PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS AND PACKET INSTRUCTIONS
INITIATING THE PROCESS

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Faculty member begins to prepare materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May</td>
<td>Faculty member and dept. chair work to put together the external peer reviewer packet. Dept. chair sends request to reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Dept. chair obtains external review letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Unit level processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>College level processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Finalization of packets and submission to the Provost’s Office DUE: November 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Final review of packets and access granted to University-level promotions committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>University-level promotions committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Final decisions and recommendations relayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWER PACKET ITEMS

BY MAY 15 (RECOMMENDED TIMELINE):
The following items are provided to external peer reviewers:

• CV
• Professional portfolio
• Samples scholarly work (up to 4 samples)
• Position descriptions for the period under review (template provided for 2019)
• Department/college context statements
• Department/college criteria for promotion and tenure

Review the guideline for external peer review found at
https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/tenure
FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

- Update/finalize University of Idaho Standard or Extension Educator CV Template
- Finalize professional portfolio
- Select up to 4 examples of scholarly work
- Develop a list of at least 5 potential external reviewers who hold:
  - the rank (or higher) to which to are applying
  - tenure, if you are seeking tenure
DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITY

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

• The unit administrator/department chair will request an evaluation of the candidate’s performance from 4 to 5 appropriate external reviewers. The names of at least 2 of these reviewers will be selected from the list provided by the faculty member under review. Final selection of external reviewers should take place in accordance with college policy.

• There must be 3 external review letters in the packet.
• All letters received go into the packet.
• Assemble the faculty member’s position descriptions for all years of the review period, department/college criteria, and the relevant context statements.
### The University Packet Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Included in the Packet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3560 and/or 3520 form(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year review, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/department bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic review, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Evaluation Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External peer reviewer summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External peer review letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Evals &amp; PDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample letter to E. reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrows are already available prior to the process beginning.

Stars items are part of the external reviewer process.
FINALIZING THE UNIVERSITY PACKET

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

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

• After receiving the faculty member’s packet approval, the 3560 and/or 3520 form(s) should be signed to initiate the internal review process.

• Now enter the external reviewer items (summary and review letters) into the packet.
# Recommended Timeline: Unit Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks at the unit level</th>
<th>Due by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member has approved the packet, signed 3560 and/or 3520 forms, and dept. admin/</td>
<td>Aug. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chair has entered the external peer review information into the packet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. admin makes packets available for unit level review. (Packets are not accessible</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the candidates from this point forward.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty vote completed</td>
<td>Sept. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit committee has met and made judgement/recommendation</td>
<td>Sept. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair has written letter</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No committee member names and no identification of external reviewers disclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair provides faculty member with the unit level correspondence which includes</td>
<td>Sept. 27 thru Oct. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a summary of strengths and weaknesses and the votes/recommendations by all reviewing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups at this level. Faculty member has one week to provide factual corrections/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. admin incorporates correspondence materials into the packet. The packet is</td>
<td>Oct. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forwarded for college level review. Dept. discloses the unit committee membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPT. CHAIR LETTER

• If there is a unit committee written summary, the department chair letter should reference that summary; it does not need to repeat what the committee stated.

• If there is no written summary from the unit committee, the department chair letter should provide an extensive summary of the committee and faculty findings as captures by meetings and the balloting process.

• The letter must clearly state and summarize the faculty votes, the committee votes and recommendation, and the department chair’s recommendation.

• Letters and summary documents can refer to external reviewer comments, however, be careful to not disclose any identifying information (name, institution, etc.) about the external reviewers.
UNIT LEVEL COMMITTEE MAKE-UP

REFER TO DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE BY-LAWS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE COMMITTEE MAKE-UP. FSH 3520 REQUIRES THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE TENURE COMMITTEE TO CONSIST OF:

• One or more tenured faculty members
• One or more non-tenured faculty members
• One or more persons from outside the unit
• And, in cases involving the evaluation or review of members of the instructional faculty, the inclusion of students if required by the unit’s by-laws
• In cases involving the evaluation of individuals involved significantly in interdisciplinary activities, one or more members of the appropriate interdisciplinary program faculty should be included
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks at the college level</th>
<th>Due by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s asst. reviews packet from the unit to ensure all votes and summaries are accurate and the packet is complete. Make packet available for college level review.</td>
<td>Oct. 4 thru Oct. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College committee has met and made recommendation</td>
<td>Oct. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College administrators have met and made recommendations, if applicable</td>
<td>Oct. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean has written letter No committee member names and no identification of external reviewers disclosed</td>
<td>Nov. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean provides faculty member with the college level correspondence which includes a summary of strengths and weaknesses and the votes/recommendations by all reviewing groups at this level. Faculty member has one week to provide factual corrections/clarifications</td>
<td>Nov. 2 thru Nov. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s asst. incorporates correspondence materials into the packet and the promotion summary workbook form. The packet is forwarded to the provost office. College discloses the college committee membership.</td>
<td>Nov. 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEAN LETTER

• If there is a college committee written summary, the dean letter should reference that summary; it does not need to repeat what the committee stated.

• If there is no written summary from the college committee, the dean letter should provide an extensive summary of the committee findings as captured by meetings and the balloting process.

• The letter must clearly state and summarize the committee votes and recommendation, and the dean’s recommendation.

• Letters and summary documents can refer to external reviewer comments, however, be careful to not disclose any identifying information (name, institution, etc.) about the external reviewers.
PACKET PREPARATION
PROMOTION AND TENURE PACKET COVER SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty type (Regular, Extension, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Appointment at Current Rank</th>
<th># Credit Years Granted toward Promotion and Tenure If applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Promotion To</td>
<td>Senior Instructor Associate Professor Full Professor Year of Last Promotion If applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Tracking</td>
<td>Non-tenure track On-track Tenured Year Tenured If applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SCORES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FSH 3560

BALLOT TO BE USED BY UNIT FACULTY FOR RECOMMENDATION ON PROMOTION IN RANK

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

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

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

I _____ recommend promotion
_____ do not recommend promotion

__________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________________
(Signature)  (Rank)  (Unit)
Faculty member should review packet before external reviewer information is inserted. Have faculty member and administrator sign form to indicate packet is ready for internal review process. Add external reviewer information after signatures.
Section 1 – Unit Committee Votes and Recommendation

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

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

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

All review committees shall be formed consistent with unit by-laws and must include tenure-track faculty. If the unit’s by-laws do not address review committee makeup, the structure of the tenure committee as described in FSH 3510 G-5 d. shall be used. (FSH 3560 E-2 c.)

The dept. bylaws may prescribe a ballot form to be used by the committee or one should be created for committee use that addresses these responses.
Section 2 – Unit Faculty Votes and Recommendations and Unit Administrator Recommendation

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

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

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

The policy states only faculty who have a rank higher than the candidate’s current rank can vote on faculty promotion.
Section 3 – College Committee Votes and Recommendations, Administrators of the College and Dean Recommendation

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

Do not leave blanks! If the vote is 0 put 0.
Faculty member should review packet before external reviewer information is inserted. Have faculty member and administrator sign form to indicate packet is ready for internal review process. Add external reviewer information after signatures.
Your numbers for this section must match the number of committee members in your tenure committee. Unit tenure committee make-up is directed by the unit by-laws or FSH 3520 G-5 d.

The dept. bylaws may prescribe a ballot form to be used by the committee or one should be created for committee use that addresses these responses.

Section 1 – Unit Committee Votes and Recommendation

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)

Do not leave blanks! If the vote is 0, put 0. If there is no committee put N/A
Section 2 – Unit Faculty Votes and Recommendations and Unit Administrator Recommendation

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

Only the tenured faculty of the unit vote. The dept. bylaws may prescribe a ballot form to be used by the committee or one should be created for committee use that addresses these responses.
Section 3 – College Committee Votes and Recommendations, Administrators of the College and Dean Recommendation

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

In each college there is a standing committee on tenure and promotion. The members serve for terms of not less than three years on a staggered basis. The membership of the committee and the method of selection are prescribed in the by-laws of the college. FSH 3560 F-2

There is no formal account if the dean chooses to consult with the unit administrators of the college for tenure.
• Include the unit and college promotion and tenure criteria that cover the period of evaluation.

• That may mean multiple versions.

• Yes, please bookmark dates/versions.
RECOMMENDATION LETTERS/MEMOS

RESPONSIBILITIES AT UNIT AND COLLEGE LEVEL:

• Read through the letters to make sure that votes and recommendations are clear.

• Check to make sure that external reviewers are not named and no identifying information is provided in the letters.

• Make sure the faculty member receives the correspondence at each level and allow 7 days to review and provide a statement before releasing to the next level.

• Ensure that that all pertinent letters are included before moving packet to the next level (example: Joint/ID/Center, candidate statement as necessary).
CANDIDATE STATEMENT

- Correspondence at each review level must be made available to the candidate who is given a week to respond.
- At the unit level that could mean the following, depending on how your unit’s are structured:
  - Unit committee report
  - Unit Administrator/Department Chair letter
- **Unit level correspondence must be sent to the candidate before the packet moves to the college level.**
- At the college level the correspondence could mean the following:
  - College committee report
  - Joint/ID/Center written recommendation(s)
  - College administrators report
  - Dean’s letter
- **College level correspondence must be sent to the candidate before the packet moves to the provost level.**
- If there is no candidate statement put in a sheet that says “no candidate statement”.
ANNUAL EVALS AND PDS

• If you are missing evals and PDs, let your dean’s assistant know who will request them from the Provost’s office.

• For 2019 PDs, print the employee view in People Admin and redact hiring information (see example)

• Evals and PDs should be sub-book marked in the packet from newest to oldest.

• Evals and PDs that are missing or have an unusual situation should be documented in the notes section on the summary.

• There will always be one more year of PDs than evaluations.
3rd Yr. and Periodic Reviews
If Applicable

Include only the correspondence in the P&T packet:

- Provost’s Letter (if applicable)
- Dean Letter
- Chair Letter
- Committee Letter

Do not include 3rd Year Review materials when applying for full professor.
# TEACHING EVALS SUMMARY

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

**Contact for obtaining this information:**
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

**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 SUMMARY AND LETTERS

MUST STAY CONFIDENTIAL FROM CANDIDATE AT ALL TIMES

• At least 3 external reviewer letters are required in the packet. All letters go in that are received.

On the summary form include all requirements for each external reviewer:
• Reviewer Name
• Department name
• Current rank
• Institution
• Brief explanation of qualifications
• Relationship to candidate
PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO

- 12 pages maximum

- Supplemental information can be provided at the unit level but it does not go beyond this level. The portfolio should encompass everything that the candidate wants to put forward.
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (1)

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

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

3. **Lack of Unit Committee Members:** When there are not enough faculty with higher ranks or tenure to fulfill the committee make-up, contact the Vice Provost for Faculty Office.
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (2)

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

2. **Disclosure of Information:**
   - **Committees:** committee membership should not be disclosed until recommendations are forwarded to the next level.
   - **External Reviewers:** external reviewers are to remain anonymous and their identity is protected. Do not put information that may identify external reviewers in any recommendation letters. Their identity must be held in confidence by all reviewing parties.
1. External Reviewers
   • Relationships: select reviewers based on their familiarity with the discipline of the candidate and standards for the professional and scholarly activity in the discipline, not based on a personal or collaborative relationship with the candidate. Reviewers must have the rank or higher than the rank the candidate is seeking and must be tenured.

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

   • Can we send teaching evaluations? – NO!
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (4)

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

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

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

4. I inserted my teaching evaluations into my portfolio, do I still need to have a separate summary from IEA? – YES. It is recommended that information in the packet not be duplicated. Teaching Evaluation Summaries are a required component of the promotion packet.
The Provost and Executive Vice President’s website for promotion and tenure provides detailed information and links to resources for conducting the process:

https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/tenure