

December 19, 2025



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

875 Perimeter Drive MS 3151
Moscow ID 83844-3151

208-885-6365
president@uidaho.edu
uidaho.edu/president

TO: Diane Whitney, Director of University Policy
Francesca Sammarucca, Faculty Secretary

FROM: C. Scott Green, President

SUBJECT: Policy Item from December 3, 2025 Request

In response to the approval consideration request of December 3, 2025, and pursuant to FSH 1460 F-2.a., I hereby disapprove the following policy item:

Faculty Staff Handbook

- FSH 3515 Periodic Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

I greatly appreciate the efforts of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate to develop this policy; however, I cannot support the policy in its current form. The goal of the corresponding Board of Regent's policy (RGP II.G) is to create a legitimate review process of our tenured faculty. The proposed FSH 3515 contains elements and protections that undermine this goal and decrease accountability. I have discussed my concerns with some of our Regents as well as staff in the Office of the State Board of Education, and they share my concerns.

I offer seven points of concern. Addressing these will strengthen this policy, align it better with our Regents' goals, and make it an authentic review process:

1. **D-3:** The presumption of a positive review after four positive annual performance evaluations will bias the post-tenure review process (a review by peers) because it assumes a *de facto* outcome without doing a *bona fide* review. In addition, the requirement to explain anything other than the presumptive outcome is redundant because justification for a negative review already requires justification in processes outlined in E-5-b and E-6-b, and E-8 (to be added – see #3 below).
2. **E-1-a-2 and E-1-a-3:** As written, allowing the faculty member the ability to significantly influence the membership of their committee undermines the legitimacy of the review. This is not standard practice in any evaluation process. In many departments, it would allow the faculty under review to hand select their committee or a major component of it. I would be supportive of language permitting this for one colleague (not three) in a manner similar to our existing post



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
875 Perimeter Drive MS 3151
Moscow ID 83844-3151

208-885-6365
president@uidaho.edu
uidaho.edu/president

tenure review policy (see [FSH 3320-B-4-a](#)). This should be the case for committees assembled for faculty and faculty with administrative appointments (see E-1-b-2).

3. **E-8-A and E-8-C:** These sections disregard the critical role of the dean in the supervisory chain. The policy contains a significant inconsistency which must be addressed. The Dean is a critical link in the faculty member's supervisory chain and is responsible for assigning work to faculty (see [FSH 1420 A-1-c-8](#)). As written, the dean can override a negative outcome from the unit but cannot override a positive outcome of the unit. The dean must be able to do both if this review is to be thorough and acknowledge the dean's responsibilities. This would be consistent with other UI review processes (e.g., third year review, P&T, annual evaluation, etc.). Like the unit leader, a dean who provides a negative evaluation must also justify their evaluation so that the reasons for such a decision are transparent.
4. **E-9-c-3:** Board policy states that a president may take action for termination based on the outcome of a periodic performance review without requiring preliminary processes. This section requires an improvement plan prior to taking this step. While policy II.G identifies an improvement plan as a possible outcome for a negative review, our policy removes a possible outcome allowed within II.G and limits the options given to the institution by the Regents. In addition, any termination action is already subject to U of I's extensive processes which include the Dismissal Hearing Committee review ([FSH 3910](#)) and a termination decision is also appealable through the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board ([FSH 3840](#).) Both processes provide appropriate protection for faculty.
5. **E-9-c:** There is no clear process identified to follow a mixed review outcome in E-9-b. This aspect of the policy is incomplete and there should be a process (or clarify the same process) for a negative outcome decided by the provost.
6. **E-11-a:** 18 months between initial notification and review completion is an unnecessarily long timeline. It will also be a problem for implementation in the first year after this policy is approved. I suggest the notification take place in the fall semester, perhaps early September, of the review year.
7. **Missing:** The policy does not address a situation where a tenured faculty member is due for a review under this policy but recently completed (i.e. within 5 years) a peer review process as defined in [FSH 3320-B-4](#). It is appropriate to delay the review in this policy until five years after a FSH 3320 review. Both are a post tenure review process and would meet the requirement of RGP II.G.