a faculty member is not considered for tenure until the fourth full year of probationary service, and consideration is mandatory no later than the sixth full year of service. (RGP IIG6). Credit for prior experience may be given in accordance with the provisions of F-4. In this context, unless otherwise specified, the term “year” means the appointment year, whether that is an academic, calendar, or fiscal year. When the appointment begins after January 1, then the following fiscal year date is the start date to begin counting for consideration for tenure. A faculty member who is not awarded tenure may be given written notice of non-reappointment, or be offered
a one-year terminal appointment, or be granted an additional short-term probationary appointment for not more than a twelve-month period by mutual agreement between UI and the faculty member. The decision to offer employment following a denial of tenure is in the sole discretion of the president (RGP IIG6j). [See 3900.] [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 7-05, rem. & rev. 1-10]

F-2. Tenure evaluation procedures must be started in sufficient time to permit completion by the end of the time periods indicated in F-1. When authorized by the president or his or her designee, the year in which the tenure decision is made may be the terminal year of employment if the decision is to deny tenure. (RGP IIG6k). [rev. 7-02, rem. & ed. 1-10]

F-3. Satisfactory service in any tenurable rank may be used to fulfill the probationary periods required for awarding tenure. A maximum of two years of satisfactory service in the rank of instructor at UI may be recognized in partial fulfillment of the time requirement in the tenurable ranks. [rev. & ren. 1-10]

F-4. In cases involving prior equivalent experience, tenure may be granted following less than the usual period of service. In particular, a new faculty member with comparable experience (see FSH 3050 B) from other institutions in relation to the expectations set forth in his/her position description may be granted credit for such experience up to a maximum of four years and may be considered for tenure after a minimum of one full year of service at UI. A faculty member initially employed as an associate or full professor, having already attained tenure at another college or university may be appointed with tenure. However, before any negotiations for appointment with tenure can begin, this action must be supported by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in the department or equivalent unit and by the university administration. If an associate or full professor is not appointed with tenure, they are considered for tenure not later than the fourth full year of service. [ed. 7-98, rev. & ren. 1-10, rev. 1-14]

F-5. In the event that a nontenured faculty member's service at UI has been discontinuous, prior years in the same or a similar tenurable rank may be counted toward tenure eligibility, subject to the limitation stated in F-3 with respect to instructors, and subject to the conditions that: [rev. & ren. 1-10]

a. Not more than three years have passed since the faculty member left UI. [ed. 1-10]

b. Applicability of the prior service toward tenure must be stated in writing before reappointment.

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

F-6. If a tenured faculty member leaves UI and later returns to the same or a similar position after not more than three years, the appointment may be with tenure, or he or she may be required to serve an additional year before a tenure decision is made. Notification of probationary or tenure status is to be given in writing before reappointment.

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

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


a. Childbirth/Adoption: A faculty member in a tenure track position who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption, may request an automatic one-year extension of the probationary period for tenure. Childbirth or adoption shall be considered an exceptional case justifying an extension under Regents' Policy II.G.(4)(b) and will not prejudice a subsequent contract renewal decision. In the event that the
extension is requested and granted before the third year review, the review is also automatically delayed for one year. [add 7-11, rev. 7-17]

b. Other Circumstances: An extension of the probationary period for tenure may be granted in other circumstances that may impede a faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure, including significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care obligations and disability/chronic illness, or other exceptional circumstances. [rev. 7-11, ed. 7-17]

c. Procedure for Requesting an Extension:

1. The faculty member must request the extension from the Provost in writing by June 1st before the review process begins and must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other circumstance. [rev. 7-17]

2. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the Provost will have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost will, at his or her discretion, determine if consultation with the dean and/or department is appropriate. The provost shall notify the faculty member, department chair, and dean of the action taken. [rev. 7-17]

3. In most cases, extension of the probationary period will be for one year. However, longer extensions may be granted upon a showing of need by the faculty member. Multiple extension requests may be granted. [rev. & ren. 7-17]

4. If a probationary period extension is approved, a reduction in productivity during the period of time addressed in the request should not prejudice a subsequent contract renewal decision. In the event the probationary period is approved before the third year review, the review is automatically delayed. [rev. 7-11, ren. 7-17]

G. EVALUATION FOR TENURE.

G-1. Unit Criteria. The faculty of each unit or equivalent unit establishes specific criteria for tenure. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity. The unit criteria may be revised at any time by a majority vote of the unit faculty, and they must be reviewed for possible changes at intervals not to exceed five years (see FSH 1590). Revisions may not be retroactive but, for tenure evaluation purposes, are considered proportionately in conjunction with criteria that were previously in force. Unit criteria must be consistent with the college criteria and are subject to review by the college committee on tenure and promotion. [rev. 7-06, 1-08, ren. & rev. 1-10]

G-2. College Criteria. College criteria must be consistent with university criteria. [add 1-10]

G-3. Annual Review (FSH 3320). The basis for the annual review is performance in relation to the position descriptions for the period under consideration where such descriptions have been developed according to the policies stated in FSH 3050 and in relation to the unit criteria for tenure and promotion. In the case of members of instructional faculty, the annual student evaluation of teaching is carefully weighed in this review. Each college must have procedures that guarantee that the student evaluations are considered (college procedures are subject to review and approval by the president and the board). The unit administrator’s annual evaluations, including all narratives and any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments— together with the judgments of higher administrators, are used as one of the bases for recommendations concerning salary, reappointment, nonreappointment, promotion, tenure, or other personnel actions, as appropriate. [rev. & ren. 1-10]

G-4. Third Year Review. A more thorough review by a non-tenured faculty member’s colleagues is held during the 24 to 36 month period after beginning employment at UI. The candidate creates a professional portfolio (see FSH 3570). A committee is appointed, in accordance with procedures determined by each unit, to consider the progress of each faculty member. The detailed procedures for appointing the committee and conducting the third year review are developed by the faculty of each unit and made a part of the unit bylaws. In case of a conflict, the below requirements in a. supersede college and unit bylaws. [rev. 7-08, 7-05, 1-08, ren. & rev. 1-10]
a. At a minimum, the candidate must submit the following materials:

1. Current curriculum vitae;

2. Annual evaluations and other progress reviews from unit administrator(s), dean(s) and center administrator(s) where applicable; in the case of joint appointments and appointments where interdisciplinary activities are part of the faculty member's position description, or in cases where faculty are located at centers or offsite locations, the secondary unit administrator and dean and/or center administrators' evaluative comments shall also be included. [rev. 1-10]

3. Professional Portfolio (see FSH 3570); [add. 1-10]

4. At the candidate's discretion, additional material may be prepared and made available to all who are evaluating his/her suitability for tenure and/or promotion. Materials from the following areas, should also be included as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service. [add. 1-10]

b. The faculty member is given a copy of the committee's report and is informed in writing by the unit administrator of strong and weak points that are brought out by this review. The following materials are then submitted to the Provost's Office: [rev. 1-10]

1. Analysis, recommendations and narratives from: [rev. 1-10]
   a) Dean,
   b) Unit chair and, where applicable, interdisciplinary program administrators (those listed on the faculty member's narrative attached to his/her position description) and center administrators, and/or administrators of faculty in joint appointments; and [rev. 1-10]
   c) Review committee(s).

2. Complete portfolio of 3rd year review materials.

G-5. Formal Tenure Review.

a. The formal evaluation for tenure requires assessing the faculty member's performance in meeting the criteria for tenure. To initiate the formal evaluation for the granting of tenure to a faculty member, the unit administrator (or college dean if the unit administrator is under consideration for tenure) obtains the position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all narratives) for the relevant period, the third year review (all maintained in the unit office), the professional portfolio (from the faculty member, see FSH 3570), summary scores of student evaluations from all classes taught (Institutional Research and Assessment), and the curriculum vitae and reviews all of the previous listed documentation for its completeness and accuracy with the candidate. [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 1-08, 1-10]

b. The unit administrator will request an evaluation of the candidate’s performance from three to five appropriate external reviewers, who should include tenured faculty at peer institutions. Persons asked to write peer reviews should be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking. The names of at least two of these reviewers will be selected from a list suggested by the candidate. See also External Peer Review Guidelines on the Provost website at http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/tenure.) Final selection of external reviewers should take place at the unit level, in accordance with college policy. The letter of request will include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions (including narratives) for the relevant period, the professional portfolio, and up to four examples of the candidate’s scholarly work. In addition, the letter of request shall include instructions that the candidate be evaluated in relation to the candidate’s personal context statement and unit and college criteria. When all deliberations within the university have been completed, the external reviewers’ evaluations will be shown to the faculty member after every effort has been made to ensure the reviewer’s anonymity. [add. 7-98, rev. 7-02, 1-08, 1-10]
g. Copies of position descriptions, unit tenure criteria, annual evaluations including all narratives, the third-year review (if applicable), the professional portfolio, summary scores of the student evaluations, the curriculum vitae, and external peer review letters are forwarded to each person participating in the review at the unit and higher levels. Supplementary material, if any, shall be available for review in the unit office. The results of the student evaluations of teaching must be carefully weighed and used as a factor in assessing the teaching component in tenure determinations. The unit administrator making the recommendation concerning tenure will solicit, and address in his/her summary, the evaluative comments regarding the candidate from all tenured faculty members of the unit, and from interdisciplinary program directors and center administrators (if applicable), and from the unit tenure-recommending committee (see G-5-d). The unit administrator’s summary should assess the candidate’s record in light of the criteria established at the unit, college and university level. Any person having a familial or other similar significant relationship with the candidate is not permitted to serve in any capacity in the review process. Each unit is responsible for developing procedures in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). A copy of the form to be used in transmitting the recommendations made at each stage of evaluation for tenure appears as the last two pages of this section. [See also FSH 3380 D.]

h. The unit tenure-recommending committee includes the following: one or more tenured faculty members, one or more non-tenured faculty members, and one or more persons from outside the unit. In cases involving the evaluation or review of members of the instructional faculty, inclusion of students shall be determined by the unit’s by-laws. Student members may include one or more students sufficient to ensure equity of representation and who have had experience in the unit with which the faculty member being evaluated is associated. Each member of the tenure review committee has an equal vote. If a unit decides not to include a student member(s), the unit by-laws will address how sufficient student input will be accomplished, e.g., formal teaching evaluations, student testimonials, open forums for comment. In cases involving the evaluation of individuals involved significantly in interdisciplinary activities, one or more members of the appropriate interdisciplinary program(s) faculty shall be included on the committee. No faculty member serves on the unit tenure-recommending committee when it is considering his or her own case. The dean is excluded from the unit committee’s process. Each unit is responsible for developing procedures, including protocols for voting, in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). [rev. and ren. 1-08, 7-12, 7-13]
H-3. College Standing Committee Recommendations. The College standing committee makes recommendations to the dean and the provost on the tenure of individual faculty members. \[\text{rev. 1-08, ren. 1-10}\]

H-4. Dean’s Recommendation. The dean considers the recommendations made by the college’s committee on tenure and promotion and makes his or her own written recommendation that assesses the candidate’s record in light of the criteria established at the unit, college and university level. It is advisable that the dean confer collectively with the unit administrators about the merits of the faculty members whom they are recommending for tenure. Before forwarding the materials to the provost, the findings of the college committee(s) and the dean are relayed to the candidate in writing indicating strengths as well as weaknesses as perceived at the college level. The candidate has one week from receipt of the findings to provide written clarification if he or she believes his or her record or the college criteria for tenure have been misinterpreted. Any such clarification is forwarded with the candidate’s materials to the provost. \[\text{rev. 7-98, 1-08, ren. & rev. 1-10}\]

I. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL.

I-1. The individual recommendations, together with the summary recommendations of the unit administrator, the recommendations of the college committee and those of the dean, including all narratives, are forwarded for review by the provost. Any individual signed recommendations are placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. \[\text{rev. 7-02, ren. & ed. 1-10}\]

I-2. The awarding of tenure to an eligible faculty member is made only by a positive action of approval by the president. The president gives notice in writing to the faculty member of the granting or denial of tenure by proffered written contract, of appointment or nonappointment to tenure not later than June 30 (see also FSH 3900 B) after the academic year during which the decision is made. (RGP IIG6c). Notwithstanding any provisions in this section to the contrary, no person is deemed to have been awarded tenure solely because notice is not given or received by the prescribed times. No faculty member may construe the lack of notice of denial of tenure as signifying the awarding of tenure. If the president has not given notice to the faculty member as provided herein, it is the duty of the faculty member to make inquiry to ascertain the decisions of the president. \[\text{rev. 7-02, ren. & ed. 1-10}\]

I-3. The board requires the president to provide a list of the faculty members granted tenure in the university’s regular semi-annual report to the board. (RGP IIC4b). \[\text{add. 7-02, ren. 1-10}\]

(Form to be put on next two pages, in separate document)
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY POSITIONS

PREAMBLE: This section, intended to define non-tenure track appointments with faculty status, was added July 2001. Further information may be obtained from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448) or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151).

A. CREATION. Non-tenure track positions may be created upon the recommendation and approval of the department or unit head, the dean, and the provost. Non-tenure track appointments are made only on annual contracts.

B. RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES. Non-tenured track faculty are eligible for emeritus status (see FSH 1565H) and have the same rights and responsibilities as other faculty at the university. Non-tenure track faculty may use the grievance processes available to other faculty. If the appointment is full-time, non-tenure track faculty receive the same benefits as other full-time employees including educational privileges, however, non-tenure track faculty are not eligible for sabbatical leaves.

C. PROMOTION. Non-tenure track positions at the assistant and associate professor level are eligible for promotion to the next rank.

D. PROVOST'S REPORT TO FACULTY AFFAIRS. The provost will provide the Faculty Affairs Committee with a report on non-tenure track positions annually during the fall term.

E. CONVERSION TO TENURE-TRACK STATUS. Conversion from non-tenure track appointments to tenure-track appointments requires the approval of the provost, dean, unit administrator, and unit faculty. Conversion from non-tenure track appointments to tenure-track appointments requires the approval of the appropriate unit faculty, in accordance with the by-laws of that unit, and compliance with all university policies for tenure-track appointments.
FACULTY PROMOTIONS

PREAMBLE: This section discusses promotion in rank and the procedures by which a faculty member is evaluated, at the department, college, and university level, for a possible promotion. In particular the charge of the University Level Promotions Committee is given (subsection G). This section was an original part of the 1979 Handbook and has been revised in very minor ways several times since. In July 1994 it was more substantively revised: subsections A and B were largely rewritten to emphasize the faculty’s responsibility for promotion, G-2 (add a “presumption in favor” of the candidate under certain conditions at the university level) and the last sentence of H (providing feedback to the candidate) added. Again in July 1998 there were substantial revisions to E-2 (making formal the requirement and procedures for an external review), and E-5 and E-5 (providing a feedback loop between candidate and subsequent evaluators). In July 2000 section B was revised to make clear that eligibility for promotion in rank necessitated a history of position descriptions that required activities consistent with the criteria for that rank. In July 2002 section D was edited to clarify promotion schedule at each rank. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 the section underwent some minor editing and revising to bring it into greater conformity with other sections of the Handbook. In January 2010 this section was again revised to reflect changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. In July 2012 the university promotions committee makeup was revised to reflect current practice and align membership to college reorganizations. In July 2014 the cap on non-tenure-track faculty appointments in a unit was adjusted and promotion processes from FSH 1565 were moved into this policy and revised. Except where otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information may be obtained from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-00, 7-02, 7-07, 1-08, 1-10, 7-12, 7-14]

CONTENTS:

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

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

B. BASES OF EVALUATION. Promotion in rank is granted only when there is reasonable assurance, based on performance, that the faculty member will continue to meet the standards for promotion. The faculty member’s position description (see FSH 3050), covering the period since appointment to his or her current rank, provides a frame of reference for the unit expectations for satisfactory performance. When the appointment occurs after January 1, the following fiscal year is the first year of the promotion consideration period. In order to form a basis for promotion in rank, the position descriptions must require activity consistent with the criteria for that rank as stated in FSH 1565. The faculty member’s professional portfolio (FSH 3570) and other documents are judged in the context of unit and college by-laws as well as the documents listed in E-2a and E-3 below. [rev. 7-00, 1-10, ed. 1-08, 7-14]
C. RESPONSIBILITY. The responsibility for submitting recommendations in accordance with the prescribed schedule [see D] falls on the unit administrator or on the dean of the college if the college is not departmentalized. Small units may be joined with others for this purpose. The intent is to secure an adequate body of recommendations from those concerned and qualified to participate in the evaluation. The procedure involves successive considerations of the candidate, beginning with the faculty member’s colleagues at the unit level, and proceeding through the college level to the university level. Interdisciplinary and center administrators are to be included as appropriate. [rev. 1-08, ed. 1-10]

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

D-1. Instructors. Each unit will develop criteria for promotion and review of its instructors. Instructors may be considered for promotion to senior instructor before the end of the third year of full-time service in this rank. Instructors who do not seek promotion shall be reviewed at the end of their third year (FSH 3570) and at a minimum of every five years thereafter as determined by the unit’s by-laws. The committee for third-year review, periodic review and promotion, defined by the unit’s by-laws, shall include tenure-track faculty within the unit.

Part-time service is not considered in determining the time for consideration for promotion. Periods of full-time service need not be consecutive; however, if there is an interruption of more than three years’ duration in an instructor’s full-time service, the instructor and the unit administrator may agree on an adjustment in the amount of full-time service that must be completed before consideration must be given to the instructor’s promotion, such adjustment being subject to approval by the provost.

Note: The rank of senior instructor, except in very rare instances, is a terminal rank that does not lead to promotion to the professorial ranks. [See 1565 D-1 b]. [ed. 7-00, 7-04, 1-10, 7-14]

D-2. Clinical Faculty. Clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion after completion of time in rank comparable to that for tenure-track faculty, and upon evaluation by departmental, college and university promotion committees. Clinical faculty shall be reviewed during their third year (see FSH 3570). Each unit will develop criteria for promotion and review of its clinical faculty. The promotion process will be consistent with that followed by the unit, college and university for tenure-track faculty (see FSH 3560). Clinical faculty will be reviewed at least once every five years thereafter as determined by the unit’s by-laws. The committee for third-year review, periodic review and promotion, as defined by the unit’s by-laws, shall include tenure-track faculty from the unit. [add. 7-14]

D-3. Assistant Professors. Assistant professors are considered for promotion before the end of their sixth year in that rank. When an assistant professor has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she will be considered again no less frequently than at five-year intervals. The review may be delayed upon the request of the assistant professor and the concurrence of the unit administrator and the dean. Assistant professors who have served eight years in that rank shall be considered for promotion following the process established in this policy. [ed. 7-97, 7-02, 1-10, ren. 7-14]

D-4. Associate Professors. Associate professors are considered for promotion before the end of their seventh year in that rank. If review for promotion to full professor is scheduled during the fifth, sixth or seventh full year after the award of tenure then the promotion review may, if it meets substantially similar criteria and goals of the post tenure review, take the place of the periodic performance review required by the board of regents. (RGP II G 6g) When an associate professor has been considered for promotion and not promoted, he or she should be considered again within five years. The review may be delayed upon the request of the associate professor and the concurrence of the unit administrator and the dean. [ed. 7-02, 1-10, ren. 7-14]

D-5. Early Consideration for Promotion. In addition to those whose consideration is mandated by this schedule, a faculty member may be considered for promotion at an earlier time if nominated for consideration by a faculty member of the recommending unit whose rank is higher than that of the nominee. It is suggested that the faculty member proposing to make the nomination confer with the administrator concerned on the merits of giving early
consideration to the nominee. If it is determined that the nomination is to be made, the evaluation process is initiated by the recommending faculty member using a copy of the form that appears at the end of this section. The remainder of the evaluation process is the same for these additional candidates as it is for those regularly scheduled for consideration. A faculty member may request consideration of himself or herself for promotion but such a request does not require that the evaluation and recommendation process be carried out. [ed. 7-97, 1-10, rev. 1-08, ren. 7-14]

D-6. Credit for Prior Experience. In cases involving prior equivalent experience, promotion may be considered following less than the usual period of service. In particular, a new faculty member with comparable experience (see FSH 3050 B) from other institutions in relation to the expectations set forth in his/her position description may be granted credit by the provost for such experience up to a maximum of four years. [rev. 1-10, ren. 7-14]

E. EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION AT THE UNIT LEVEL. [ed. 7-97, 1-10]

E-1. Unit Criteria. The faculty of each department or equivalent unit establishes, as appropriate for the unit, specific criteria that are consistent with criteria in FSH 1565 C for promotion in rank. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role of interdisciplinary activity. Unit criteria are subject to review by the college standing committee on tenure and promotion for consistency with the college criteria. Such criteria may be revised at any time by a majority vote of the unit faculty, but they must be reviewed for possible changes at intervals not to exceed five years (see FSH 1590). Revisions may not be retroactive but, for promotion evaluation purposes, are considered proportionately in conjunction with criteria that were previously in force. [rev. 1-08, 1-10]

E-2. Formal Promotion Review.

a. The formal evaluation for promotion requires assessing the faculty member’s performance in meeting the criteria for promotion. To initiate the formal promotion evaluation, the unit administrator (or college dean if the unit administrator is under consideration for promotion) obtains the position descriptions for the relevant period (maintained in the unit office), annual performance evaluations, and the third year review (FSH 3520 G-4) if conducted while in the current rank, including all narratives, the professional portfolio (from the faculty member)(see FSH 3570), summary scores of the student evaluations of all classes taught (from Institutional Research and Assessment), and the curriculum vitae, and reviews the latter for completeness and accuracy with the faculty member. [ren. & rev. 1-08, rev. 1-10]

b. Copies of documents referred to in E-2 a. and copies of the unit, college, and university criteria for promotion are made available to each person participating in the review at the unit and higher levels. Supplementary material, if any, shall be available for review in the unit office. [See FSH 3380 D.] The results of the student evaluations of teaching must be carefully weighed and used as a factor in assessing the teaching component in promotion decisions. [rev. 7-98, 1-10, 7-10, ren. 1-08, 7-14]

c. 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 3520 G-5 d. shall be used. [add. 1-10, rev. & ren. 7-14]

d. Members of the faculty of the candidate’s unit (or group of small units joined together for this purpose) whose ranks are higher than that of the candidate are afforded an opportunity to submit their opinions and recommendations on the candidate’s promotion on the lower portion of the front page of the prescribed form. The unit administrator making the recommendation will solicit, and address in his/her summary, the evaluative comments regarding the candidate from all faculty members (within the candidate’s unit) of a higher rank than the candidate, from interdisciplinary program directors and/or center administrators (if applicable). Any person having a familial or other similar significant relationship with the candidate is not permitted to serve in any capacity in the review process. Each unit is responsible for developing procedures in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). A copy of the form to be used in transmitting the recommendations made at each stage of evaluation for promotion appears as the last two pages of this section. [See FSH 3380 D.] [rev. & ren. 1-08, 1-10, ren. 7-14]
f. The unit administrator completes the first section on the back of the recommendation form. In arriving at
a conclusion, the administrator carefully considers the following (particularly as they relate to the factors
listed in B): the information obtained from the curriculum vitae, the position descriptions (including all
narratives), the conference with the candidate, the recommendations solicited from the candidate’s
colleagues, the external reviewers, interdisciplinary administrators and/or center administrators (if
applicable) and the results of annual student evaluations of teaching (in the cases of teaching members of
the faculty). [ren. 1-08, rev. & ren. 1-10, rev. 7-14]

E-3. External Review: In addition to E-2 above, tenure-track faculty will require an external review. The unit
administrator will request an evaluation of the candidate’s performance from three to five appropriate external
reviewers, who should include faculty at peer institutions. Persons asked to write peer reviews should be at, or
above, the rank the candidate is seeking. The names of at least two of these reviewers will be selected from a
list suggested by the candidate. (Also see External Peer Review Guidelines on the Provost website at
http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/tenure.) Final selection of external reviewers should take place at the
unit level, in accordance with college policy. The letter of request will include the candidate’s curriculum vitae,
position descriptions for the relevant period (including all narratives), the professional portfolio, and up to four
elements of the candidate’s scholarly and creative work. In addition, the letter of request shall include
instructions that the candidate be evaluated in relation to the candidate’s personal context statement and unit and
college criteria. When all deliberations within the university are completed, the external reviewers’ evaluations
will be shown to the faculty member after every effort has been made to ensure the reviewers’ anonymity. [ren.
1-08, rev. 1-10, ren. & rev. 7-14]

E-4. Forwarding Materials.

a. Before forwarding the materials to the college, the unit administrator shall forward the following to the
candidate:

| Written findings of the unit and/or committee’s recommendation and vote [rev. 7-10] |
| His or her written recommendation which shall include strengths as well as weaknesses as perceived at the unit level [rev. 7-10] |

The candidate has one week from receipt of the above to provide written clarification if he or she believes
his or her record or the unit criteria for promotion have been misinterpreted. Any such clarification is
forwarded with the rest of the candidate’s materials to the college.

b. The unit administrator then forwards the following items to the dean:

| His or her completed copy of the recommendation form for each person considered |
| The forms submitted by individual faculty members, including responses from external reviewers, interdisciplinary administrators and/or center administrators (if applicable) |
| A summary of votes and any comments |
| Any clarification received from the candidate as noted in “a” above. [rev. 7-08, 1-10, ren. 1-08, 7-14] |

E-5. The names of the members of the unit committee are made public after the committee’s recommendations
have been forwarded. [rev. 7-14]

E-6. Unit Administrator Under Review for Promotion. If a unit administrator is under consideration for
promotion, the forms completed by the faculty members concerned, are forwarded directly to the dean and the
dean is responsible for making the summary. (See FSH 3320 C-2) [rev. 1-08, 7-14]

F. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL.

F-1. College Standing Committee. 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 bylaws of the college. [rev. 1-08]
F-2. **College Criteria.** Each college shall have bylaws, adopted by the college faculty, specifying criteria consistent with FSH 1565 C for granting promotion to specific ranks in that college. The criteria shall include a statement regarding the role ascribed to interdisciplinary activity. College criteria must be compatible with the university-wide criteria as specified in FSH 1565 and section A above and are subject to approval by the provost. The dean or the faculty (by petition of 20 percent or more of the faculty members of the college) may initiate consideration for revision of the criteria at any time. [rev. 1-08, 1-10]

F-3. **College Standing Committee Recommendations.** The college standing committee makes recommendations to the dean and provost on promotion of individual faculty members.

F-4. **Dean’s Recommendations.** The dean considers the recommendations made by the college’s committee on promotion and makes a written recommendation. It is advisable that the dean confer collectively with the unit administrators about the merits of the faculty members whom they are recommending for promotion. Before forwarding the materials to the provost, the findings of the college committee(s) and the dean are relayed in writing to the candidate indicating strengths as well as weaknesses as perceived at the college level. The candidate has one week from receipt of the findings to provide written clarification if he or she believes his or her record or the college criteria for promotion have been misinterpreted. Any such clarification is forwarded with the candidate’s materials to the provost. [rev. 7-98, 1-08, 7-10, ren. & rev. 1-10]

F-5. The names of the members of the college committee are made public after the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded. [ren. 1-10]

G. **REPORT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FORWARDED.** When an administrator forwards a recommendation to the next higher level, he or she simultaneously reports, in writing, the recommendation to the candidate concerned and to those who have submitted recommendations on that candidate. If the recommendation is negative, then reasons for the negative recommendation are transmitted in writing to the candidate. [ed. 7-97, ren. 1-08, rev. 1-10]

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

H-1. All individual recommendations, together with the summary recommendations of the unit administrator, the recommendations of the college committee and those of the dean, including all narratives, are forwarded for review by the provost. Any individually signed recommendations are placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. [rev. 1-08, 1-10]

H-2. A University Promotions Committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost, is named each year. The committee reviews each promotion recommendation with specific reference to university guidelines and to the criteria established by the unit and college of the faculty member concerned and reflected in the faculty member’s position descriptions for the relevant period. This review involves full consideration of the material that was used in making the recommendations at the unit and college levels. [ed. 7-10]

a. One third of the committee’s membership is randomly selected by the provost from the previous year’s committee; the remaining members are selected by the provost and the chair and vice chair of the Faculty Senate from nominations submitted by the senate. The random selection of carryover members is done one week before the senate makes its nominations. The delegation representing the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members who should be representative of the breadth of the disciplines within the college. The delegation representing the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members from the college—two each from (a) faculty with greater than 50% teaching and research appointments and (b) faculty with greater than 50% University of Idaho Extension appointments. The delegations from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large each nominate two faculty members from their constituencies. [rev. 7-12]

b. Membership of the committee, including carryover members, consists of the provost (chair), two representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College...
of Agricultural & Life Sciences, one representative from each of the other colleges, the vice president for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies, and the vice provost for academic affairs. The provost, the vice president for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies, and the vice provost for academic affairs shall be ex officio members without vote. Applications of faculty members being considered for promotion from the University Library, Law Library, Counseling and Testing Center, and the University of Idaho Extension will be represented by the University Promotions Committee's representative whose own position most closely matches that of the applicant. The names of the members of the University Promotions Committee will be made public as soon as the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded. The chair will conduct voting on candidates by closed ballots. [rev. 7-97, 1-10, ed. and ren. 1-08, 7-12, ed. 7-09]

H-3. A presumption in favor of promotion shall exist for each candidate who comes to the University Promotions Committee with a favorable recommendation from all of the committees that have considered the matter at the unit and college level, from the unit chair and dean directly involved, and from a majority of the faculty members who submitted a recommendation pursuant to section E-2.d. above. Upon showing that the lower level recommendations were made without due regard for the university criteria for the rank sought pursuant to section 1565, Faculty Ranks and Responsibilities, the presumption shall be overcome, and in such case the University Promotions Committee shall state in writing the reasons for the decision. [ed. 7-98, ren. 1-08, rev. 1-10]

I. APPEAL. If the President’s decision is against promotion, the faculty member has the right of appeal. [See 3840.]

J. ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION CONSIDERATIONS. The process of promotion considerations is carried out annually. The unit level evaluation for promotion begins summer/early fall and shall follow the timetable provided by the provost and published on the provost’s website. [ed. 7-99, rev. 1-10]

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

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 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. [ed. 11-11]

____________________________________________________
(Unit Administrator)

____________________________________________________
(Unit Administrator, Faculty with joint appointments)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

============================ (cut along these lines) ====================================== RECOMMENDATIONS

Each reviewing individual enters his/her 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. [ed. 11-11]

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 having a rank higher than the candidate. Of these, _____ judged the candidate’s performance of assigned duties to be exceptional, _____ judged it to be above expectations, _____ meets expectations, _____ below expectations, and _____ unacceptable. [ed. 7-10, 11-11]

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

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. [add. 11-11]

___________________________________
(Committee Chair)

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. [ed. 7-10]

___________________________________
(President)
PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO

PREAMBLE: This section was introduced to the Handbook July 1998 as section B of 1565. For better ease of access it was made its own section in January 2008. In January 2010 this section was revised to reflect changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms that simplified the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process and a new section C was added. In July 2014 changes were made to clarify that external reviews are not required of all faculty and ensure that tenure-track faculty review course material taught by non-tenure-track faculty. More information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 1-10, 7-14]

CONTENTS:

A. Introduction
B. Professional Portfolio for Third-Year Review, Tenure, and/or Promotion
C. Academic Unit Context Statement

A. INTRODUCTION. Evidence of effective teaching, scholarship and creative activities, outreach and extension, and organizational leadership (FSH 1565 C) is to be provided in a professional portfolio submitted by the faculty member for the third year review (FSH 3520 G-4) and when under consideration for tenure and promotion. The professional portfolio should be designed to complement the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae and position descriptions. For evaluative purposes, faculty members may also submit a portfolio on an annual basis. The professional portfolio should address all aspects of the faculty member’s responsibilities as defined in their position description (FSH 3050). The preparation of a portfolio encourages one’s growth and development in all relevant areas. Through the collection and organization of a variety of materials in combination with self-reflection, one gains an overview of one’s responsibilities as a member of the academic community. An individual faculty member understands best what he or she does and the portfolio explains the nature of the faculty member’s activities so that others will understand them fully for purposes of assessment. The format and method of presentation of the professional portfolio is a matter of faculty choice, samples are available on the Provost website. [rev. 7-00, ed. 1-08, rev. 1-10, 7-14]

B. PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW, TENURE, AND/OR PROMOTION. Diversity rather than uniformity is encouraged since the portfolio serves to reflect the academic discipline and position description of each faculty member—the context within which each faculty member does his/her job. Following are the minimum requirements for the contents of a professional portfolio. The faculty member may provide additional material that offers further insight into his/her responsibilities and accomplishments. (The portfolio that is forwarded for tenure and/or promotion is limited to twelve pages. At the candidate’s discretion, additional material may be prepared and made available to all who are evaluating his/her suitability for tenure and/or promotion. This additional material, if any, is available for review in the departmental office, but is not forwarded with the packet.) [ed. and rev. 7-00, ed. 1-08, rev. 1-10]

B-1. Personal Context Statement describing the faculty member’s scholarly responsibilities within his or her academic unit. The personal context statement is written by the faculty member (limited to two pages) and reviewed by the relevant unit/college/center administrators. The statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by interdisciplinary programs or research centers, the requirements of joint appointments or other special circumstances. [rev. 1-10]

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

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

B-5. In the case of instructional or extension faculty, evidence of evaluation of course/extension material content by tenure track faculty. [add. 7-14]

C. ACADEMIC UNIT CONTEXT STATEMENT [add. 1-10]

C-1. An Academic Unit Context Statement is included in the package of materials sent to external peer reviewers, when applicable, (see FSH 3520 G 5 b and 3560 E 3). It is intended to inform reviewers about the academic environment at the University of Idaho so that reviewers may consider the similarities and differences between their own academic units and that of the candidate for tenure or promotion. The Academic Unit Context Statement shall be developed and approved by the faculty of the academic unit and reviewed regularly for accuracy. Each faculty member may clarify their unique responsibilities within their Personal Context Statement (see B-1 above). [rev. 7-14]

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

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

a. The usual allocation of effort as described in the position descriptions of faculty in the academic unit.
b. A description of the annual review process and annual performance criteria.
c. Unit/College criteria for promotion and tenure.
d. Resources available to support scholarly activity such as travel, teaching assistants, etc.
e. Other information deemed useful to those outside the academic unit.
Policy Map for New Promotion Tenure Policy (rev. 10/18/19)

Note: This is a rough outline of parallel policies. It does not imply equivalent policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW POLICY</th>
<th>OLD 3520</th>
<th>OLD 3560 Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-1 a</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-1 b</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-1 c</td>
<td>1420 E-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-1 d</td>
<td>B-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-1 e</td>
<td>E-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-2 a</td>
<td>A, E-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-2 b</td>
<td>B, F-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-3 a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-3 b</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-3 c</td>
<td>C, E, G-1, H-2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-3 d</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-4 a</td>
<td>3530 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 A-4 b</td>
<td>3530 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 B-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 B-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 B-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-1 a-1</td>
<td>D-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-1 a-2</td>
<td>D-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-1 a-3</td>
<td>D-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-1 a-4</td>
<td>D-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-1 b</td>
<td>D-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-1 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-2 a</td>
<td>F-1, F-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-2 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 a</td>
<td>F-1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 b</td>
<td>F-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 c</td>
<td>F-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 d</td>
<td>F-5, F-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 e</td>
<td>F-1, F-2, F-4 D-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 f</td>
<td>F-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 g</td>
<td>E-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 h</td>
<td>G-7 E-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-3 i</td>
<td>E-2D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 a</td>
<td>F-9A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 b</td>
<td>F-9B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 f</td>
<td>F-9C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 C-4 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 D-1 a</td>
<td>G-5A E-2A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 D-1 b</td>
<td>G-5A E-2A 3570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 D-1 c</td>
<td>E-2B 3570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why are we revising our P&T procedures?
Our current procedure is a complex web of separate policies that are overlapping, inconsistent, and incomplete. They contradict other UI policies as well as unit/college bylaws. This complexity makes it difficult to understand and even more challenging to follow properly.

What are the goals of this revision?
1. To unify provisions of the FSH regarding the promotion and tenure procedure at all levels (unit, college, and university).
2. To help faculty navigate promotion and tenure by clarifying the procedure.
3. To free reviewers to concentrate on the candidate’s materials, not on complex procedures and process interpretation.

Are we changing our P&T criteria?
No. The proposed policy addresses the procedure for promotion and tenure evaluation. It does not change criteria for P&T evaluation. Criteria will remain in unit/college bylaws.

What has changed from our current policy?
All of the procedures have been rewritten. Many changes have been made to provide clarity and create a better process. In addition, the following noteworthy changes have been introduced:
1. A single process for evaluating both promotion and tenure that also allows for evaluation of promotion or tenure alone as needed.
2. Clarity regarding the promotion of non-tenure track faculty.
3. Uniform committee structures across units and colleges and clearly defined criteria for committee membership.
4. Delegation of “administrative guidance” elements to the provost.
5. Uniform dossier requirements including content, submission timelines, and supplemental materials.
6. Further clarification of special circumstances.

Is this different than a version I saw last April or a few weeks ago?
Yes. The draft policy has been continuously revised in response to input from various constituencies and legal counsel.

Where is the “redline” version of the old policy?
This policy incorporates and completely reorganizes the content of three existing FSH sections (3520, 3560, 3570), as well as the content of numerous unit and college bylaws. A
“redline” version (i.e. one that shows changes) would be nearly impossible to create and of little utility to the reader. Instead, we have created a “map” that shows where corresponding policies are located between the new and old versions. This map doesn’t include every single detail, but it will guide you to the general location of parallel issues. This new policy will be added in two new chapters: FSH 3500 and 3510. FSH 3530 will remain with proposed updates.

**Who has already provided initial feedback?**
1. **Spring 2019:** Feedback was collected from Faculty Senate (1 meeting), Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)(2 meetings), and unit administrators (2 meetings).
2. **Fall 2019:** Feedback was collected from deans (2 meetings), associate deans (3 meetings), Faculty Senate (1 meeting), and FAC (4 meetings).

**What if this policy is different from my unit/college bylaws?**
This policy contains the entire P&T process so that procedures are not needed in unit or college bylaws (the most frequent source of current conflicts). FSH policies supersede bylaws so there will be an organized effort next spring to remove conflicting policy from bylaws.

**Why are clinical faculty not specifically addressed in this policy?**
Clinical ranks are addressed in FSH 1565 and 3530. As a clinical faculty member goes through the P&T process, they fall under the “non-tenure track” provisions according to the appropriate rank. This is also true for research professors.

**Who wrote the new policy?**
The initial draft was created by former Policy Coordinator, Liz Brandt, in fall 2018. A small group of people familiar with the P&T process revised the policy throughout 2018-19 year (Liz Brandt, Torrey Lawrence, Ann Thompson, Mary Stout, and Kim Rytter). Revisions have continued in fall 2019 and feedback was collected from many different constituencies to arrive at a final version that was approved by FAC on Tuesday, October 5, 2019.

**What are the next steps?**
If approved, all administrative guidance materials will be updated by the Provost in early spring 2020. Training will also be revised and provided to those directly involved in March 2020. The new procedures would go into effect on April 1, 2020.

---

**Questions Added Since October 17 FAQ**

**Why is the former “portfolio” now limited to eight pages?**
The page limit of the candidate’s narrative section (3500 D-1-b) generated significant discussion. Some faculty argued for as little as three pages while others advocated for no limit. In the end, FAC approved a limit of eight pages, balancing the need to keep the portfolio concise while still providing sufficient space for the candidate to present his or her case.

**Is a department context statement no longer required?**
Correct. It is no longer required. This was very problematic in our previous practice because department context statements varied greatly, if they existed at all, and many were extremely general in nature. The new policy allows for the candidate to provide context for their specific position and role at UI. Nothing prevents a candidate from using a department context statement, if they chose to do so.

**Why was the “presumption in favor of promotion” not included in the new policy?**
The current policy regarding presumption in favor of promotion (FSH 3560 H-3) was largely misunderstood. It was intended to strengthen the position of a case that had strong support at lower levels; however, it was sometimes interpreted to effectively prevent review of a case by the university level promotion committee, thereby weakening the review process and creating inconsistency. It was removed so that all cases are reviewed in the same manner.

**Do I get to choose between the old and new policy?**
The new policies take effect in spring/summer 2020, but faculty hired prior to approval may elect to use the timing provisions of the old policy or the new policy. The transition details are specified in 3500-I and 3510-H.

**Questions?**
Contact Torrey Lawrence with questions (tlawrence@uidaho.edu or 885-7941).
Feedback on the New P&T Policy  
Collected via online survey Oct. 18-25, 2019  
All input was considered by the Faculty Affairs Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment/Suggestion</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - A. Introduction</td>
<td>Under &quot;Tenurable Ranks&quot;, the only ranks that should be tenurable are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. All others should be non-tenurable. This could be particularly problematic with research professors, which are almost exclusively on soft money.</td>
<td>Incorrect. The new policy reflects current practice and ranks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - A. Introduction</td>
<td>Looks great!</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - B. Role of the Provost</td>
<td>The provost's role should be limited strictly to rejection for cause (i.e. academic or workplace misconduct).</td>
<td>The new policy does not expand the provost's role but rather provides further clarity of that role in one location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - B. Role of the Provost</td>
<td>This section is clear. My only hesitation is around the B-1 statement. I would suggest editing it so that it pertains to any minor responsibilities and does not include the final tenure and promotion recommendation to the president. In other words, I would not be in support of anyone else subbing for the provost for the actual decision making. If there is ever any appeal from the tenure/promotion decision, the provost is the one involved in the hearings, so it would not make sense to have anyone else making the recommendation but then having the provost defend that decision.</td>
<td>This could be added, however, the provost does have the authority to delegate hearings participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - B. Role of the Provost</td>
<td>I wanted additional clarification on timeline for the important roles outlined by the provost. While there is a timeline provided for when P&amp;T packet materials are submitted by the candidate, there is no corollary timeline for when any mandatory guidance will be released. Particularly I would be concerned about formatting requirements for the CV, formatting for the dossier, etc. Many candidates begin preparing materials early. Is there some assurance that new formatting requirements would not be released a month before the due date? A week? In terms of shared governance, it would be helpful to see an expected timeline outlined for the provost’s duties as well.</td>
<td>Considered by FAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - C. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Consideration</td>
<td>C1c. This seems squarely aimed at clinical faculty and those seeking promotion to full. I would rather it be two years, rather than three years before promotion could be sought again. It is not clear who is served by this policy. I do not know of very many people who are going up every year, such that it causes a labor burden. And two years time would be sufficient for most folks to get another book, grant, or a few more papers out the door. If we want to encourage the associates who are in a slump, giving them only one shot every three years certainly discourages them from pursuing the promotion. In addition, there should be some clarification about whether letter writers or even letters might be used again? Asking an external reviewer to write ANOTHER letter for someone's promotion send a particular message to that letter writer, in smaller disciplines it may be difficult to identify new letter writers that are experts... and if the cause for failure to be promoted in round 1 was not due to external evaluation, but some other internal matter, I doubt many people would ever try again.</td>
<td>Yes, this does apply to NTT faculty and those seeking promotion to full. Note: with the simple approval of the dean there is no restriction. Regarding letters, we are leaving this to the discretion of chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - C. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Consideration</td>
<td>The extension for tenure in the event of having or adopting a child needs to be automatic and not something that requires writing to the provost. This shouldn't be something that is discretionary. Most institutional automatically grant this extension and we should too. (Faculty do not HAVE to go up late in these cases - but they automatically have time added to their clocks).</td>
<td>It is automatic but they must tell the university in writing so that employment processes are followed and documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSH 3500 - C. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Consideration</td>
<td>Clear!</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FSH 3500 - C.  Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Consideration

C.1.c doesn’t solve any real problem. It creates new problems by discouraging talented people and creating unnecessary barriers to promotion. It solves the problem of faculty going up only months after being denied without significant changes to their portfolio. This is to protect time of faculty and external reviewers involved in this labor-intensive process. FAC reconsidered and decided not to change the timeline.

FSH 3500 - D.  Promotion and Tenure Dossier

Why is there a limit of 8 pages instead of 12?
D2C What other evidence of teaching effectiveness would we expect here? Also, why are summer teaching evaluations included in teaching evaluation summaries, when contracts and PDs do NOT include summer for AY faculty? This should be addressed explicitly.

There is an error in this sentence: “Because reviewers are asked to provide independent and objective review, reviewers shall not have a personal or professional relationship with the candidate that could prevent a biased assessment.” (I would hope we would WANT to prevent a biased assessment, but here it seems that NOT have a relationships that could prevent a biased assessment?) Either you mean the relationship could prevent an objective assessment or you mean that could lead to a biased assessment.

D2E. Why are deans not also weighing in on the external reviewers and their appropriateness? It seems that there should be someone beyond the chair and candidate involved in this selection.

D3. This timeline is not clear. The consideration for P&T begins in fall. I would hope that candidates would submit to the chair materials for external review by end of May so that external reviewers can be contacted over the summer so that a dossier complete with external reviews would be available to departments by Sept. “Prior to the beginning of the semester” is too late and/or too vague for those needing external reviews. For NTT folks or those without scholarship pieces this timeline is probably fine.

A shorter written was requested by many people. There was much discussion between 3-12 pages. FAC settled on 8. --
D2C other evidence is described in FSH 1565, thus the reference. --
Summers are currently counted. The new policy clarifies “all” evaluations are considered. --
D2E We chose to leave this to unit administrators who know their field best. -
- D3 This is addressed in the policy.

FSH 3500 - D.  Promotion and Tenure Dossier

I have grave concerns about the state of bylaw approvals. Many units in the University have passed at least one set of bylaws at the unit level that have been sitting with legal for “final approval” for years. This seems an untenable system and runs counter to ideals of shared governance. If unit bylaws set the annual review process, performance criteria, and criteria for P&T it seems absolutely vital that those bylaws be approved by legal in a timely manner. As it stands, most units are operating under the assumption that the bylaws that they have voted on in good faith are their operating bylaws, when in fact this is not the case. Junior faculty are tasked with deciding "which bylaws" apply to them, or are also attempting to operate in good faith that the bylaws passed before they even arrived might eventually "get approved." This is an ad hoc system that must be addressed. I know it is somewhat outside the scope of this report, but it is directly tied to the stability of the P&T system. I hope that it becomes a priority.

This is a valid concern. We have a plan for bylaw approvals (and necessary changes) once this new policy is approved. It will begin in February and we expect approvals by August 2020.

FSH 3500 - D.  Promotion and Tenure Dossier

Please consider the following:

D-2, e: External Peer Reviews. The unit administrator shall obtain a minimum of three external reviews of the candidate’s performance. . .

This section requires a minimum of three external reviews, but it does not mention a maximum number of external reviews. A maximum of five external reviews is recommended.

We incorporated this change.
FSH 3500 - D. Promotion and Tenure Dossier

FSH 3500 - D-1 b. I was disheartened to see that the page limit for Candidate Statements appears to have decreased from 12 pages (3570 - B) to 8 pages. If this decrease is accurate, I would like the Faculty Affairs Committee to clarify their reasons for this change.

See above.

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

Yes! Finally excluding students!!

E1a3. Specify a ballot or whether a voice/byhand vote is allowed or not. Must ballots be signed?

E.1.b. Specify the ballot to be used.

E.2.b. Having the chair provide a report (even a brief rationale for the vote) is a considerable amount of work in the larger colleges. Perhaps if the dean or AD serves in this role they should be providing the rationale. When you have 10 cases, I would imagine there would be a great deal of redundant language in these brief rationales. This would be extra work in our college, where the dean convenes the committee, takes notes and from the notes and conversations composes the dean’s letter. This would add another week to the process to have a chair submit the committee rationale to the dean.

Yes, student feedback is collected but they will not sit on P&T committees. -- We added language to require a signed ballot to be provided by the Provost. -- Correct, but many colleges do provide college committee reports. It must be consistent.

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

One issue that [faculty member] caught that our committee hasn’t yet discussed is regarding composition of college P&T committees. Section V.B.1. states that each unit shall have one representative. For the CBE, which has two units, that would mean a committee of two. Yet the Business department, which has six majors, has in the past appointed one representative for each major.

FAC suggested a clarification for CBE due to their unique structure.

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

Our department currently allows all faculty to vote. I have great concerns with the formation of a five faculty panel. It seems a chair could easily set up a committee that would be in favor or against a particular candidate. In other words, this sets up the possibility of discrimination and unfair process.

This would need to be remedied by either allowing entire faculties to vote OR having a random process for selecting committees. This is basic research methods in social science.

All faculty will vote as they do now (see E-2). The committee will now be elected, not appointed.

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

"1. The committee shall be composed of five members who shall elect a chair from among their tenured members. At least three of the committee members must be tenured faculty members in the unit."

I contend that it is inappropriate to require the committee passing judgment on clinical faculty to be primarily from the ranks of tenured faculty. Suggest revising to have the committee reflect the designation of the individual.

Considered by FAC regarding NTT (not just clinical).

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

Tenure faculty should have a majority of tenure line faculty on their review committees, and clinical faculty should have a majority of clinical faculty on their review committees.

Considered by FAC regarding NTT (not just clinical).

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

I am concerned with the number of tenured faculty required to be on promotion committees for clinical faculty. There is a history of tenured faculty not understanding the nature of the clinical faculty position, and evaluating us based on the expectations of tenured faculty. Our positions are extremely varied and different, and our promotion committees should be primarily comprised of clinical faculty who understand the nuances and variety encompassed in our positions.

Considered by FAC regarding NTT (not just clinical).

FSH 3500 - E. Unit Level Review

Section E, Unit Level Review Dictates that the unit committee must be comprised of five members, at least three of whom must be tenured.

Considered by FAC regarding NTT (not just clinical).

For clinical faculty, why are the majority of members tenured? The majority should be comprised of clinical faculty who better understand clinical positions.
The college promotion and tenure committee will be voting on the promotion of clinical faculty, yet clinical faculty are not represented on that committee. Suggest separate committees: one for tenure-line and one for clinical.

Tenure faculty should have a majority of tenure line faculty on their review committees, and clinical faculty should have a majority of clinical faculty on their review committees.

I am concerned with the number of tenured faculty required to be on promotion committees for clinical faculty. There is a history of tenured faculty not understanding the nature of the clinical faculty position, and evaluating us based on the expectations of tenured faculty. Our positions are extremely varied and different, and our promotion committees should be primarily comprised of clinical faculty who understand the nuances and variety encompassed in our positions.

Section F, College Level Review Dictates that the college committee must be comprised of three tenured members.

For clinical faculty, why are the majority of members tenured? The majority should be comprised of clinical faculty who better understand clinical positions.

"The committee shall include tenured faculty members." That could be construed in one of two ways. First, of the required positions on the committee, at least two need to be tenured. Second, the committee will be comprised of all tenured faculty members. As above, I suggest having a separate committee for clinical promotion. I’d also suggest infusing clinical faculty members into the university committee. Omitting them (us) is an indication that they (we) are not valued in the process, when we all know we rely on each other to make the U of I the great institution it is.

Tenure faculty should not be the only faculty reviewing clinical faculty at this junction.

I did not see that there was any way to appeal if the process was faulty or unfair or something like that. Should there be?

The committee shall include tenured faculty members. "Shall include" does not mean all are tenured. It means at least one.

Appeals are covered in H-3.

I am concerned with the number of tenured faculty required to be on promotion committees for clinical faculty. There is a history of tenured faculty not understanding the nature of the clinical faculty position, and evaluating us based on the expectations of tenured faculty. Our positions are extremely varied and different, and our promotion committees should be primarily comprised of clinical faculty who understand the nuances and variety encompassed in our positions.

Section G, University Level Review The committee shall include tenured faculty members.

For clinical faculty, why are the majority of members tenured? The majority should be comprised of clinical faculty who better understand clinical positions.

I was unclear from the report if the provost gets an actual counted vote at the University level P&T Committee. As-is, it reads that they do not, though their recommendation report will hold great weight with the President. It would be helpful for additional clarification if that report stands alone, or carries a counted "vote" as we conceive it as part of the actual P&T Committee.

We added "without vote" to the policy.
If we are going through the trouble to make changes, the deadlines should also be made clear here. The 24-36 months, make it seem as though it is a rolling evaluation rather than a routine process that happens almost always in the Spring term. While we are standardizing things, it seems making this something that happens in Spring with a dossier due before close of fall term would make sense. "The dossier is due prior to the beginning of Spring term that would fall after the 24th month but before the 36th month of employment."

This comment assumes all faculty are hired in August. They are not. The policy must address all hiring possibilities.

I think this process remains the most vague. While the requirements for committee and evaluation are relatively clear, upper-administration’s duties are not. Are candidates notified in writing that they passed Third Year Review? If not, what is the reasoning for this? It is standard business practice to inform employees about the results of major performance evaluations. As I understand it, as of last year, Third Year Review candidates were not informed if they “passed.” Instead the expectation is "no news is good news." While they see the letter written by their Dean to the Provost office, a lack of final confirmation/communication is troubling. This is not standard at most peer institutions. Candidates have an expectation of receiving a letter from upper administration confirming that they are meeting standards. This paperwork is additional good faith that faculty rely upon. It builds a paper trail that should reflect their progress towards tenure. Removing a final reporting function seems like a step away from shared governance. There should be duties beyond mere "record keeping."

There is no “pass” or “fail” in this process. The candidate receives all reports. If any employment action is taken, it is done through other policies in FSH, not part of the third year review. – We added a required response from the dean. FYI Current policy does not require a response from anyone above the dean.

All people participating in the process should be instructed to give appropriate deference to the opinions of the department and of the outside reviewers who are the most qualified people to assess the teaching and scholarship of the candidate.

We have multiple levels of review for a variety of reasons. To defer to department/external would obviates the reasons for multiple levels of review.

I think it is important that promotion for clinical faculty be primarily considered by other clinical faculty while tenure and promotion for tenure track faculty should remain in the hands of faculty with tenure. While we value the feedback of tenure track faculty, the majority of faculty reviewing a candidate’s promotion for a clinical position should also be clinical faculty.

Under consideration by FAC regarding NTT (not just clinical).

I LOVE that we are streamlining the process across the university and I really appreciate everyone’s work on these changes!!! Having served in FAHB and seeing the inconsistencies across units, I couldn’t be any more excited to see this work! I hope we can get it approved!

Thank you.

Generally speaking, the move towards standardizing P&T procedural practices across UI is very positive. Allowing a faculty comment period is appreciated. While I feel like these policy changes are moving us towards a much better place in terms of clarifying the P&T process, I do have remaining concerns about: timeline for mandatory guidance, bylaws that have not been approved by legal...some have been outstanding for over 4 years (with no expected timeline given to any units), and a lack of a final letter/reporting function by upper administration in the Third Year Review process.

See above regarding bylaws, timeline, and final TYR letter.

My concern lies with the section stating that an associate professor must wait a full three years if she/he is unsuccessful at promotion to full. The university has started initiatives to reduce associate professor stall outs, which affects women and faculty of color more than white males. This policy will act as a deterrent for associate professors seeking promotion to full professor and will likely increase the number of associate professors on campus. I am strongly against this policy.

See above.
BEYOND THE RIGHT THING TO DO: THE VALUE OF FUNDING SOLAR IN HIGHER EDUCATION
SUSTAINABILITY

✓ STRATEGIC CORE VALUE

“We embrace our personal and social obligation to ensure the sustainability of our future.”

✓ UI CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

“We are committed to achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.”
ENERGY SECURITY

✓ ELECTRICITY COSTS INCREASING BY 5% YEAR

“When you purchase a solar array, it’s like buying your energy “in bulk” for the next 30 years, or longer, at a fixed price.”
PROJECT BACKGROUND

✓ AVAILABLE FUNDING
✓ INFRASTRUCTURE FOCUS
✓ CARBON NEUTRALITY
1. Proximity to Public
2. Payback Period
3. Aesthetic Impact
4. Location Access
5. Service Access
6. Percent of Load
7. Site Preparedness

Site Criteria & Critical Metrics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Public Prox.</th>
<th>Payback Period</th>
<th>Payback ITC</th>
<th>Aesthetic Impact</th>
<th>Location Access</th>
<th>Service Access</th>
<th>Percent of Load</th>
<th>Site Preparedness</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoup</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Lawn</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIC Roof</td>
<td>6734</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Lawn</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facil. Lot</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEB Roof</td>
<td>4044</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim Ctr.</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons</td>
<td>5486</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC Roof</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibbie Lot</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJL Roof</td>
<td>4312</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibbie</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEB Roof</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;A East</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria Comments:**
- **Public Prox.** This metric is the array’s public visibility, based on the number of TIP tags within 1/8th of a mile. 
  - >2000 = 5
  - 1000-2000 = 3
  - <1000 = 1
- **Payback Period** This metric represents how quickly a given array will generate its installation cost worth of energy. 
  - 5 = Lowest
  - 3 = Neutral
  - 1 = Highest
- **Payback ITC** This metric takes into consideration how a solar installation will affect the aesthetic of a given location. 
  - 5 = Positive
  - 3 = Neutral
  - 1 = Negative
- **Aesthetic Impact** This metric reflects the relative ease of access to the location switch gear for installation and maintenance. 
  - 5 = Easy
  - 3 = Neutral
  - 1 = Complicated
- **Location Access** This metric is the relative ease of access to the location switch gear for interconnection. 
  - 5 = High
  - 3 = Medium
  - 1 = Low
- **Service Access** This metric demonstrates what percent of the buildings consumption the array would cover. 
  - 5 = Lowest
  - 3 = Neutral
  - 1 = Highest
- **Percent of Load** Metric based on the age of the roof and amount of work required to prepare site for installation.
  - 5 = Lowest
  - 3 = Neutral
  - 1 = Highest
- **Site Preparedness** Total Score: this reveals the most suitable locations. Higher is better. Greener is better.
INTEGRATED RESEARCH AND INNOVATION CENTER (IRIC)

✓ 145.41 KW ARRAY, 393 SOLAR PANELS
✓ EQUIVALENT TO 18 HOMES
✓ $ 365,000
✓ BALLASTED RACKING SYSTEM
- 120 Panels
- 273 Panels
- 393 Solar Panels
- 145 KW Production
- 196,000 KWH Annually
- 15% of IRIC Energy
SOLAR TRAINING ACADEMY

✓ SYSTEM DESIGN
✓ ANALYZING ENERGY USE
✓ MODELING INVESTMENT RETURNS

“Historical trends show very clearly the $/watt dropping significantly every year, efficiency is increasing (which means more energy savings).”
AVERAGE MONTHLY INSOLATION

San Francisco, CA
Moscow, ID
Berlin, Germany
“DO YOU SUPPORT A STUDENT FEE INCREASE OF $5 OR LESS TO FUND ENERGY CONSERVATION INFRASTRUCTURE, SUCH AS SOLAR ARRAYS?”

UISC STUDENT SURVEY (2018)
- YES! 73%
- No 27%

ASUI STUDENT SURVEY (2018)
- YES! 69%
- No 31%
Video Link: https://youtu.be/DDLkGPmglo4
SHARED FUNDING STRATEGY
$365,000
✓ FUNDING RAISED 56%
✓ STILL SEEKING 44%
FUNDRAISING

✓ 393 PANELS X $166 = $65,000
✓ 50+ DONORS
✓ $9000

UANDIGIVE.UIDAHO.EDU/PROJECT/16664
IRIC ROOFTOP SOLAR ARRAY:

- Revenue Neutral
- Micro Grid
- Real-World Classroom
- Research Platform
- Recruitment Asset
- Scalable Design
- Student Support 93%