

2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate – ~~Pending Approval~~
Meeting # 24

Approved at Mtg #25
March 19, 2024

Tuesday, March 5, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Barannyk, Blevins, Buchen, Chapman, Gauthier (Chair), Haltinner (Vice Chair), Justwan, Kirchmeier, Long, Maas, McKenna, Miller, Mischel, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Ramirez, Raney, Roberson, Rode, Rinker, Rode, Sammaruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Shook, Schwarzlaender, Tibbals.

Absent: Kenyon (excused), Strickland (excused)

Call to Order: Chair Gauthier called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):

The minutes of the 2023-24 Meeting #23, February 27, 2024, were approved with the addition of new ASUI representative Alivia Buchen to the list of members present on 02/27/2024.

Chair's Report:

- About the admissions criteria, yesterday UCC voted to return to our pre-Covid admissions standards. I just wanted to say that we have a large spectrum of students in Idaho, and we need to offer them a variety of options. ISAT is a new test that we need to take it in consideration.

Provost's Report:

- Midterm grades are due March 11. This is a great chance to reach out to students who need extra help.
- Comments on the article found at <https://www.idahoednews.org/top-news/u-of-i-funnels-7-3-million-of-phoenix-consulting-to-greens-former-employer/>
Provost Lawrence read a statement from President Green categorically denying any conflict of interest in the hiring of the Hogan Lovells firm. He has been gone from the firm for several years and has no financial interests in it. The firm was hired for its expertise in regulatory services and outstanding reputation. They are the best of the best. In fact, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, John Roberts, was a partner at Hogan Lovells. Knowing that our state and our university deserves the best due diligence available, our University Counsel Kent Nelson hired Hogan Lovells for this work. The article seems an attack to discredit President Green and the university.
- Comments on legislative actions regarding the University of Phoenix affiliation, see <https://idahocapitalsun.com/2024/02/15/idaho-legislators-threaten-lawsuit-to-stop-university-of-phoenix-purchase/>.

On Thursday and Friday, the House State Affairs Committee had two hearings. On Thursday they did ask us some questions, but on Friday they relied primarily on the viewpoints of the opposite side, and only asked us one question in an hour and a half of presentations. House Concurrent Resolution 25 can be summarized in four main points (see "Let It Be Resolved..." section): Asking the State Board of Education to reconsider their May 18, 2023 decision; Asking the State Board to reconsider the affiliation until they can be more involved; Asking the State Board and the university to fully cooperate with the legislature about the affiliation. We've answered questions and participated in hundreds of meetings with legislators. So, we feel like we've cooperated from the start. The final point of the bill is that it authorizes the speaker and pro temp to act as an agent of the legislature if there were to be any legal action. The coverage on this point has

been a little confusing. The purpose of this part of the resolution is not to take legal action but to authorize two individuals to act should it be needed. Resolution 25 passed the House today with a vote of 49 in favor and 21 against and goes to Senate next. We continue to have conversations with legislators daily about all of this.

- A couple of other things from last week's meetings. Senate Bill 1357 (like the legislation in Texas and Florida), could remove all DEI staff and programming from universities. It's currently not past the legislature, and we don't know if it will reach the floor in either chamber. The university is concerned and we've made those concerns known.

Addressing a question placed in the chat, the Provost said that it's not clear who stands to benefit from blocking the University of Phoenix acquisition. A lot of these questions are not necessarily judging the affiliation itself, but really the power and the authority around.

As private individuals, you can address your legislators with opinions and concerns about all these legislative measures.

There are two other topics regarding legislature. One is around remote work. We don't know if it will pass, but we'll know soon, as we're entering the final month or so of the legislative season. They're hoping to adjourn before the end of March. The other one is CEC. It was very encouraging to see that the Education committee wanted to understand how only half of an approved standard CEC goes to fund the universities, and they were very interested in learning more about fully funding it.

Discussion:

A senator expressed deep concern about President Green's decision to hire Hogan Lovells having turned into a big PR problem, at a time when our opponents are trying to make waves. President Green should have been aware of the consequences, even if only based on perceptions. The president, not GC, bears the responsibility for these decisions. Furthermore, the massive redaction of documents signals no transparency. The Provost responded that there was awareness, but the decision was driven by the reality that this firm is one of the best. As for redacted documents, some confidential information is protected by law. We are following the law. (This point was supported and elaborated on by a senator with legal training.)

Chair Gauthier asked whether there is a back-up plan should the Phoenix transaction fail. The Provost responded that many discussions are going on. They will continue to address concerns as they become known to them.

Another senator brought up the financial piece of the deal that would result into expenses of \$10M per year for the U of I. They are wondering how much the university is pouring into a deal which may not even happen, and if it does happen, our payout is at least a year in the future. While debates are still going on, it would help to talk about the financial piece. Provost Lawrence responded: Concerning the upfront costs we've already invested, any business transaction requires costs. We've had a massive team of experts because we felt it was important to fully vet this. It is a large amount of money. Part of the closing transaction details may include reimbursement of transaction costs. As for our 10-million-dollar revenue piece, we don't have to wait a year, because it's included in the closing costs being finalized. As with any business, there is a risk of getting into it, should one decide to walk away. But we're committed to this transaction and so are the university of Phoenix and the sellers. He encouraged everybody to look at the big picture. A lot has been invested because it was worthy of that for our own safety, and to mitigate risks as much as possible.

Vice Chair Haltinner suggested to keep in mind the broader issue of transparency, besides the PR problems. She is very reassured to hear that the money will be reimbursed in closing. She asked Provost Lawrence to confirm that, should the deal not close, the money already invested is lost. The Provost confirmed.

A senator argued that the perception of nepotism may be likely, if President Green has friends among his previous business associates. Another senator, who watched the JFAC meeting, was puzzled by some of the narrative and reactions, because the Phoenix deal and the role of JFAC are separated.

Next, the discussion focused on the possible impact of current controversial issues on other appropriation decisions from the legislature. Senators are worried about possible repercussions on next year's appropriation decisions. Provost Lawrence: It's very hard to predict what JFAC or any legislative body is going to do. SBOE and U of I have fully cooperated with the legislators since May. We will respond to their needs and requests as they come in.

Committee Reports (voting):

- Proposed changes to the Faculty Staff Handbook:
 - FSH 1640.08 Admissions Committee – Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate, Attach. #2
The Vandal Gateway Program requests inclusion on the Admissions Committee as a nonvoting member. Like the other nonvoting members on the committee, the Vandal Gateway Program director has important insights into the types of support offered at UI for people requesting admissions appeals. This proposal is coming from the Committee on Committees.
Discussion:
A senator noted that VGP is currently a pilot program, and thus this addition may have to be removed if the program isn't continued. It should be clear that this action doesn't make VGP more likely to be approved.
A senator proposed to amend by adding "or designee" next to "the director of the Vandal Gateway Program."
A senator asked whether we could approve it for one year only. Policy Coordinator Diana Whitney replied that there is no mechanism to change a policy for just one year.
Motion to amend (Tibbles, Mittelsteadt) adding "or designee" next to "the director of the Vandal Gateway Program."
Vote on the amendment: 21/22 yes; 1/22 no.
Vote on amended motion: 19/22 yes; 3/22 no. Motion passes.
 - FSH 2700 Student Evaluation of Teaching – Erin Chapman, Family and Consumer Sciences, Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences and Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, Attach #3.
Alistair Smith gave a brief background on these revisions to FSH 2700. They involved a multi-year Senate Taskforce that included representatives from ASUI leadership and input from the Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Teaching Committee and were focused on reducing bias and discrimination associated with the questions that are counted towards candidate's student course evaluation summaries used in the tenure and promotion processes. Revisions align FSH 2700 with changes already approved under FSH 1565 C.1.a that reframed evaluations to, instead, feedback on teaching effectiveness. Smith commented that the name of the policy should reflect the change to FSH 2700 Student Feedback on Teaching Effectiveness. The format of the policy was updated to align it with the rest of the FSH, namely by adding purpose, scope, policy, and procedure sections. Revisions also included clarifying when mid-semester formative feedback occurs, and how the data can be used. Revisions also introduced an appeals mechanism for instructors to

challenge inclusion of feedback in their records. As part of the revisions process, a new standard form for mid-semester formative feedback was created (it did not exist previously) and a revised standard form for end-of-semester formative feedback was developed. Finally, a mechanism to support instructors not meeting teaching effectiveness expectations was introduced.

Discussion:

In response to a question, Smith confirmed that instructors can still include additional questions.

Another senator argued that completing the course valuations should be a requirement for the students. Smith said that the committee discussed it but decided against it.

There is a preamble to explain the scope, but more information should be given to the students before making it mandatory. Some additional discussion followed about the pros and cons of mandatory evaluations. It may be something to consider in the near future, to increase the response rate and a more realistic distribution of positive and negative comments.

The discussion moved to FSH 2700 Form D-3 (mid-term formative feedback) and D-4 (end-of-the-semester feedback). Some senators asked for clarification on the questions that are or are not required for the purpose of P&T and annual evaluation, and the N/A option if students feel the question is not relevant to their course. Smith pointed to the instructions at the top of the forms. Only the five questions marked with an asterisk count for P&T and annual evaluations. The others are purely formative.

A senator asked about the second question in the Teaching Delivery part of form D-4, that refers to the course applied learning components. Although it's just formative, they worry that this item might influence students in a negative direction, even if the course is not supposed to have applied learning components. From survey design theory, a particular question in the survey will influence what comes before and what comes after. Smith noted that the present order can be rearranged. They are not proposing an order. The task force consulted with experts in the social sciences and law faculty, as well as experts on gender bias issues. Narrative is encouraged where students can provide constructive feedback. And again, if hate speech or insulting comments appear in the narrative, the instructor has the right to ask to have those tossed. If the chair, dean and the vice provost for faculty deny the request, they can appeal to the FHAB. The task force included an appeal mechanism because many international faculty have had nasty evaluations that remain in their permanent records. It was time to improve this process. As for the order in which the questions are presented, when this goes into Anthology, those with the asterisk may come first, followed by the formative feedback. The senator had also some concern about assignments being the main theme in the course content part of form D-4.

Many agreed that, overall, this proposal is a huge step forward.

Vice Chair Haltinner pointed to the second question on "Syllabus and Course Expectations." She is not comfortable with the wording "... was easy to access and coherently organized." Access is mostly about technology. If a system fails, that will reflect poorly on the instructor. Furthermore, "coherently organized" means something different to different people. Smith responded that the five starred questions were selected by FAC, but Senate is welcome to make changes.

Erin Chapman gave some additional background on how the questions were chosen. She agreed that there could be some subjectivity in assessing what's coherently organized.

Another senator echoed the concern about technology being an issue. If something doesn't work, the instructor would be held accountable. Also, in the first sentence of FSH 2700 D-3, the word "will" implies that the formative mid-semester feedback is required.

A senator asked whether it is possible to integrate this survey with Canvas. Can we give some form of reward, such as a few extra points, to the students who submit feedback? Smith replied that every instructor already has that ability.

There was a request for clarification about dropping the "neutral" category from the possible choices for the starred questions. Smith confirmed that it was removed and explained that the reason for the removal is that under the old format, the neutral answer reflected a score of 3.0, which equated to not meeting expectations, which was not the intent of a neutral response. Smith explained that in the new forms, where N/A is allowed, as per the proposed revision to FSH 2700, those responses are no longer recorded. Smit also, clarified that N/A will not be an option for the asterix questions.

Proposed amendments (Mittelsteadt, Maas):

In the first sentence of FSH 2700 D-3, replace "will" with the word "may." Under "Syllabus and Course Expectations" in the end-of-semester evaluations, the question that says "The course syllabus was easy to access and coherently organized" shall be removed from consideration as one of the five questions (thereby reducing the number of questions to 4) used in tenure, promotion and evaluation.

Vote on the amendments: 17/19 yes; 2/19 no.

Vote on the amended motion: 16/19 yes; 3/19 no. Motion carries.

- FSH 3500 Promotion and Tenure – Erin Chapman, Family and Consumer Sciences, Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences and Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee Attach. #4
Revision to add a reference to FSH 2700 regarding the questions in student feedback on teaching that can be counted toward a candidate's student course evaluation summaries used in the tenure and promotion processes.
No questions.
Vote: 19/19 yes.

Announcements and Communications:

- Online Software Approval Ticketing Process – Teresa Amos, Director, IT Planning and Initiatives, Office of Information Technology.

A senator inquired about the recent change from OIT that requires preapproval to get reimbursed through Chrome River for the purchase of some common software. What is the thought process for doing that?

Teresa didn't have background to prep with, so she is not able to give any specifics on this question. She will look into the matter and report to senate at a later time.

This conversation will continue when Teresa returns to senate, along with the one on the transition to MyUI.

Additional discussion:

A senator reported submitting a ticket 20 days earlier for a well-established software called CMA, Comprehensive Meta Analysis, developed by NIH and used by many federal agencies. It's needed for two Ph.D. students for their Prelim Exam. They have eight weeks to complete the exercise. This senator is very concerned about the timeline. They may have to readjust the Ph.D.

Prelims schedule, which will create additional complications. Teresa will investigate this specific ticket and communicate to the senator what she finds out.

- A senator reported comments from several faculty about the recent satisfaction survey from OIT. The space to provide commentary is insufficient, about 60 words. Teresa replied that Dan Ewart was aware of that feedback and has resolved the problem with institutional research.
- Women's Leadership Conference – Laurel Meyer, Education Abroad Advisor/Marketing Coordinator, International Programs Office.
Laurel Meyer is one of the planning co-chairs for the Women's Leadership Conference, and the Athena co-president for staff. After a five-year hiatus, the Women's Leadership Conference is returning to campus on April 2. The registration link went live today on the conference website, <https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity/edu/womens-center/events/womens-leadership-conference>. Please share this opportunity with all your colleagues. It is a full-day event, and it is free. It's a joint conference between the University of Idaho and Washington State University. Most of the seats are reserved for either members of U of I or WSU, but there are some limited seats available for community members as well. We're not necessarily inviting students to attend, but if there's a student who's motivated and would like to attend, they're welcome to register. But that's not our target audience. Over the next couple of days, the website will be updated with the full schedule. For any questions, please contact Laurel Meyer at laurelm@uidaho.edu.

New Business:

None.

There will be no meeting next week (spring break).

Adjournment:

The agenda being completed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:03pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammaruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate

University of Idaho
2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting #24

Tuesday, March 5, 2024 at 3:30 pm
Zoom Only

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - Minutes of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate Meeting #23 February 27, 2024 **Attach. #1**
- III. Chair's Report
- IV. Provost's Report
 - Discuss Idaho Ed news article about Hogan Lovells
 - Discuss Idaho Sun article about UofPhx Acquisition
- V. Committee Reports (voting)
 - Proposed changes to the Faculty Staff Handbook
 - FSH 1640.08 Admissions Committee – Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate **Attach. #2**
 - FSH 2700 Student Evaluation of Teaching – Erin Chapman, Family and Consumer Sciences, Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences **Attach #3**
 - FSH 3500 Promotion and Tenure – Erin Chapman, Family and Consumer Sciences, Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences **Attach. #4**
- VI. Announcements and Communication
 - Online Software Approval Ticketing Process – Teresa Amos, Director, IT Planning and Initiatives, Office of Information Technology
 - MyUI Delay/Change – Teresa Amos, Director, IT Planning and Initiatives, Office of Information Technology
 - Women's Leadership Conference – Laurel Meyer, Education Abroad Advisor/Marketing Coordinator, International Programs Office
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

Attachments

- **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate Meeting #23 February 27, 2024
- **Attach. #2** FSH 1640.08
- **Attach. #3** FSH 2700
- **Attach. #4** FSH 3500

2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval

Meeting # 23

Tuesday, February 27, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Zoom only

Present: Barannyk, Blevins, Chapman, Gauthier (Chair), Haltinner (Vice Chair), Justwan, Kenyon, Kirchmeier, Long, Maas, McKenna, Mischel, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Ramirez, Raney, Roberson, Rode, Rinker, Rode, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Shook, Schwarzlaender, Strickland, Tibbals.

Absent: Lawrence (excused), Miller.

Call to Order: Chair Gauthier called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):

The minutes of the 2023-24 Meeting #22, February 20, 2024, were approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:

- After meeting with Boise State University and the Idaho State Board of Education admissions change workgroup, we received more data and some answers to your questions. See attached slide. Dave Paul (UCC) requested more data before the next UCC meeting. FSL will review the information and data tomorrow at our Wednesday meeting and prepare a packet including the latest data from Wes. All the information we gather will go to UCC and their recommendation will come to Faculty Senate.

Provost's Report, delivered by Vice Provost for Faculty Diane Kelly-Riley:

- The next faculty gathering is today, from 4:30 to 6:30. It will be at the ICCU Arena in the alumni room, hosted by the College of Graduate Studies, and Dean Jerry McMurry. The next will be on March 21, 2024, Vandal Ballroom, hosted by COS. <https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty-gathering>
- Midterm grades are due March 11.
- Discussion: With reference to Senate Bill 1357, a senator asked if there is any insight on what the implications for us can be, such as the university inability to provide training in diversity and inclusion. Vice Provost Kelly-Riley concurs that the bill is concerning. Nothing is definite yet. She will share the question with the Provost, who may be in a better position to address it. Of course, anyone, acting as a private citizen, can contact their legislators to express their concerns. Faculty Senate is very concerned about the potential impact of this bill.

Suggestion: invite Yolanda Bisbee to visit with Faculty Senate.

There were inquiries concerning a recent article on Idaho Ed News, see link below, <https://www.idahoednews.org/top-news/u-of-i-funnels-7-3-million-of-phoenix-consulting-to-greens-former-employer/>, and a request for updates on the lawmakers' resolution to sue the University of Idaho to stop the University of Phoenix purchase, see link below, <https://idahocapitalsun.com/2024/02/15/idaho-legislators-threaten-lawsuit-to-stop-university-of-phoenix-purchase/>. Vice Provost Kelly-Riley will inform Provost Lawrence of these questions.

There was a reminder that both LC and U of I are on the JFAC agenda tomorrow, at 7:00am MT.

Announcements and Communications:

- Language regarding Faculty Senate membership, FSH 1520 – Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate, Attach #2.

Kristin led a discussion on possible revisions of FSH 1520 Constitution of the University Faculty Article V, Section 2. The question is whether we should clarify and/or modify the current language “...*The faculty of each college, except the College of Graduate Studies, elects one senator for each 50, or major fraction thereof, full-time-equivalent faculty members in the college, provided, however, that each college faculty elects at least one senator...*” This means that every college has one senator, and one more for every additional 50 FTE faculty in the college. Kristen considered several scenarios (see Attach.2). All options, other than keeping the current policy, impact the membership, namely, some colleges would lose or gain senate representatives.

Discussion:

A senator asked whether there is a need for a change, and, if so, what the reasons are. Other senators noted that the current policy disadvantages small colleges regarding the addition of a second senator. On the other hand, it was also acknowledged that it may be hard to fill new seats from small colleges, who have less service capacity, without additional workload for the college delegates.

A senator demonstrated that the current language gives most stability of senate membership with respect to changes in the number of faculty in the colleges.

Ultimately, there was consensus that no substantive changes should be made, although the current language could be clarified.

- Committee on Committees Update – Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate. Review of Committee Audit. Members of the Committee on Committees are looking into selected committees which may need revisions/repurposing:
 - FSH 1640.20 University Budget & Finance Committee. Revisit roles under the new budget model.
 - FSH 1640.43 Faculty Appeals Hearing Board. Procedures, scope of the board.
 - FSH 1640.58 Ubuntu. Simplify membership – too many non-voting members who seldom attend.
 - FSH 1640.81 University Staff Compensation Committee. Large workload.
 - FSH 1640.10 Americans with Disabilities Act Advisory Committee. Unfilled seats. There are ideas but no money. Reinstate the budget for this committee?
 - FSH 1640.36 Dismissal Hearing Committee. Heavy emotional load, summer meetings not anticipated in FSH 1640.36.
 - FSH 1640.77 Scientific Misconduct Committee. The workload became large last year, possibly because of a note in the Daily Register.
 - FSH 1640.06 Administrative Hearing Board. Lack of gender diversity since a long time.

Other updates:

- Adding one non-voting seat from the VGP team on the Admission Committee.
- Committee preference survey. Appointments will be made in March.
- Sustainability Certificate. Last Fall, Faculty Senate appointed the existing interdisciplinary faculty-led committee as an *ad-hoc* program committee to serve as the ‘relevant unit and college’ authorized to submit curricular proposals per FSH 4120-E. This committee is empowered to propose the UG Academic Certificate in Sustainability

to the University Curriculum Committee as a University-Wide Program, and to set its initial curriculum. They are now seeking approval to turn the *ad hoc* committee into a permanent university-level committee.

- As a reminder, the Secretary points to recently revised FSH 1620 University-Level Committees, in particular FSH 1620 E-13 “ *Prepare a succinct year-end report for submission to the Faculty Senate in care of the Office of the Faculty Secretary for distribution as needed. The report must contain: number and approximate frequency of the committee meetings; committee goals; committee accomplishments...*”

New Business:

- OIT changes:
 - New online software approval ticketing process. Suggestion: invite Teresa Amos or Dan Ewart to clarify.
 - MyUI will soon replace VandalWeb. Suggestion: invite Dan Ewart for updates.

- Generally, fees for membership in professional organizations are not reimbursed by the university. Why so and are there exceptions?

Adjournment:

The agenda being completed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:40pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

YEAR 2019

Cohort = 22000 students

% of student that qualify for the letter of 8

ISAT 3/3 = 34%

ISAT 3/3 or GPA 3.0 = 64%

ISAT 3/3 and GPA 3.0 = 30%

ISAT 3/2 and GPA 2.8 = 66%

ISAT 3/3 and GPA 2.8 = 32%

ISAT 3/3 or GPA 2.8 = 72%

Class of 2021 - GPA 2.8 = 61%



POLICY COVER SHEET

For instructions on policy creation and change, please see <https://sitecore.uidaho.edu/governance/policy>.

All policies must be reviewed, approved, and returned by the policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached, to ui-policy@uidaho.edu.

Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH)

Addition Revision* Deletion* Emergency Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title: **FSH 1640.08 ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE**

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)

Addition Revision* Deletion* Emergency Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title:

*Note: If revision or deletion, request original document from ui-policy@uidaho.edu. All changes must be made using "track changes."

Originator: Kristin Haltinner

Policy Sponsor, if different from Originator: Torrey Lawrence, Provost

Reviewed by General Counsel ___ Yes ___x___ No Name & Date:

1. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

The Vandal Gateway Program requests inclusion on the Admissions Committee as a nonvoting member. Like the other nonvoting members on the committee, the Vandal Gateway Program director has important insights into the types of support offered at UI for people requesting admissions appeals.

The Admissions Committee chair ran this by the committee and it was supported.

2. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

None

3. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

None

4. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK

Chapter I: HISTORY, MISSION, GENERAL ORGANIZATION, AND GOVERNANCE

Section 1640: Committee Directory

1640.08

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

A. FUNCTION. To act on applications for admission to UI in the cases of undergraduate applicants who do not meet minimum requirements for admission but who request a review. The Admissions Committee also evaluates and acts on applications of undergraduate students to special UI programs requiring minimum qualifications lower than those for regular admission to the University of Idaho. The Admissions Committee also hears appeals from disenrollment when that disenrollment is the result of the presentation of incomplete or false information on initial application as an undergraduate at UI. Decisions of this committee may be appealed as stated in [FSH 2500](#). (Similar applications for admission to the College of Graduate Studies are acted on by the Graduate Council, and its decisions may be appealed as stated in [FSH 2500](#); those for admission to the College of Law are acted on by that college's Committee on Admissions, and its decisions may be appealed, in order, to the full faculty of the college and, when they consent to hear the appeal, to the president of the university and the regents.)

A-1. This committee traditionally meets during the summer.

B. STRUCTURE. Five members of the faculty, director of counseling and testing center or designee, chair of Ubuntu or designee, a member of the American Language and Culture Program faculty, and the following without vote: director of admissions (or designee), ~~a~~ Student Support Services designee, a representative from the Office of Multicultural Affairs, a professional advisor, [the director of the Vandal Gateway Program](#), and up to two representatives from student support programs. To assure a quorum, alternates for the faculty positions are appointed by the chair of the Admissions Committee from a list of those who have previously served on the Committee. †



POLICY COVER SHEET

For instructions on policy creation and change, please see
<https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy>

All policies must be reviewed, approved, and returned by the policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached, to ui-policy@uidaho.edu.

Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH)

Addition Revision* Deletion* Interim Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title: **FSH 2700 STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)

Addition Revision* Deletion* Interim Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title:

*Note: If revision or deletion, request original document from ui-policy@uidaho.edu. All changes must be made using “track changes.”

**Policy originator: Erin Chapman (former Student Feedback on Teaching Senate Taskforce Chair)
Alistair Smith (FAC Chair, and former Student Feedback on Teaching Senate Taskforce Chair)**

Policy sponsor, if different from originator: Gwen Gorzelsky, Vice Provost Academic Initiatives

Reviewed by General Counsel: Yes No Name & Date: Kim Rytter, 4/8/23

Comprehensive review? Yes No

1. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed change.

Revision of FSH 2700 Student Evaluations of Teaching. Revisions to FSH 2700, which involved a multi-year Senate Taskforce that included representatives from ASUI leadership and input from the Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Teaching Committee, were focused on reducing bias and discrimination associated with the questions that are counted towards candidate’s student course evaluation summaries used in the tenure and promotion processes.

Revision aligns FSH 2700 with changes already approved under FSH 1565 C.1.a that reframed evaluations to instead feedback on teaching effectiveness. The format of the policy was updated to align it with the rest of the FSH, namely by adding purpose, scope, policy, and procedure sections. Revisions also included clarifying when mid-semester formative feedback occurs, and how the data can be used. Revisions also introduced an appeals mechanism for instructors to challenge inclusion of feedback in their records. As part of the revisions process, a new standard form for mid-semester formative feedback was created (it did not exist previously) and a revised standard form for end-of-semester formative feedback was developed. Finally, a mechanism to support instructors not meeting teaching effectiveness expectations was introduced.

2. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this change have?

Minimal. Will require updating forms in anthology.

3. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

FSH 3500 Promotion and Tenure

- 4. Effective Date:** This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 H) unless otherwise specified.

UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK

CHAPTER TWO:

STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES

2700

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

OWNER:

Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives
Dean Panttaja
panttaja@uidaho.edu

LAST REVISION: July 2008

CONTENTS:

A. Purpose

B. Scope

BC. Policies Policy and Procedures

D. Procedure

A. PURPOSE. Student ~~evaluation of feedback on~~ teaching has two divergent purposes. First, student ~~evaluations~~ feedback assists individual instructors in improving ~~their own teaching course design, delivery, assessment, and expectations~~ ("instructor," as used in this section, refers to any teaching member of the faculty or staff, including graduate teaching assistants). Second, ~~they student feedback~~ assists academic administrators in counseling instructors about their teaching and ~~they are the feedback is~~ carefully weighed as a factor in ~~judging-evaluating~~ the teaching component in tenure, promotion, and salary determinations. ~~To achieve the first of these purposes instructors are urged to provide their students mechanisms for evaluation throughout the academic term. To assist academic administrators in evaluation, the following policy and procedures have been adopted.~~

B. SCOPE. This policy applies to all instructors and students at the University of Idaho.

BC. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

B-1. All students will have the opportunity to evaluate each of their instructors in all sections of all courses during every academic term.

D. PROCEDURE

D-1. The Office of the Provost is responsible for oversight of the administration of the feedback process, except for feedback in the College of Law and the WWAMI Regional Medical Education Program, which will be administered by those programs.

D-2. Standard university forms for anonymous mid-term formative feedback (D-3) and end-of-semester feedback (D-4), as approved by the faculty, will be used by all instructors in all of their classes, except in the College of Law and the WWAMI Regional Medical Education Program, which will use evaluative devices tailored to their needs. The student evaluation summary referred to in FSH 3500 D-2 c shall comprise the questions denoted by an asterisk in form D-4.

D-3. Mid-term formative feedback on teaching will take place during the three-week period centered on the mid-term week of the academic term or the proportion thereof for courses of less than a semester duration. The feedback will be made available to faculty two weeks after mid-terms to encourage student input for faculty seeking to improve teaching. The data generated through the mid-term formative evaluation process shall be for evaluative use by the faculty member. The data are not considered part of the faculty member's record and are not to be used in any evaluation of the faculty member, unless included in the record at the discretion of the faculty member.

UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK
Chapter II: STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES
Section 2700: Student Evaluation of Teaching
July 2008

D-4. End-of-term feedback on teaching shall take place during the last three weeks of the academic term (excluding final exam week) or the proportion thereof for courses of less than a semester duration.

D-5. All student feedback on teaching will be provided to the instructor, irrespective of response rates or class size (excluding courses where only a single student is enrolled).

D-6. The Office of the Provost shall see that a database is maintained of end-of-term feedback for at least the last five academic years. The data shall be made available to colleges and academic units as needed, and the numerical summaries of an instructor's end-of-term feedback shall be made available to students or other members of the university community upon request.

D-7. The Office of the Provost, in conjunction with the University Teaching Committee, will review the student feedback on teaching forms and processes at least every five years.

D-8. Student feedback on teaching must comply with all university policy, including FSH 2300 Student Code of Conduct. Instructors may submit to their dean requests for the exclusion of individual student feedback on teaching that violates university policy from materials used in annual evaluations and for promotion and tenure consideration. The decision of the dean is appealable to the Vice Provost for Faculty and then through the policies and procedures in FSH 3840.

D-9. Instructors who receive feedback on teaching effectiveness that fails to meet unit expectations will be referred by the unit chair to the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to receive faculty development support and to design a strategy for improving their teaching.

D-10. Student feedback reported as not-applicable (N/A) on the standard university forms will not be included in annual evaluations and in the evaluation of the teaching component used in tenure, promotion, and salary determinations.

E. RELATED INFORMATION

E-1. Form D-3

E-2. Form D-4

~~B-2. The standard university form, as approved by the faculty, will be used by all instructors in all of their classes, except in the College of Law which will use an evaluative device which it has tailored to its needs.~~

~~B-3. The Office of Academic Affairs has the responsibility of oversight in the administration of the evaluations, except those in the College of Law.~~

~~B-4. The evaluation shall take place during the last three weeks of the academic term (excluding final exam week) or the proportion thereof for courses of less than a semester duration.~~

~~B-5. Instructors will be able to view the student responses for their courses after final grades have been submitted.~~

~~B-6. A system for mid-term formative evaluation of instruction will be available to encourage student input for faculty seeking to improve teaching. The electronic data generated through the formative evaluation process shall be for evaluative use by the faculty member. The data are not considered part of the faculty member's record, and are not to be used in an evaluation of the faculty member by another, unless included in the record at the discretion of the faculty member.~~

UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK
Chapter II: STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES
Section 2700: Student Evaluation of Teaching
July 2008

~~B-7. The Office of Academic Affairs shall see that a database of evaluation results for at least the last five academic years is maintained. These results shall be made available to colleges and academic units as needed, and the numerical summaries of an instructor's evaluations shall be made available to students or other members of the university community upon request.~~

~~B-8. The Office of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the Teaching and Advising Committee, will review the student evaluation of teaching forms and processes periodically, at least every five years.~~

Version History

Amended July 2008. The on-line process was evaluated which resulted in minor policy language changes and removal of section C dealing with implementation of the on-line system. This made the original Handbook section obsolete, and thus it was completely revised.

Amended July 2002. Following a period of testing in 2001, a paperless web-based evaluation system was given formal approval in 2002.

Amended July 1992. Edits were made to reflect the removal of student evaluations to the Office of Academic Affairs.

Adopted 1979.

FSH 2700 Forms

Student feedback on an academic course and learning environment

1. ~~How often did you attend class or online learning environment? (Circle one)~~

~~Less than 60%~~

~~60%+~~

~~70%+~~

~~80%+~~

~~90%+~~

2. ~~How many hours per week did you do work for this course? (Circle one)~~

~~Less than 2 hours~~

~~2+ hrs.~~

~~4+ hrs.~~

~~6+ hrs.~~

~~8+ hrs.~~

Please use the following scale to answer questions 3, 4, and 5.

SD—strongly disagree; D—disagree; N—neutral; A—agree; SA—strongly agree

3. ~~The instructor expressed clear expectations for learning outcomes in this course.~~

4. ~~Overall, the content and organization of this course contributed to your understanding of this subject.~~

5. ~~Overall, the instructor's delivery and efforts contributed to your understanding of the course material.~~

6. ~~The instructor was helpful to me outside of class or online learning environment. (Circle one)~~

~~No~~

~~Yes~~

~~N/A (I did not seek help from the instructor outside of class)~~

Comments:

~~7. What were some positive aspects of the course that supported learning?~~

Comments:

~~8. What aspects and/or content of the course that could be improved to better support learning?~~

Comments:

FSH 2700 Form – D3 (mid-term formative feedback)
Student feedback on an academic course and learning environment

Purpose: We need your feedback to help provide the instructors with information that may improve the course for the remainder of this semester. This information is only shared with the instructor and is not used as part of their permanent teaching record. Please remember that instructors can include faculty, staff, and graduate teaching assistants. This questionnaire should take approximately 5 minutes to complete.

Instructions:

- In terms of the following categories, please rate your agreement with each statement.
- If the question is not relevant to the course (e.g., the course has no labs, or has no written assignments) or you have no feelings about the question, please select N/A.
- Feedback must be free of hate speech and discrimination.
- Several questions are appropriate for all courses and will not have the N/A option.
- Narrative feedback must comply with all university policy, including FSH 2300 Student Code of Conduct.

Mid-Semester Formative Feedback	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The course materials are delivered in a manner that is easy to follow and understand.					
The course materials are easy to access.					
The course assignments are useful for a better understanding of the topic.					
The course labs reinforce the course content.					
The instructor organizes and manages the class sessions well.					
The instructor provides useful feedback to me on my coursework.					
The instructor gives grades that are consistent with course rubrics and class expectations.					
The instructor provides opportunities for students to ask and answer questions related to the content.					
Narrative: As you reflect on the course up to this point, what things are working well for you?					
Narrative: As you reflect on the course up to this point, what things are not working well for you?					

FSH 2700 Form – D4 (end-of-semester feedback)
Student feedback on an academic course and learning environment

Purpose: We need your feedback on this assessment for two reasons. First, instructors rely on your answers to improve their teaching. Instructors can include faculty, staff, and graduate teaching assistants. Second, your responses are used to guide instructors' annual performance evaluations and in evaluating the teaching component in tenure, promotion, and salary determinations. This questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Instructions:

- In terms of the following categories, please rate your agreement with each statement.
- If the question is not relevant to the course (e.g., the course has no labs, or has no written assignments) or you have no feelings about the question, please select N/A.
- Several questions are appropriate for all courses and will not have the N/A option.
- Narrative feedback must comply with all university policy, including FSH 2300 Student Code of Conduct.

Teaching Delivery	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The instructor's delivery and management of the class sessions contributed to your understanding of the course material. *					
The instructor organized the course's applied learning components (e.g., labs, studios, field trips) well.					
The instructor provided opportunities for students to ask and answer questions.					
The instructor provided opportunities for students to engage with the subject matter in a variety of ways (e.g., group discussions, group projects).					
The instructor provided useful feedback to me on my coursework. *					
The instructor gave grades that were consistent with course rubrics and class expectations.					
Narrative: If you have additional constructive feedback you wish to share with the instructor to improve the teaching delivery, please enter additional details here.					

Course Content	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The course materials were delivered in a manner that was easy to follow and understand.					
The course materials were easy to access.					
The course assignments were useful in better understanding the course content. *					
The course time (classrooms, labs, fieldtrips, etc.,) reinforced the course content.					
The quantity of material in the course was appropriate to its credit hour load.					
The course (classroom, labs, fieldtrips, etc.) content was current and up-to-date.					
<p>Narrative: If you have additional constructive feedback you wish to share with the instructor to improve the course content, please enter additional details here.</p>					

Syllabus and Course Expectations	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The course syllabus and expectations were consistent throughout the course.					
The course syllabus was easy to access and coherently organized. *					
The instructor provided updates to changes in the course schedule or expectations.					
The grading expectations of assignments and assessments were clearly explained. *					
The course policies, including late work and academic honesty, were clearly explained.					
Written assignments included a grading rubric or other instructions that clearly explained the expectations.					
<p>Narrative: If you have additional constructive feedback you wish to share with the instructor to improve the syllabus and course expectations, please enter additional details here.</p>					

Student Experience	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
I spent enough time on this course each week and came to class prepared to participate during in-class activities.					
I was consistently prepared for assignments, projects, and exams.					
I have put in adequate effort to advance my learning.					
I was positively challenged.					
The instructor was supportive of my success.					
The instructor addressed and/or acted on the mid-term student feedback on teaching.					
The instructor tried to create an inclusive and respectful learning environment.					
<p>Narrative: If you have additional constructive feedback you wish to share with the instructor to improve the student experience, please enter additional details here.</p>					



POLICY COVER SHEET

For instructions on policy creation and change, please see <https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy>

All policies must be reviewed, approved, and returned by the policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached, to ui-policy@uidaho.edu.

Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH)

Addition Revision* Deletion* Interim Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title: **FSH 3500 PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)

Addition Revision* Deletion* Interim Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title:

*Note: If revision or deletion, request original document from ui-policy@uidaho.edu. All changes must be made using "track changes."

**Policy originator: Erin Chapman (former Student Feedback on Teaching Senate Taskforce Chair)
Alistair Smith (FAC Chair, and former Student Feedback on Teaching Senate Taskforce Chair)**

Policy sponsor, if different from originator: Diane Kelly-Riley, Vice Provost for Faculty

Reviewed by General Counsel: __Yes No Name & Date:

Comprehensive review? __Yes No

1. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed change.

Revision to add a reference to FSH 2700 regarding the questions in student feedback on teaching that can be counted toward a candidate's student course evaluation summaries used in the tenure and promotion processes.

2. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this change have?

None.

3. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

FSH 2700 Student Evaluations of Teaching

4. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 H) unless otherwise specified.

July 1

**FSH 3500
PROMOTION AND TENURE**

A. INTRODUCTION. FSH 3500 contains all official University promotion and tenure procedure and supersedes any promotion or tenure procedure contained in college or unit bylaws.

A-1. Definitions.

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

b. Board. “Board” refers to the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho.

c. Faculty Member. “Faculty member” means any member of the university faculty who holds one of the following ranks: instructor, senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

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

e. Unit. “Unit” means a school, division, department, or program (i.e., the first organizational unit below the college level), but the College of Law, WWAMI, Library, and the Counseling and Testing Center shall be considered to be units. For Extension educators, the unit shall be the Extension district.

f. Unit Administrator. The “unit administrator” is the administrator of the unit that holds faculty member’s appointment. In the case of an interdisciplinary appointment, the administrator of the unit that holds the majority of the appointment shall be considered the unit administrator.

g. University. “University” and “UI” refer to the University of Idaho.

A-2. Faculty Promotion.

a. Purpose. Academic rank represents and rewards the individual’s performance as a scholar, teacher, and faculty member. Promotion to a higher rank is not automatic but is a decision made on an individual basis subject to university, college, and unit criteria.

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

c. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion. Non-tenure track positions at the assistant and associate professor level are eligible for promotion to the next rank. Full-time instructors are eligible for promotion

to senior instructor. Senior instructor is not a rank from which a faculty member may be promoted (FSH 1565 D-1.b).

A-3. Faculty Tenure.

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

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

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

d. Tenurable Ranks. The tenurable ranks are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Research professors, extension faculty, psychologists, and licensed psychologists can be either tenure track or non-tenure track. See FSH 1565.

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

B. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

B-1. Delegation. The provost may delegate any of their responsibilities in this policy to a designee.

B-2. Provost's Administrative Guidance. The process of promotion and tenure is administered by the provost. The provost shall publish guidance necessary for the administration of the promotion and tenure system that is consistent with the *Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH)* and the *Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures (RGP)*. This guidance shall be mandatory. The provost's administrative guidance shall include:

- a. Deadlines for the promotion and tenure process;
- b. The forms required to document the promotion and tenure process (e.g. dossier submission form, unit voting forms, etc.);
- c. Procedures for requesting early consideration for promotion;
- d. Requirements for curriculum vitae;

e. Requirements regarding the submission of promotion and tenure dossiers including format, order of materials, page limits for materials, etc.;

f. Requirements for the selection of external reviews for scholarly work;

g. The timing of appointments and relative representation of faculty on the university promotion & tenure committee pursuant to section G-1 herein; and

h. Other matters necessary to ensure the appropriate administration of the promotion and tenure process.

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

B-4. Procedural Error Remediation. In the event of a procedural error, the provost shall confer with the dean, unit administrator, and candidate and the parties shall attempt to come to an agreement that resolves the error. Following this process, the provost shall decide the resolution of the procedural error and communicate the decision to the candidate in writing. If the candidate agrees to the resolution in writing, he or she may not later object to the resolution. If the candidate does not agree to the resolution in writing, he or she retains the right to appeal the final institutional decision based on that procedural ground (see H-3 herein). These procedural rules are intended to guide the orderly and fair administration of the promotion and tenure process and should be followed carefully, but a promotion or tenure denial may not be set aside merely because there was a procedural error unless the procedural error materially impacted the outcome.

B-5. Confidentiality. Except as specifically provided herein or in the provost's administrative guidance, all materials generated in consideration of candidates for promotion or tenure shall not be disclosed to the candidate or to persons having no role in the administration of promotion and tenure policy unless required by law or approved by the provost. Faculty participating in tenure or promotion cases must maintain confidentiality regarding all aspects of the procedure. This prohibition applies not only during the promotion or tenure process but also indefinitely into the future.

B-6. Recusal.

a. Disclosure required. Prior to consideration of candidates, each committee member shall disclose in writing to the other committee members the nature and extent of any relevant relationships and working arrangements with each candidate who will be considered by the committee.

b. Recusal due to conflict of interest. A committee member with a conflict of interest as defined in this policy shall recuse themselves from consideration of each candidate with whom they have a conflict of interest.

c. Conflict of interest defined. For purposes of this policy, conflict of interest means:

- i. The committee member has a "relationship" with the candidate as defined by FSH 6241 Nepotism, or
- ii. The committee member has a conflict of interest as defined by FSH 6240 Conflicts of Interest or Commitment.

d. Objection; disqualification; final decision. Objection to a committee member's participation based on conflict of interest as defined by this policy or on other grounds may be raised by the candidate, any member of the committee, by the chair of the candidate's unit, or by the dean of the candidate's college, and shall be communicated to the provost. If an objection is raised and the committee member refuses to recuse themselves, the dean of the candidate's college shall decide whether the committee member shall be disqualified from participation, unless the dean is the party raising the objection, in which case the provost shall decide. The decision of the dean or provost, as applicable, is final.

e. Recusal on other grounds. A committee member shall recuse themselves from consideration of a candidate if the committee member subjectively determines that they cannot fairly evaluate that candidate's performance as required by University policy.

C. SCHEDULE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE CONSIDERATION.

C-1. Promotion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C-2. Tenure.

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

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

C-3. Special Circumstances.

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

b. Transfer between Units.

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

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

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

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

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

1. After review of the candidate's qualifications, the faculty in the unit vote that the candidate meets UI criteria for the rank to be offered, and
2. The candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed through service at another institution, or has made substantial contributions to their field of specialization, and
3. The candidate must complete one full year of employment at UI prior to applying for promotion or tenure.

e. Appointment with Tenure. Appointment with tenure may be offered under the following circumstances:

1. The candidate has attained tenure at another college or university, and
2. After review of the candidate's qualifications, the faculty in the unit vote that the candidate meets UI criteria for tenure and the rank to be offered, and
3. The candidate has demonstrated performance of responsibilities relevant to the position for which the person is being appointed.

f. Administrative Appointment.

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

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

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

C-4. Extensions.

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

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

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

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

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

f. Procedure for Requesting an Extension:

1. The faculty member must request the extension from the provost in writing by March 15 of the calendar year in which the review process begins, as set forth in the provost's administrative guidance (B-2 herein). The written request must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other exceptional circumstance.
2. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the provost shall have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost shall, in their discretion, determine if consultation with the dean or unit administrator is appropriate.
3. The approval decision shall be made without regard to whether or not the faculty member takes a leave related to the same circumstances presented for the extension.
4. The provost shall notify the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean of the action taken. The candidate may choose to provide information regarding the extension in their Personal Statement of Accomplishment; otherwise, no information regarding the extension shall be included in the candidate's dossier, unless such information already exists in the materials to be provided by the unit administrator, as detailed in D-2. If such information already exists in the D-2 materials, the candidate may choose to have that information redacted. Committee and administrator reports shall not mention the extended timeline.

g. Effect of Extension. No additional productivity is expected when a faculty member extends the timeline for promotion or tenure. For example, if a tenure decision would customarily take place in the sixth year, and it is extended to the seventh year, the standard of productivity would remain the same as for a tenure decision made in the sixth year.

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

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

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

b. Candidate Statements. This section is limited to eight pages with an optional one-page COVID impact statement for a maximum of nine pages.

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

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

3. COVID Impact Statement (Optional) In one page, the candidate may describe the effects of the pandemic on their work activities and outcomes during the period of review. Candidates may describe such effects across the four areas of consideration: teaching; scholarship and creative activity; outreach and extension; and university service and leadership.

c. Evidence of Accomplishment. The candidate may provide evidence of accomplishment for each area of responsibility in the position description. Evidence may include examples of scholarly work; evidence of teaching effectiveness as provided in FSH 1565 C-1.a. (note that student course evaluations, and, if applicable, peer evaluations are provided by the unit administrator; see D-2.c.); letters of support, etc. Evidence of Accomplishment shall not include additional narrative regarding promotion or tenure. This section has no page limit.

D-2. Materials Provided by the Unit Administrator. The unit administrator shall provide to the candidate items a-d below, in the format prescribed by the provost's administrative guidance (B-2 herein), at least five business days prior to the beginning of the semester in which the promotion or tenure review is scheduled to begin. After the dossier has been finalized, as described in D-3.c, the unit administrator shall add the external peer review letters described in D-2.e and forward the dossier for the first level of review.

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

1. Annual review process and annual performance criteria.

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

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

c. Teaching Effectiveness. If teaching is included in the candidate's position descriptions, copies of all of the candidate's student course evaluation summaries (RGP II.G.6.e) as described in FSH 2700 D-2 for the period under review, and peer evaluations of teaching for the period under review, as prescribed by the provost's administrative guidance (B-2 herein).

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

e. External Peer Reviews. The unit administrator shall obtain three to five external reviews of the candidate's performance in the area of scholarly and creative activity, as defined by FSH 1565 C-2. External review shall not be conducted for faculty undergoing third-year review or for nontenure track candidates for promotion with an average of 5% or less responsibility for scholarship or creative activity in their position description during the review period. In the case of tenurable and tenured faculty in Extension, the external review shall focus on the candidate's performance in the areas of scholarship and creative activity and outreach and extension. All review letters received shall be included in the dossier.

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

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

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

4. Materials Provided to the External Reviewers. The unit administrator shall provide only the candidate's CV, position descriptions for the period under review, candidate statements from D-1.b herein, up to four examples of the candidate's scholarly and creative activity chosen by the candidate, and the sections of college and unit bylaws setting forth criteria for promotion or tenure. In the case of tenure-line faculty appointments with extension, the four examples shall include the candidate's scholarly and creative activity and extension and outreach work chosen by the candidate. The unit administrator shall not provide the complete dossier or any additional materials to external peer reviewers.

5. Criteria for External Review.

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

the case of tenurable Extension faculty, this review shall encompass scholarship and creative activity and outreach and extension.

b) Reviewers may not be asked to evaluate the candidate pursuant to external criteria such as those at the reviewer's institution or other professional organizations.

c) The university shall make every effort to keep the names of the reviewers confidential from the candidate. The candidate may request to view the external reviewers' anonymized evaluations after the final institutional decision is made. Such requests shall be directed to the provost.

f. Additional Review Letters.

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

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

D-3. Submission of Dossier.

a. Deadlines for Submission of Candidate Material and Unit Materials. Materials to be provided by the candidate in support of tenure and/or promotion, as described in section D-1, shall be submitted to the unit administrator either prior to the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to begin or prior to the submission of the candidate's materials to the external reviewers, whichever is earlier. In the event a unit administrator fails to provide materials within the timeline referenced in D-2 above, the candidate's deadline for submission shall extend to ten days after the provision of materials by the unit administrator.

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

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

b. Failure to Submit Candidate Materials by Deadline. Candidates are expected to follow the submission timeline contained in the provost's administrative guidance. A candidate who does not submit the materials described in D-1 by the deadline described in D-3.a of the mandatory year, or of the tenure consideration year as adjusted pursuant to an extension under section C-4, is deemed to have been denied tenure as of the deadline.

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

E. UNIT LEVEL REVIEW.

E-1. Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

1. The committee shall be composed of five faculty members. At least three members shall be tenured faculty members in the unit. At least one member shall be a tenured faculty member from outside the unit.
2. The committee shall elect a chair from among their tenured members.
3. Because the promotion and tenure committee is a personnel committee, students and non-university employees shall not serve on the committee.
4. In cases considering promotion to full professor, the committee shall include at least one full professor.
5. Neither the unit administrator nor the dean may serve as a member of a unit promotion and tenure committee.
6. If there are not three tenured faculty members available to serve on the committee, or a full professor in a case considering promotion to full professor, the unit administrator, in consultation with the dean, shall designate appropriate faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are as closely related as possible to the work of the candidate. One such member may chair the committee if there is not a tenured member from the unit available to serve as chair.
7. Upon request by the candidate to the unit administrator, the unit administrator shall provide the candidate with the names of the committee members.

b. Basis for Evaluation. The unit administrator shall submit the completed dossier to the chair of the unit promotion and tenure committee. The review shall be based on the dossier. The committee shall not meet until the dossier has been available to all members for a minimum of five business days. The committee shall evaluate the candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion.

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

E-2. Unit Faculty Voting.

a. General.

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

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

c. Voting by Promoted Faculty. In the case of promotion, the unit administrator shall solicit the vote of all faculty members of the candidate's unit of the same or higher rank as that to which the candidate seeks promotion. Faculty members of lower rank shall not be eligible to vote.

E-3. Unit Administrator.

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

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

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

F. COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEW.

F-1. College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each college having more than one unit shall have a standing promotion and tenure committee. The members shall be tenured and shall serve staggered three-year terms. Each unit within the college shall be represented by one faculty member, to be selected as follows: Each unit shall nominate two faculty members, from which the dean shall select one, giving consideration to representational balance in the makeup of the committee. The committee shall elect its chair from among its members or may elect the dean or associate dean to serve as chair without vote. For the College of Business and Economics each major area shall serve as a "unit" for purposes of section F. Names of committee members shall be provided to the candidate upon request to the dean.

F-2. College Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation and Report. The committee shall not meet until the dossier has been available to all members for a minimum of five business days. The committee shall evaluate the dossier in light of the unit, college and university criteria. The committee chair shall write a report for each candidate recommending whether the candidate should be promoted and/or tenured. For each candidate, the report shall include a brief rationale for the committee's recommendations and an anonymized record of the committee's vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate. Abstentions are not allowed. A tie vote will result in a recommendation of "undecided."

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

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

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

G. UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW.

G-1. University Promotion and Tenure Committee Composition. A university promotion and tenure committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost without vote, is appointed each year. If, in the discretion of the provost, the number of dossiers to be considered exceeds the capacity of the committee, one or more additional University Promotion and Tenure Committees may be formed using the procedure below.

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

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

1. The vice president for research, the dean of the College of Graduate Studies and the provost's designee with primary responsibility for faculty promotion and tenure, to serve *ex officio* (without vote).
2. Two representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, and one representative from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large.
3. The committee shall include at least one tenured faculty member (RGP II.G.6.e).
4. Upon request by the candidate to the provost, the provost shall provide the candidate with the names of the committee members.

G-2. University Promotion and Tenure Committee Vote. The committee shall not meet until the dossier has been available to all members for at least two weeks. The committee shall deliberate and vote for or against tenure and/or promotion of each candidate in light of the unit, college and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Abstentions are not allowed.

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

H. DECISION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. A candidate who is denied tenure is still eligible for employment at the University in nontenurable positions.

Version History

Amended January 2023. The October 2022 interim revision was permanently adopted.

Amended October 2022. President Green adopted an interim revision to G-1 to provide for the formation of an additional University Promotion and Tenure Committee in years when, in the discretion of the provost, the number of dossiers to be considered exceeds the capacity of a single committee.

Amended July 2022. In response to feedback collected from faculty and administrators, extensive revisions, clarifications, and editorial changes were made. In addition, the May 2021 temporary emergency changes were permanently adopted.

Amended May 2021. President Green adopted temporary emergency changes affecting sections D-1.b. and D-2.e.

Amended July 2021. Section A-2.a. was revised to state the purpose of promotion; D-2.e.4. to clarify contents of packet for external review; and F-1 to require consideration of representational balance.

Adopted January 2020. The university's promotion and tenure policies were comprehensively revised in order to unify all provisions regarding procedure in the Faculty Staff Handbook and to help faculty and reviewers by clarifying the procedure. The following changes were approved: Deletion of FSH 3520, 3560, and 3570; revision of FSH 3530; and addition of new FSH 3500 and 3510.