REGULAR FACULTY

Promotion To:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Pat Pluto

2019-20

Location: Moscow
Department of Planets

With tenure consideration
Date ______________________________
Name __________________________________________  Unit ___________________________________

Considered for promotion to the rank of ___________________________________________________________

Has served in the rank of _______________________ since ___________________________ (month/year)

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

REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Having reviewed the candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all
narratives) we concur in their completeness and accuracy. Other documentary material deemed by either of us to be
pertinent has been appended to the curriculum vitae.

___________________________________ ___________________________ _____________________
Candidate Signature  Unit Administrator Signature

Copies of the documents referenced in E-2 a. were made available to the persons or groups called upon to participate
in the evaluation of the candidate and to make recommendations on his or her promotion.

________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature

________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature, (Faculty with joint appointments)

________________________________________
Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate)

________________________________________
Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate)

(Recommendations continue on next page of form)
FSH 3560 - RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

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

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

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

There are ____ faculty members in the unit having a rank higher than that of the candidate, and ____ of these faculty have submitted evaluations of the candidate and recommendations on the proposed promotion. Of these evaluations, ____ evaluated the candidate’s performance of assigned duties to be exceptional, ____ above expectations, ____ meets expectations, ____ below expectations, and ____ unacceptable.
Moreover, ____ faculty members recommended promotion and ____ recommended against it.

_______________________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature (or person responsible for faculty vote)

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

__________________________________________________
Unit Administrator Signature (or N/A if no unit)

The college committee on promotions ____ does ____ does not recommend the proposed promotion. The committee’s vote was: ____ in favor of, and ____ against the promotion, and there were ____ abstentions.

__________________________________________________
College Committee Chair Signature

The unit administrators of this college ____ did or ____ did not meet to consider collectively all of the recommendations submitted by the units. The vote of this group was: ____ in favor of, and ____ against the promotion, and there were ____ abstentions.

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

__________________________________________________
Dean Signature

In the university-level review committee, the votes were: ____ in favor of, and ____ against the promotion, and there were ____ abstentions.

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

__________________________________________________
Provost and Executive Vice President Signature

I ____ do ____ do not approve the promotion.

__________________________________________________
President Signature
FSH 3520 - REPORT OF EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARDING OF TENURE
[rev. 2015]

Date __________________________

Candidate’s Name ______________________________________________________________________________

Current Rank ___________________________________ Unit ___________________________________________

VERIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

for ____ full years in the rank of ____________________ at ______________________________, and

for ____ full years in the rank of ____________________ at ______________________________.

REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

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

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

Candidate Signature ___________________________ Unit Administrator Signature ___________________________

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

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate) ___________________________

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Signature (when appropriate) ___________________________

(Recommendations continue on next page of form)
RECOMMENDATION ON AWARDING OF TENURE

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

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

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

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

There are ____ tenured faculty members in the unit of the candidate, and ____ of these faculty submitted a recommendation on the award of tenure. There were ____ votes in favor of and ____ votes against recommending that tenure be awarded.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Unit Administrator Signature or person responsible for faculty vote

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

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Unit Administrator Signature

The college committee on tenure ____ does ____ does not recommend that tenure be awarded.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

College Committee Chair Signature

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

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Dean Signature

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

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Provost and Executive Vice President Signature

I ____ do ____ do not approve the award of tenure.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

President Signature
Section 8.3 Promotion and Tenure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
TENURE AND PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE

September 2004

SECTION I. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION II. DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

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

SECTION III. HEARINGS

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

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

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

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

SECTION IV. MEETINGS

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. The department chair will then forward the decisions of the committee and the voting faculty to the dean of the College of Science along with a written narrative outlining the relevant discussion points.
Example: Department Committee Letter

From: Department Committee Chair  
To: Department Chair/Head or Direct Supervisor  
Date: September 2019  
Re: Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure consideration – Pat Pluto

The committee met:
1. September 8th to discuss the promotion and tenure review process. The two student representatives were charged with surveying current (and past, if possible) students for information in assessing Dr. Pluto’s performance over the past six years.
2. September 13th to discuss the Promotion and Tenure Packet. At the meeting, we discussed his contributions in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in detail. Overall, all committee members were impressed with his accomplishments. To conclude the meeting, all members submitted a completed ballot.

All committee members have reviewed and approved the content of this memorandum.

Committee Vote
For Promotion: 6  
Against Promotion: 0  
Abstentions: 1

For Tenure: 6  
Against Tenure: 0  
Abstentions: 1

RATIONALE

Teaching/Advising
- Summarize the committee’s review of evaluations, professional portfolio and CV on teaching and advising.
- Discuss student participation on the committee and the findings/contributions of the student feedback.
- Section may include advising workload and number of graduate students the candidate is mentoring and/or have completed.
- Section should have a summarizing sentence: All committee members agreed that Dr. Pluto has excellent credentials in the area of teaching and advising.

Scholarship
- Summarize the committee’s review of evaluations, professional portfolio and CV on accomplishments in scholarship.
- Summarize the review of scholarship from the external reviewers, keeping external reviewer information anonymous.
- Include how the scholarship compares at a departmental, college and national or international level.
- Section should have a summarizing sentence: All external reviewers evaluated Dr. Pluto’s accomplishments with strong letters of support. The reviewers were all impressed by the
quality of his research program, level of competitive funding, variety of research sponsors, and his excellent publication record in quality journals. In conclusion, they all favored promotion.

Service and Outreach

- Service should be weighed based on the percentage in the position description and compared to department, college and university levels of required service.

- All service activities do not need to be listed but a representation of the service done can be summarized.

- Section should have a summarizing sentence: The committee feels that by actively providing a desirable service to the University and professional organizations, he is performing his service commitments beyond the usual expectations.

Final Recommendation or summary (examples of possible final recommendation paragraphs are available):

Positive Review Example:

Dr. Pluto is a valued member of the Department of Planets at the University of Idaho. He has received several university awards. His record in the area of Teaching, Advising, Scholarship and Service is very strong, and clearly meets the requirements for promotion to associate professor. All external reviewers were impressed by his achievements. The committee fully agrees with the external reviewers, and fully expect him to achieve even greater success in research and scholarship in the future.

The committee recommends unanimously that Dr. Pat Pluto be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure.

Mixed Review Example:

The committee was split on their evaluation of Dr. Pluto’s record. While half the committee felt that his scholarship, teaching and service met or exceeded the requirements for promotion and tenure in the department and college the other committee members expressed concern over the quality of the scholarship and felt it did not meet the expectations of an Associate Professor with tenure in our department.

The committee voted as follows: 2 in favor of promotion and tenure, 2 against promotion and tenure, and 1 abstention.

Negative Review Example:

The unit committee does not recommend Dr. Pluto for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and does not recommend tenure. This determination is based on the presented record of teaching, scholarship and service.
Date: 

To: Sally Saturn, Dean, College of Glass Houses

From: Mary Mars, Department Chair, Department of Planets

Subject: Professor Pluto, Tenure and Promotion

The department chair letter is not meant to be repetitive of the committee letter but to provide a summary of the committee findings, the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate as identified by the faculty, the documentation of the faculty votes (if not in the committee letter) and to provide the recommendation of the department chair.

Opening Statement:
- Should include a brief intro of the candidate
- A clear personal recommendation of whether you support promotion and/or tenure
- A designation of your evaluation of their overall performance:
  - Exceptional
  - Above Expectations
  - Meets Expectations
  - Below Expectations
  - Unacceptable

Teaching & Advising: Indicate here the evaluation of their teaching performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of teaching and/or advising
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Scholarship & Creative Activity: Indicate here the evaluation of their research performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of research/scholarship
- Include external review findings, keeping reviewer information anonymous
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Outreach & Extension: Indicate here the evaluation of their outreach performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of outreach and/or extension
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Service & Leadership: Indicate here the evaluation of their service performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of service and/or leadership
- Collegiality can be included in this section
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Closing Statement
- Can reiterate your recommendation
- Provide any further evidence or information about the candidate
Examples for possible closing statements:

Positive Review Example:
The Tenure-Recommending Committee recognizes Professor Pluto as a tremendously valued colleague. His courses excite and challenge students at all levels, he is emerging as a leading scholar in his field, and he contributes to the community with many forms of service, all performed with skill and generosity.

As department chair, I enthusiastically support Professor Pluto’s candidacy for tenure and promotion. He is an outstanding colleague in every facet of her work. His annual performance evaluations indicate that he is one of the most dynamic faculty members in our department.

Mixed Review Example:
While the department committee voted unanimously for Dr. Pluto’s promotion and tenure, the faculty vote was not fully in favor of both promotion and tenure and two of the four external review letters expressed concern about the number of publications that Dr. Pluto has published and felt that he was not ready for promotion and tenure at this time. I have taken the time to strongly consider all the external reviewer letters as well as the findings of the faculty and the committee and reviewed the department and college by-laws. While I understand the concern of a low number of publications, Dr. Pluto’s publications meet the minimum requirement of the department. Feedback from this process will be valuable to him as he continues to pursue his career at the University of Idaho. I recommend that Dr. Pluto be promoted and tenured.

Negative Review Example:
The review of the faculty of the department of planets and the department committee unanimously determined that Dr. Pluto’s performance does not warrant promotion and tenure at this time. I concur with their recommendation.

SUMMARY (include as the last page to the letter):
Assistant Professor seeking promotion to associate with tenure

Faculty vote on tenure:
10 recommend
0 do not recommend
0 abstain

Faculty vote on promotion:
6 recommend
0 do not recommend
0 abstain

5 – exceptional
1 – above expectations
0 – meets expectations
0 – below or unacceptable

Unit Committee vote:
10 in favor
0 against
0 abstain
Dept. Chair recommendation:
YES
Joint/ID/Center Letter if Applicable

Date:

To: Dean

From: Joint administrator, Interdisciplinary administrator, CEO of __

Subject: Promotion and tenure of Dr. Pat Pluto

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

Policy allows for the dean/joint administrator to incorporate the findings and recommendations of the college committee review, administrators of the college recommendation in his/her communication. It is important to ensure in such instances, that the candidate is aware of the process.
From: College Committee Chair
To: Dean
Date: October 2019
Re: Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure consideration – Pat Pluto

The college committee letter is not meant as a repeat of previous letters but is an independent committee review and finding. Letters can go into more depth should the committee chose to but essentially needs to contain the committee vote and recommendation.

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of one faculty member from each department. The Dean of the College and the University Promotions Committee college representative attend the meeting but do not vote so there are five voting members of the committee. The committee vote to recommend tenure for Dr. Pat Pluto was five (5) to recommend and zero (0) to not recommend. The committee vote for the promotion of Dr. Joe Vandal was five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed. The committee recommends that Dr. Pat Pluto be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure.

The representative from Dr. Pluto’s department informed the committee that his department is very impressed with his work and evaluates him highly. The department feels he is doing an excellent job and he is highly committed to both teaching and research.

The committee discussed Dr. Pluto’s record and everyone was very impressed with the quality of his work. He has $1.6 million in grants for which he is the primary Principal Investigator and additional funding on grants for which he is the co-Principal Investigator. He has had 17 journal articles published since starting at the UI and is invested in promoting his students and their work.

Because of all these factors the College Committee unanimously recommends Dr. Pat Pluto for both promotion and tenure.
Date:

To: John Wiencek, Provost and Executive Vice President

From: Dean Clean, College of Glass Houses

Subject: Professor Pluto, Tenure and Promotion

Opening Statement:
- Should include a brief intro of the candidate
- A clear personal recommendation of whether you support promotion and/or tenure
- A designation of your evaluation of their overall performance:
  - Exceptional
  - Above Expectations
  - Meets Expectations
  - Below Expectations
  - Unacceptable

Teaching & Advising: Indicate here the evaluation of their teaching performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of teaching and/or advising
- Provide and overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Scholarship & Creative Activity: Indicate here the evaluation of their research performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of research/scholarship
- Include external review findings, keeping reviewer information anonymous
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Outreach & Extension: Indicate here the evaluation of their outreach performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of outreach and/or extension
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Service & Leadership: Indicate here the evaluation of their service performance
- Summarize findings at all levels of service and/or leadership
- Collegiality can be included in this section
- Provide an overall college review
- Provide a clear personal assessment

Closing Statement
- Can reiterate your recommendation
- Provide any further evidence or information about the candidate

Examples of closing statement:

Positive Review Example:
Dr. Pluto is a very productive faculty member who is becoming a national leader in the area of planets. His external letters are highly consistent in recommending him for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. He continues to attract significant competitive extramural support and he has a strong graduate program. He is helpful and plays a key role in facilitating our land grant mission. I strongly recommend him for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.
Mixed Review Example (with a recommendation for):
In closing, let me reiterate my recommendation in favor for tenure and promotion for Dr. Pluto. Our criteria for tenure and promotion requires, as a minimum, evidence of strong performance in both teaching and scholarship as well as outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. He has met these benchmarks in my opinion and I urge you to promote Dr. Pluto to Associate Professor with tenure.

Mixed Review Example (with a recommendation against):
In closing, let me reiterate my recommendation against promotion for Dr. Pluto. Our criteria for promotion requires, as a minimum, evidence of strong performance in both teaching and scholarship as well as outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. He has not met these benchmarks in most evaluations.

Negative Review Example:
In closing, let me reiterate my recommendation against tenure and promotion for Dr. Pluto. Our criteria for tenure and promotion require, as a minimum, evidence of strong performance in both teaching and scholarship as well as outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. All of the evaluation steps (Faculty, Department Chair, Faculty Governance Council and Dean) agree that he has not met these benchmarks.

SUMMARY (include as last page to the letter):

Associate Professor seeking promotion to full professor

Unit vote:
3 in favor
2 against
0 abstain

Department chair recommendation:
YES

College vote:
1 in favor
4 against
0 abstain

Dean recommendation:
NO
No candidate statement
CURRICULUM VITAE
University of Idaho

NAME: [Redacted]
DATE: [Redacted]

RANK OR TITLE: [Redacted]

DEPARTMENT: [Redacted]

OFFICE LOCATION AND CAMPUS ZIP: [Redacted]
OFFICE PHONE: [Redacted]
FAX: [Redacted]
EMAIL: [Redacted]
WEB: [Redacted]

DATE OF FIRST EMPLOYMENT AT UI: [Redacted]

DATE OF TENURE: [Redacted]

DATE OF PRESENT RANK OR TITLE: [Redacted]

EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL:

  Degrees:

  Additional Coursework for Credit:

  Certificates and Licenses:

EXPERIENCE:

  Teaching, Extension and Research Appointments:

  Academic Administrative Appointments:

  Non-Academic Employment including Armed Forces:

  Consulting:

TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

  Areas of Specialization:

  Courses Taught:

  Students Advised:

    Undergraduates:

    Graduates:

      Advised to completion of degree - major professor
      Served on graduate committee

Materials Developed:

  Workbooks, Manuals:

  Web Pages:

  Video Productions:
Displays and Posters:

Powerpoint/Slide Presentations:

Courses Developed:

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

Honors and Awards:

SCHOLARSHIP ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, Recitals:

Refereed:

Books:

Book Chapters:

Journals:

Abstracts and Proceedings:

Peer Reviewed/Evaluated:

Extension Publications:

Journals:

Abstracts and Proceedings:

Research Reports:

New Curricula Developed:

Refereed/Adjudicated (in press or submitted):

Peer Reviewed (in press or submitted):

Other:

Impact Statements:

Abstracts and Proceedings:

Research Reports:

Thesis and Dissertations:

Scholarly Presentations and Other Creative Activities:

Slide Sets/Power Point:

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

Patents:

Grants and Contracts Awarded:

Honors and Awards:

SERVICE:

Major Committee Assignments:

Professional and Scholarly Organizations:

Outreach Service:

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

Miscellaneous Extension Publications:

Popular Press:

Interview Articles:

Media Presentations:

Web Pages:

Applied Research/Demonstration Trials:

Judging:

Review Activities:

Community Service:

Honors and Awards:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

Teaching:

Scholarship:

Outreach:

Administration/Management:
CURRICULUM VITAE
University of Idaho

NAME: DATE:
RANK OR TITLE:
DEPARTMENT:
OFFICE LOCATION AND CAMPUS ZIP: OFFICE PHONE:
FAX: EMAIL:
WEB:

DATE OF FIRST EMPLOYMENT AT UI:
DATE OF TENURE: (Year or untenured)
DATE OF PRESENT RANK OR TITLE:
EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL:

- Degrees: (List most recent degree first: Degree, institution name, city, state, date, major or area of specialization.)

- Certificates and Licenses:

EXPERIENCE:

- Teaching, Extension and Research Appointments: (List position titles and locations since receipt of Bachelor’s degree)

- Academic Administrative Appointments: (List position titles and locations since receipt of Bachelor’s degree)

- Non-Academic Employment including Armed Forces: (List title, brief description, date)

- Consulting: (List company/institute name, title, brief description, date)

TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS: (Academic and Extension teaching)

- Areas of Specialization:

- Courses Taught: (title, course number, date(s))

- Students Advised:

  - Undergraduate Students: (advised to completion of degree, number per year)
  - Graduate Students:
    - Advised to completion of degree-major professor (student name, degree, and date)
    - Served on graduate committee (student name, degree, and date)

- Materials Developed: (non-scholarship activity)

- Courses Developed:

- Non-credit Classes, Workshops, Seminars, Invited Lectures, etc.:
Honors and Awards:

SCHOLARSHIP ACCOMPLISHMENTS: (Including scholarship of teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery, and application/integration)

Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, Recitals:

- **Refereed/Adjudicated**: (i.e. books, book chaps., journals, proc., abstr., etc.; provide citations-author, date, title, publisher)

- **Peer Reviewed/Evaluated**: (i.e. journals, articles, proceedings, abstracts, etc.)

- **Other**: (reports, proceedings, papers, citations and references, performances)

- **Refereed/Adjudicated (currently scheduled or submitted)**: (provide citations)

- **Peer Reviewed/Evaluated (currently scheduled or submitted)**:

- **Presentations and Other Creative Activities**: (i.e. slide sets, web pages, video productions, etc., provide date and location)

- **Professional Meeting Papers, Workshops, Showings, Recitals**: (provide date and location)

Patents: (provide title/description, patent number and date)

Grants and Contracts Awarded: (provide principal and co investigators, title, sponsor, funding dates, amount)

Honors and Awards:

SERVICE:

- **Major Committee Assignments**: (National, State, District, County, University, College, Departmental and dates)

- **Professional and Scholarly Organizations** (including memberships, committee assignments, editorial services, offices held and dates)

- **Outreach Service**: (Including popular press, interview articles, newspaper articles, workshops-seminars-tours organized, Extension impact statements)

- **Community Service**: (non-academic unrelated to employment)

Honors and Awards:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: (workshops and seminars attended)

Teaching:

Scholarship:

Outreach:

Administration/Management:
### SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

**FOR**

Dr. ________, Department of __

#### ANNUAL PERFORMANCE:

Annual performance evaluations by head of department and summary evaluation by dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Advising</th>
<th>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activities</th>
<th>Outreach &amp; Extension</th>
<th>Service &amp; Leadership</th>
<th>[Ok to add rows to accommodate older Evals]</th>
<th>Dept. Head</th>
<th>Dean/Overall Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes:**

Scoring key:

- **Y** = Met or exceeded expectations
- **N** = Did not meet expectations
- **1** = Unacceptable performance
- **2** = Below expectations
- **3** = Meets expectations
- **4** = Above expectations
- **5** = Exceptional performance

#### ANNUAL POSITION DESCRIPTION ALLOCATION:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Advising</th>
<th>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activity</th>
<th>Outreach &amp; Extension</th>
<th>Service &amp; Leadership</th>
<th>[Ok to add rows to accommodate older PDs]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes:**

Please note that the PD for 2015 is missing.

Commented [EJ(1)]: Delete this if there are no other rows to add.

Commented [EJ(2)]: Delete this if there are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>PD %</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall faculty member met or exceeded the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations defined in the position description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary/recommendations on progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance.*

*Relationship to Promotion and Tenure Process. The faculty annual performance evaluation is an administrative review. Annual evaluations are one component of the independent promotion and tenure process. See FSH 3520 and 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.
The unit administrator is responsible to solicit, discuss and consider evaluative comments from those interdisciplinary/center administrators listed in the faculty narrative. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form.\(^7\)

Faculty Comments Attached (optional). The faculty member is allowed to include comments that respond to the administrator's evaluation.

Dean's Comments Attached (optional). If there is any significant difference in the commentary, recommendations, or evaluation overall between the department chair and college dean, the dean shall include a narrative stating the reasons for these differences. The form with attachments must be returned to the faculty member and an opportunity provided for the faculty member to respond.\(^8\)

Disclosure of Conflicts\(^9\)

- If you have a conflict to disclose then you also will need to complete Form FSH 6240A.
- If there is any change in your circumstance that may give rise to potential conflicts or eliminate potential conflicts previously disclosed, then you will need to complete Form FSH 6240A within 30 days of the change.
- Disclose outside employment for compensation of more than 20 hours/week by completing FORM 6240B

I DO NOT have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts, according to FSH 6240, to report.

I DO have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts, according to FSH 6240, to report.

☐ I have submitted FSH 6240A and a plan to manage each conflict or apparent conflict to my unit administrator.

Faculty Signature Date

Unit Administrator Signature Date

\(^1\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320
\(^2\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-1
\(^3\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-2
\(^4\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-3
\(^5\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-4, 1420E
\(^6\) “At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator.” FSH 3320 A1 e
\(^7\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 3050 B-2, 3320 A-1 d, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4c, and 3560 C,E-2d
\(^8\) If there is a disagreement, see Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320 A-1 i
\(^9\) Faculty Staff Handbook section 6240
Vice Provost for Faculty

Employee Details

Employee

Employee First Name  Torrey
Employee Last Name  Lawrence
Employee ID  V00677664

Organization

Location  Moscow
Primary Division/College  Provost (Div)
Primary Unit  Office of the Provost/Exec VP

Position Responsibilities

Position Summary

The Vice Provost for Faculty will work closely with faculty, Faculty Senate and the Deans to position the University of Idaho to successfully achieve the goals articulated in the Strategic Plan. The plan emphasizes the need for our continued focus on higher levels of excellence. Excellence in research, teaching and service will be influenced by the faculty we hire, the growth opportunities for those faculty, and the support faculty receive. The Vice Provost for Faculty will assist in the assessment of our current faculty strengths and size and suggest a path forward for continued professional growth in support of our mission and strategic plan. In addition, the Vice Provost for Faculty will foster an inclusive and diverse community of faculty to support the Strategic Plan goal to cultivate a valued and diverse community. Reporting to the Provost and Executive Vice President, this position will partner with other Vice Provosts and the Deans to provide leadership for the recruitment, development, and retention of a high quality faculty engaged in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and outreach/engagement. Working in partnership with other Vice Provosts, Deans, Department Chairs/Administrators, and faculty, the Vice Provost for Faculty will improve and sustain current faculty support programs to assure the University of Idaho's continued commitment to faculty excellence.

Effective Date
### Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Duty Function</th>
<th>Percentage Of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Advising</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage Of Time 95%

Role Expectations

Description of Expectations The Vice Provost for Faculty will work closely with faculty, Faculty Senate and the Deans to position the University of Idaho to successfully achieve the goals articulated in the Strategic Plan. The plan emphasizes the need for our continued focus on higher levels of excellence. Excellence in research, teaching and service will be influenced by the faculty we hire, the growth opportunities for those faculty, and the support faculty receive. The Vice Provost for Faculty will assist in the assessment of our current faculty strengths and size and suggest a path forward for continued professional growth in support of our mission and strategic plan. In addition, the Vice Provost for Faculty will foster an inclusive and diverse community of faculty to support the Strategic Plan goal to cultivate a valued and diverse community. Reporting to the Provost and Executive Vice President, this position will partner with other Vice Provosts and the Deans to provide leadership for the recruitment, development, and retention of a high quality faculty engaged in teaching, research / scholarly activity, and outreach / engagement. Working in partnership with other Vice Provosts, Deans, Department Chairs / Administrators, and faculty, the Vice Provost for Faculty will improve and sustain current faculty support programs to assure the University of Idaho’s continued commitment to faculty excellence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation/Workshop</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># Evals returned</th>
<th>Information shared met audience needs</th>
<th>Overall presentation was clear and well-organized</th>
<th>The audio-visual and other teaching aids were used appropriately</th>
<th>The instructor is well informed and kept audience interested</th>
<th>The instructor encouraged questions and interaction with participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/19/15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/29/13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/15/12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/21/11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five point response scale ranges from 4 (highest) to 0 (lowest)

** Five point response scale ranges from 5 (highest) to 1 (lowest)
## TEACHING EVALS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of courses</th>
<th>Semester/Dat e</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fa 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fa 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fa 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fa 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
<td>Overall Instructor</td>
<td>Overall Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact for obtaining this information:
Send email request to [studeval@uidaho.edu](mailto:studeval@uidaho.edu)

or contact
Wes McClintick
Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation (IEA)
208-885-7994
[mcclintick@uidaho.edu](mailto:mcclintick@uidaho.edu)

The student teaching evaluation report is obtained from IEA. Faculty cannot provide their own evaluations. This template may be relevant for use by Extension Faculty.
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR:

Dr. Joe Vandal

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

(1) Reviewer Name
Department
Rank
Institution
Brief explanation of qualifications
Relationship to candidate

(2) Reviewer Name
Department
Rank
Institution
Brief explanation of qualifications
Relationship to candidate

(3) Reviewer Name
Department
Rank
Institution
Brief explanation of qualifications
Relationship to candidate

(4) Reviewer Name
Department
Rank
Institution
Brief explanation of qualifications
Relationship to candidate

(5) Reviewer Name
Department
Rank
Institution
Brief explanation of qualifications
Relationship to candidate
Reviewer 1 Response Letter
Reviewer 2 Response Letter
Reviewer 3 Response Letter
July 28, 2019

Dr. Mars
Department of Planets
University of Earth

Dear Dr. Mars,

I appreciate your willingness to help with the external peer review for Dr. Pluto’s tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor in the Department of Planets at the University of Idaho. To assist you in the review process, you will find enclosed with this letter: (1) Dr. Pluto’s Curriculum Vitae and his professional portfolio, (2) our college and departmental context statements, (3) a summary of Dr. Pluto’s position descriptions while at the University of Idaho, and (4) four peer reviewed journal articles authored by Dr. Pluto.

In your evaluation, please briefly describe the nature of your acquaintance with Dr. Pluto. Second, please review and critique his scholarly activity on the basis of standards in the discipline and the candidate’s position description at the University of Idaho. Finally, please provide an assessment as to Dr. Pluto’s recognition and standing among his peers on the basis of his scholarly record and whether his body of work is likely to stimulate significant advances in this area of research.

University policy specifies the scholarly activity to be reviewed as a part of the tenure and promotion processes must be evaluated relative to University of Idaho departmental and college criteria. The department and college context statements are provided to understand the mission and responsibilities of our academic unit. These statements are expected to provide a framework that will help clarify Dr. Pluto’s position description at the University of Idaho, specifically the portion of the appointment dedicated to teaching/advising and to scholarly activity.

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

I recognize that this review requires a substantial effort on your part, and I am very grateful for your help. In order to meet college and university deadlines for the review process, I ask that you return your review to us by September 1, 2019.

Sincerely,

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

I. POSITION CONTEXT STATEMENT


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

II. PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“It needs more cows.”

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

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

III. EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE

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

Table 1. Workshops and Facilitation; Community and Professional Audiences

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

Selected Comments on Evaluations:

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

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

Strategic Planning: Impacts on the Community Audience

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

Small Business Workshop: Impacts on the Community Audience

Selected Comments on Evaluations:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 2. Grants for Extension Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Great! These made class fun.”

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


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

Students even seemed to enjoy the writing assignments:

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

“Good opportunity to explore some of the topics.”

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

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