

University of Idaho  
2025 – 2026 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting #27  
Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 3:30 pm  
Zoom Only

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (VOTE)
  - Minutes of the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Meeting # 26 (March 31, 2026)  
**Attach. #1**
- III. Chair’s Report
- IV. Provost’s Report
- V. Invited Guest Presentations
  - None
- VI. Committee Voting Items and Reports
  - Report from Information Technology Committee – Margie Pinnell, Committee Chair, and Ata Zadehgo, College of Engineering. **Attach. #2**
  - Report from Administrative Hearing Board – Debb Thorne, Board Chair.
  - P&T Salary Increase Recommendation (VOTE) – Brenda Bauges, Chair of Faculty Compensation Committee. **Attach. #3**
  - Ad Hoc Committee on AI Use in the Classroom Roster Recommendation (VOTE) – Kristin Haltinner, Chair of Committee on Committees. **Attach. #4**
- VII. Other Policy Business
  - None
- VIII. Other Announcements and Communications
  - None
- IX. New Concerns or Issues
- X. Adjournment

Attachments

- **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Meeting # 26 (March 31, 2026)
- **Attach. #2** IT Committee Reports
- **Attach. #3** RCC Recommendation
- **Attach. #4** AI Committee Roster
- **Attach. #5**

**2025 – 2026 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval**

**Meeting # 26**

Tuesday, March 31, 2026, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm PST

Zoom only

**Present:** Bailey, Barannyk, Borrelli, Erickson, Hagen, Haltinner (vice chair), Harrison, Hu, Kenyon, Kolas, Lawrence (provost, w/o vote), Long, Maas, McKenna, Miller, Murphy (chair), Remy, Rinker, Rivera, Roe, Shook, Strickland, Stuen, Thorne, Tohaneanu, Vella (faculty secretary, w/o vote), Victoravich

**Absent:** no absences

**Call to Order**

Chair Murphy called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes (vote)**

- The minutes of the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Meeting #25 (March 24, 2026) were approved as circulated.

**Chair's report**

- The chair reported on his discussion with general counsel on reporting of Senate votes. Senate is not bound by open meetings law to report votes. The Idaho code does not place restrictions on how we report votes. If we would like to report votes differently (e.g., list the vote of each member by name) we could do a bylaws amendment. If senators would like to move forward with a change, let Tim know.

**Provost's Report**

- The April Faculty Gathering will be hosted by the School of Health and Medical Professions, Wednesday, April 8, 2026 from 4:30-6:30 pm PT in the D.A. Huckabay Medical Education Building (121 W. Sweet Ave). Please complete this [RSVP form](#) if you plan to attend.
- The Provost provided an update from the President's office on the Interim Provost Search: The committee screened applications and selected candidates to move to the interview stage. The first round of interviews will conclude this week. The committee will meet early next week to discuss who will move on to the final stage. Those individuals will participate in in-person interviews and stakeholder meetings in the coming weeks. After the in-person processes conclude, the committee will provide the president with recommendations detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the applicants for his final determination. It is hoped that his process will be concluded by the end of April.
  - Committee members include:
    - Chris Nomura (Chair) – VP of Research and Economic Development
    - Blaine Eckles – Vice Provost for Student Affairs/Dean of Students
    - Kim Salisbury – Senior Associate Vice President for Finance
    - Lisa Victoravich – Dean, College of Business and Economics
    - Jodi Walker – Co-Chief Marketing Officer
    - Charles Goebel – Professor of Forest Ecosystem Restoration and Ecology and Department Head of Forest, Rangeland, and Fire Sciences
    - Juliet Marshall – Associate Director of Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station, Professor, and Extension Specialist in Cereals

- Chantal Vella – Faculty Secretary, Professor
  - Shawna Bertlin – Director of University Advising Services
  - Nathan Schiele – Associate Professor – College of Engineering, Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering
  - Marty Ytreberg – Professor – College of Science, Department of Physics
  - Katherine Ball – Clinical Professor – College of Law
- 
- Diane Kelly-Riley provided an overview of how the transition from legacy spread pay to deferred pay is impacting W-2 forms. Some faculty on the old system were noticing their W-2 salary amounts were different than previous years. In this transition, the payroll schedule changed from July to July (legacy spread pay) to August to August (new deferred pay). It was noted that during summer 2025 there were 8 weeks in which individuals on the legacy spread pay schedule did not receive a paycheck, and this will be reflected in the W-2 form. It was noted that the academic year contract spans 2 calendar years and differs from the reporting shown on the W-2 form. Information was added to the deferred pay intranet. Please reach out to Vice Provost Kelly-Riley with questions. [Inside U of I Deferred Pay](#)

### Committee Voting Items and Reports

- UCC 179 Movement Sciences Department Name Change – Philip Scruggs, Department Chair of Movement Sciences  
This change renames the Department of Movement Sciences, within EHHS, to the Department of Kinesiology to align with nationally recognized disciplinary naming within the field.  
Vote: 24/24 yes. 0/24 no. Approved.
  
- UCC 32 Department of Health Professions – Russel Baker, WWAMI Associate Director  
This change renames the Department of Clinical Medicine, within SHAMP, to the Department of Health Professions to align with the growing number of health progressions programs housed within the department.  
Vote: 23/23 yes. 0/23 no. Approved.
  
- FSH 3170 University Ethics and Faculty Code of Conduct – Bob Borrelli, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee.  
This update established a faculty code of conduct within the existing ethics policy in compliance with Idaho State Board of Education Policy II.G.  
Discussion  
A question was raised regarding how a report is determined to be made in good faith and who is responsible for making that determination. It was noted that the alternative language could be more problematic because it may protect individuals who make reports in bad faith. The intent of the section is to protect individuals who act in good faith. It was also noted that the policy is linked to related policies, and that the federal law and Idaho Code provide protection against retaliation.  
  
Haltiner made a motion to remove “good faith” from section C-3.c. Tohaneanu seconded.  
Vote: 10/23 yes; 13/23 no. Motion failed.

Long made a motion to change C-3.h to read: The enumeration of these Faculty Rights shall not be construed to deny any other rights retained by the Faculty under applicable law and university

policy, **including, but not limited to, rights related to academic freedom, shared governance,** and the Responsibilities of the University Faculty under FSH 1520 Article IV. Barannyk seconded. Vote: 23/23 yes, 0/23 no. Motion to amend was approved.

The chair called for a vote on FSH 3170 as amended.

Vote: 22/23 yes. 1/23 no. Approved.

- FSH 3780 Dependent Educational Tuition and Fee Reduction – Teresa Amos, Chair Faculty Staff Policy Group.

This proposal changes the dependent tuition benefit from two students per household to two students per employee. Additional language is included to prevent double dipping and to clarify provisions related to termination of an employee prior to the first census date.

Discussion

A question was raised about how scholarships awarded to a student dependent are applied. With this benefit, the tuition rate is reduced by half for the first child, and any additional adjustments from scholarships are applied after that reduced amount.

Vote: 22/22 yes. 0/22 no. Approved.

- Request for Creation of Ad Hoc Committee on E-Bike and Scooter Safety – Kristin Haltinner, Ad Hoc Committee on Safety and Security.

This is a proposal to establish an ad-hoc committee on e-bike and scooter safety.

Discussion

Questions were asked about campus security presence on campus, whether a new committee should be created to address this issue, and whether a smaller committee would be appropriate. It was noted that there is not an existing standing committee suited to take on this responsibility. The issue was described as complex and requires liaisons from multiple areas to support communication, including coordination with the Moscow Police Department.

Vote: 17/23 yes. 6/23 no. Approved.

- Ad Hoc Safety and Security Committee Request to Put Content on Senate Intranet Site – Kristin Haltinner, Ad Hoc Committee on Safety and Security.

A need was expressed for a mechanism to communicate safety initiatives to the campus community. A proposal was made to request creation of a subpage of the Faculty Senate intranet where these initiatives can be posted. It was noted that it is important to have an accessible place for this information to be housed.

Vote: 22/22 yes 0/22 no. Approved.

### **Consent Agenda**

- Faculty Senate Standing Committee Roster (Consent Agenda Item) – Kristin Haltinner, Chair of Committee on Committees.

This item was adopted by general consent.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm PST (4:45 p.m. MT).

Respectfully Submitted,

Chantal Vella

Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate

## **IT Committee annual report (Part I: Technical)**

Committee Chair: Darryl J. Woolley

### **Table of Contents**

1. IT Committee charge: [FSH 1640.55](#)
2. IT Procurement
  - a. Timeline
3. Hardware diversity report
4. Faculty satisfaction
  - a. Survey results
  - b. Anecdotal information

### **IT Committee Charge**

#### FSH 1640.55 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

- A. FUNCTION. To advise and recommend university policies regarding the planning, implementation, and maintenance of information technology in the areas of teaching, research, outreach, and management.
  - A-1. To make recommendations to the Faculty Senate, the president, the provost, and other appropriate administrators concerning policies and procedures affecting university-wide information technology.
  - A-2. To solicit recommendations from the faculty, staff, students, and administration concerning present and proposed policies and procedures related to university-wide information technology.
  - A-3. To review, in an advisory capacity, short-term and long-term plans related to university-wide technology.
  - A-4. This committee traditionally meets on Mondays at 3:30 p.m.

### **IT Procurement Policy**

#### Timeline

- 7/22/22 APM 30.16 amendment passed
- 4/11/23 Faculty senate requests APM 30.16 be rolled back
- 7/13/23 President Green rejects faculty senate request
- 9/30/23 Faculty Senate requests IT committee involvement

#### APM 30.16 D

- D-1. University of Idaho employees shall procure technology hardware, regardless of funding source , through the U of I technology procurement process as documented on the ITS Portal. Whenever feasible purchases shall be limited to Standard Technology Hardware unless an exception request is preapproved pursuant to section F.
- D-2. Technology hardware may not be purchased on University issued P-cards except by ITS as a part of the U of I technology procurement process. Personal funds reimbursed by the University may not be used to purchase technology hardware.
- D-3. Whenever feasible, technology hardware shall be treated as a managed technology device. Exceptions to this will be at the discretion of ITS.
- D-4. All technology hardware shall be tracked in and through central inventory management systems as documented on the ITS Portal.
- D-5. Repairs or upgrades of technology hardware shall be coordinated through ITS.
- D-6. Security and management software shall not be removed or rendered unusable for any reason on any managed technology device unless preapproved through ITS.
- D-7. No hardware or software shall be added, modified, or removed from technology hardware that negatively impacts the performance of security and management software.
- D-8. Upon any of the below events, managed devices shall be cleaned of all data through an approved ITS process and reset to meet managed device standards, unless an exception is approved by ITS; in addition, all technology equipment shall be evaluated by ITS to ensure use is still appropriate.
- The end of employment of an employee
  - Change of position of an employee
  - Reallocation of technology hardware resources
  - Receipt of new technology hardware
  - Situations deemed necessary to address security or compliance

As part of an employee's offboarding process, the supervisor is responsible for contacting ITS to secure electronic information that is subject to archival or records management policy.

- D-9. Surplus or disposal of technology hardware will be coordinated through ITS as documented on the ITS Portal.

#### Hardware Diversity, Security, and Total Cost of Ownership

1. University of Idaho procedures
2. Peer institutions
3. NIST 800.53 (security)
4. Gartner Research G00208758 (total cost of ownership)
5. Survey Results – revised analysis
6. Recommendations by the University IT Committee
7. IT Procurement Anecdotes from UI Employees

## **2. Peer institutions**

Attached are documents from Faculty Senate leadership detailing IT policies at Boise State University (BSU), Idaho State University (ISU), and Montana State University (MSU). Based on these documents, it appears that none of these institutions require employees to purchase computers from a single vendor. BSU and ISU allow multiple vendors, with BSU restricting choices to state-approved vendors. MSU's policies focus on technical requirements without vendor restrictions.

## **3. NIST 800.53 (security)**

Based on NIST reference [1], employing diversity in suppliers, designs, technologies, and supply-chain strategies significantly enhances security resilience, mitigates risks from targeted attacks, reduces vulnerabilities from common-mode failures, and ensures operational continuity. Although increased diversity may add complexity and management overhead — potentially leading to mistakes and unauthorized configurations — these risks are outweighed by the critical role diversity plays in effectively mitigating cybersecurity threats.

## **References**

- [1] "Security and Privacy Controls for Information Systems and Organizations," U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-53r5>

## **4. Gartner Research G00208758 (total cost of ownership)**

The study in [2] analyzed feedback from numerous client interactions and detailed interviews with nine organizations that integrated a second networking vendor. The findings indicate that adopting a dual- or **multivendor** approach reduces **total cost of ownership**

(TCO) by 15% - 25% over five years without increasing long-term operational costs. The study recommends evaluating alternative vendors for cost-effective network solutions and adopting multivendor-capable management tools.

## References

- [2] M. Fabbi and D. Curtis, "Debunking the Myth of the Single-Vendor Network," Gartner, 2010. [Online]. Available: [https://static.spiceworks.com/attachments/post/0009/2370/Debunking\\_the\\_Myth\\_of\\_a\\_Single\\_Vendor\\_Network\\_copy.pdf](https://static.spiceworks.com/attachments/post/0009/2370/Debunking_the_Myth_of_a_Single_Vendor_Network_copy.pdf), and <https://www.gartner.com/en/documents/1471937>, and <https://i.dell.com/sites/content/business/solutions/whitepapers/en/Documents/gartner-debunking-myth-of-single-vendor-network.pdf>

## 5. Survey Results – revised analysis

On question 8 below, UI employees who are Strongly Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied comprise approximately 52% in 2021-2022, 61% in 2022-2023, and 47% in 2023-2024.

On question 7 below, UI employees who are Strongly Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied comprise approximately 30% in 2021-2022, 32% in 2022-2023, and 28% in 2023-2024.

Note that for questions 8 there was a 55% drop in the number of respondents (from 940 to 517) from 2022 to 2023, and a 58% drop in the number of respondents (from 940 to 546) from 2022 to 2024. Question 7 follows approximately the same trends.

*Q07: The technology procurement process provided the equipment I need to complete my technology-required job tasks.*

*Q08: The technology procurement process met my expectations for timeliness.*

## 6. Recommendations by the University IT Committee

- When equipment is purchased on the PI's funds, the PI should be allowed to choose their vendor and equipment, as long as:
  - The vendor is not on the List of NON-APPROVED Vendors & Manufacturers, and
  - The equipment will not harm the U of Idaho network.
- Clarify the above in the text of APM 30.16 **policy**, so that there is no misunderstanding in **practice**.



Recommendations  
by U IT Committee W

## Executive Summary

This summary consolidates findings from the University IT Committee report, peer institution comparisons, and committee analysis conducted during the 2024–25 review cycle. This executive summary also synthesizes faculty and staff survey responses describing friction and frustration, as well as the successes under recent IT policy changes, mainly focused on the subchapter [30.16 - Technology Hardware Lifecycle Management](#).

Using all [APM Chapter 30](#) as the fixed policy framework, the goal here is to help the IT Committee understand the current operational landscape, identify root causes of faculty and staff dissatisfaction related to technology procurement and to clarify where challenges stem from *policy design versus policy implementation* and *personnel capacity*. The subcommittee has identified areas where recommendations are warranted in alignment with APM 30 and the [IT committee's charge](#) to advise on university-wide information technology policy and practice.

## Overall Landscape and Sentiment

While APM 30.16 has become the focal point of faculty frustration, the most significant pain points arise from **inconsistent implementation, staffing capacity, and communication** - not from the existence of the policy itself. Ambiguities in policy language and inconsistent interpretation have amplified operational strain, creating the perception that the policy is more restrictive than it explicitly states.

The dominant sentiment from feedback is negative, characterized by frustration, uncertainty, loss of autonomy, and perceived disrespect for faculty expertise - particularly in research-intensive disciplines. Faculty consistently report that IT processes feel optimized for administrative standardization, not the realities of research, teaching labs, creative production, or grant-funded work. Heavy concerns regarding limiting hardware and software purchases to a small subset of vendors was a consistent frustration. Hardware diversity improves cybersecurity resilience, prevents single point of failure, countering assumptions that uniformity is inherently more secure or cost-effective.

At the same time, a non-trivial minority reports excellent experiences - especially where they had strong relationships with dedicated assigned Technology Service Partners (TSPs), clear communication, and timely approvals for nonstandard needs. This contrast suggests that the problem is not uniformly the policy itself, but rather inconsistent execution, unclear ownership, and uneven communication.

# Initial Recommendations

The following recommendations retain ideas surfaced in submissions and are framed for committee action where possible:

## 1. Adopt a tiered, risk-based procurement model

- a. A “commodity fast lane” for low-risk, low-cost items
- b. A “research/high-performance lane” with specialized review and faster turnaround
  - i. Quotes received from approved vendors (or not on the non-approved vendor list) should be prioritized and greenlit quickly, within a week.

(Aligned with APM 30.11 and 30.16 principles)

## 2. Make exceptions transparent and usable

- a. Publish clear criteria, templates, examples, and a decision FAQ
  - i. Hyperlink to approved and [non-approved vendors](#) list from APM
  - ii. This information is found across multiple locations in the intranet – there should be a singular place one can learn from
- b. Clarify what qualifies for preapproved exceptions under APM 30.16
  - i. Publish this description as part of APM 30.16

## 3. Define service expectations and accountability

- a. Clear response-time targets – suggested within 24 hours of initial contact
- b. Every ticket confirmation should include a simple reporting or escalating ladder
  - i. (assigned OIT owner → supervisor → director → VP/CIO)
- c. This creates transparency, accountability, and a clear path for time-sensitive escalation without ad hoc dean/chair intervention
- d. Build a training module within the annual Purchasing-Card course, assign to Principal Investigator’s (PI’s)

## 4. Improve communication practices

- a. Advance notice with clear “what / why / when / impact” messaging
- b. Written instructions and expectations for timelines of changes
- c. Consider the timing of these announced changes to align with faculty contracts, giving them enough time to review and prepare for proposed changes
  - i. Avoid major announcements during academic breaks like summer or winter, when faculty are considered off-contract

(Consistent with APM 30.18.)

**5. Establish a supported research-computing autonomy model**

- a. Documented pathways for Linux/GPU and specialized stacks
- b. Controlled, auditable admin/root access where justified
  - i. Standardize the request process
  - ii. Outline clearly who *might* qualify and who **would not** qualify
- c. Reduce incentives for faculty and staff to rely on personal devices for institutional work.

(See RPP #2 below. Aligned with APM 30.10 and 30.15.)

**6. Clarify vendor standards vs. policy mandates**

- a. Publish the rationale for standard vendors
  - i. Include a common rationale for non-approved vendors as well
- b. Explicitly document when and how alternatives are permitted, for example, addressing partner or sponsor restrictions transparently
- c. Hardware diversity improves cybersecurity resilience, prevents **single point of failure**, and can reduce total cost of ownership by 15–25% over time, countering assumptions that uniformity is inherently more secure or cost-effective.

**7. Treat research storage and backup as an enablement function rather than an exception**

- a. Provide a list of approved third-party backup solutions (including self-funded options) within APM 30.
- b. Establish a clear mapping between data classifications and approved storage solutions.
- c. Develop streamlined training for researchers with elevated storage needs, coupled with expedited approval and access processes.

**8. Conduct a consistency and cycle-time audit**

- a. Identify where similar requests receive different outcomes
- b. Standardize decision logic and report cycle-time metrics to the IT Committee
- c. Develop a clear training policy for new onboarding OIT staff that addresses all previously listed recommendations and common pain points when dealing with Faculty and Staff purchasers
  - i. Aim to clean up the multiple and inconsistent responses to faculty after initial requests (Ex: singular vendor only blanket responses)

**9. Consider bringing the oversight of IT policy to the FSH as opposed to the current APM**

- a. Historically, policies that directly affect faculty affairs (performance, research, etc), have been housed and managed in the Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH), whereas procedures have been housed in the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)
- b. A move such as this would bring oversight and development back through the faculty senate, a voting body, to more clearly and transparently align with the varied and diverse needs of faculty
- c. This was a consistent request from the faculty anecdotes in the most recent survey

## Key Recurring Pain Points (RPP)

Below is a summary of survey data and anecdotal responses taken from Faculty across the university. These responses have not been followed up with, verified, or confirmed externally, and yet, there is a clear and common theme across the feedback. These all align with the recommendations above but give more context to the work.

### **1. Procurement Delays and Opacity**

Routine purchases (hard drives, monitors, accessories) and research-critical systems alike are described as taking weeks to months, with little visibility into status, shifting quotes, unexplained price increases, and vendor cancellations after long delays. Faculty report lost productivity, delayed research milestones, and teaching disruptions.

Policy context: APM 30.16 emphasizes centralized procurement, standard hardware, and lifecycle management. The lived experience lacks predictable timelines, pricing transparency, and accountability.

### **2. Standardization vs. Research and Teaching Reality**

Faculty in engineering, sciences, creative disciplines, and emerging research areas report that “standard” configurations do not meet their needs (Linux environments, GPUs, specialized software stacks, large storage, multi-user labs). Restrictions on admin/root access and security software conflicts are cited as actively inhibiting productivity and, in some cases, stopping work entirely.

Policy context: APM 30.10, 30.15, and 30.16 emphasize least privilege, managed devices, and security controls, but do not clearly articulate a research-appropriate operating model.

### **3. Vendor and Brand Restrictions**

Many submissions report a perceived “Lenovo-only” mandate, even when faculty cannot find such a requirement in APM 30.16. Inconsistent approvals (e.g., Dell approved in some cases but denied in others) fuel perceptions of arbitrariness, overreach, and misinterpretation of policy

Drawing on NIST 800-53 and Gartner research, hardware diversity improves cybersecurity resilience, prevents single point of failure, and can reduce total cost of ownership by 15–25% over time, countering assumptions that uniformity is inherently more secure or cost-effective.

Committee concern: a gap between APM language and operational standards as enforced.

### **4. Communication and Change Management Failures**

Faculty consistently report changes implemented without advance notice, explanation, or instructions - sometimes while faculty are off-contract. Examples include login changes, device registration prompts on personal phones, new phone systems, and software behavior changes that resemble phishing attempts.

Policy context: APM 30.18 explicitly emphasizes structured change management and minimizing disruption; current practice is widely seen as misaligned.

### **5. Access, Storage, and Backup Risks**

Restrictions on third-party backup services, limited institutional storage, and privilege barriers have led to fear of data loss, forced personal workarounds, and in one case, inability to retrieve one’s own data. Faculty request scalable, research-appropriate backup options - even if self-funded.

Policy context: APM 30.11’s risk-based data classification framework is not translating into clear, usable guidance for research data workflows.

### **6. Inconsistent Service and Accountability**

Many submissions emphasize that outcomes depend on “who you get.” Tickets stall unless escalated through chairs or deans, responsibility shifts between individuals, and there is rarely a clear owner. This inconsistency explains both very negative and very positive experiences.

Committee concern: training and reduction in turnover should work to resolve many of the issues commonly cited.

## Closing Note

Across submissions, faculty consistently express a desire to comply with security and policy requirements; however, current IT practices are impeding their work, resulting in stalled research, disrupted teaching, and an erosion of trust. The recurring patterns indicate that implementation is inconsistent with the actual text of the APM, and that insufficient clarity and accountability constitute significant barriers to faculty fulfilling their responsibilities. Addressing these issues is expected to improve outcomes while maintaining institutional security and compliance.



To: Provost Lawrence, Faculty Senate

From: Faculty Compensation Committee

Subject: Recommendation for Increase in Promotion and Tenure Increments

Date: March 26, 2026

---

Dear Faculty Senate and Provost Lawrence,

The Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) recommends that the current Promotion and Tenure Increments be increased. The FCC recommends any such increase take effect beginning with promotion and tenure decisions made this academic year (2025-2026), and that thereafter the increments be reviewed every three years for necessary increases based on inflation rates. Details and justification for this recommendation are included below.

**Historical Justification:**

The 2024-25 Ad Hoc FCC set forth well-reasoned justification for increases in general. We attach their letter as Attachment 1. We would specifically reiterate their reasoning that promotion and tenure increments “have not changed since 2006. In practice, this means that faculty “real” promotion rates have decreased by 37%. For example, the equivalent spending power of a \$6,000 raise in 2006 would require a raise of approximately \$9,500 in 2024.” Inflation rates relied upon by that committee can be verified using the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.<sup>1</sup>

**Comparator Institution Justification:**

In February of this year, an informal survey requesting information on promotion and tenure increments was sent to various institutions via the Association of Public Land Grant Universities, Committee on Faculty Affairs Listserv. A number of institutions responded, including Boise State University. We believe BSU provides the best comparator data chiefly due to its geographic proximity and similar nature as an Idaho higher educational institution. Additionally, BSU, unlike some of the other institutions, had a comparable

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.bls.gov/cpi/>.

increment structure (e.g. flat rate as opposed to percentages and across-the-board equality between tenure track versus non-tenure track promotions).

BSU reported that their P&T increments are \$9,000 for Assistant Professors being promoted to Associate Professors for both tenure and non-tenure track faculty, and \$12,000 for Associate Professors being promoted to Full Professor for both tenure and non-tenure track faculty.

**Specific Recommendation:**

The FCC recommends that the University of Idaho increase its P&T increments from \$6,000 to \$9,000 for Assistant Professors being promoted to Associate Professor, and from \$8,500 to \$12,000 for Associate Professors being promoted to Full Professor. These numbers are specifically for those professors on an academic year contract, regardless of tenure-track status. The University of Idaho publishes different P&T increments for instructors and fiscal year contract professors. We recommend proportional increases to those numbers as well.

The projected total budget increase for P&T increments at their current rate for all promotion decisions made this academic year (2025-26) across all fund types is \$376,700. That number increases by \$150,300 with this suggested adjustment.

This suggested increase, though not exact, is commensurate with the increase suggested by last year's committee to address inflation concerns of not raising P&T increments in the last 10 years. Thus, it is justified by both bases of addressing the oversight of not reviewing P&T increment increases on a periodic basis to keep up with inflation and of remaining competitive and commensurate with our comparator institution.

To ensure that such a large increase in one year does not occur again in the future—so as to avoid compression, fairness, and budget planning issues—the committee recommends an on-going three-year review and adjustment of P&T increments to account for inflation. This can be done by the Provost Office under its authority to establish and publish “guidance necessary for the administration of the promotion and tenure system guidelines” pursuant to FSH 3500(B-2). Alternatively, FSH 3500 can be amended to specifically outline this review and adjustment process. As to the latter option, the FCC recommends the policy revision in Attachment 2.

Respectfully,

*The Faculty Compensation Committee: Brenda Bauges, R. A. Borrelli, Lide Chen, Dale Graden, Carolina Manrique Hoyos, Corey McKenna, Leticia Ribeiro da Silva dos Santos, Benjamin Ridenhour*

To: Provost Lawrence

From: Faculty Ad Hoc Salary Committee



Subject: Recommendations for Changes to Employee Compensation

Dear Provost Lawrence,

The Faculty Ad Hoc Salary Committee appreciates the opportunity to provide recommendations on how best to allocate funds for faculty raises in alignment with market-based compensation goals while balancing equity, fairness, and strategic objectives. In accordance with the unanimous vote by Faculty Senate, we propose the following steps be taken in order:

***1) Total CEC distributions be divided between staff and faculty groups based (at a minimum) on the current proportion of total payroll across these groups.***

We first acknowledge that many staff salaries have not kept up with inflation, which results in an inability to retain high-quality employees and generally decreases morale and motivation across campus. However, since 2022 the growth in total number of staff positions has grown at roughly twice the rate of faculty positions, accordingly the total salary to this group has grown 36% faster than the growth of faculty salaries (17.6% vs 12.9%). Indeed, the faculty group is now more than \$5.2 million behind targets compared to the staff deficit of \$4.4 million, despite making up a smaller portion of total payroll.

The faculty is concerned about the continued decrease in the proportion of total payroll allocated to faculty. For example, the proportion of payroll going to faculty has dropped by 1% within the last two years (44.2% in 2023 to 43.2% in 2025), and considerably more since 2018. As such, we recommend a mechanism that (at a minimum) holds the proportion of payroll to staff and faculty groups constant. Despite having record research and near record enrollment, the proportion of payroll going to faculty has decreased substantially across time. This problem is exacerbated by the incommensurability between staff and faculty targets. Despite claims to the contrary, determination of staff targets is not as objective as determination of faculty targets. As such, they may be gameable, which is evidenced by their notable increase beyond national wage growth. Any system that allocates a single pot of money between staff and faculty based on “targets” is therefore fundamentally flawed.

***2) Set Promotion and Tenure Funds Aside.***

The total sum of funds required to meet promotion and tenure raises are calculated, set aside and applied in Step 6.

*Rationale:* Promotion and tenure raises are among the few guaranteed salary increases faculty members receive. To align with the CEC and market-based compensation goals, promotion and tenure funds should be awarded only after adjustments have brought faculty closer to their target salary levels. These funds should be seen as a reward for promotion, not as a mechanism to address salary gaps. Additionally, we recommend that promotion raises increase by \$750 each year for the next five years for AY assistant professors being promoted to associate professor ranks. Raises for other promotions (e.g., AY associate to full) should be increased proportionally. Raises associated with promotions have not changed since 2006. In practice, this means that

faculty “real” promotion rates have decreased by 37%. For example, the equivalent spending power of a \$6,000 raise in 2006 would require a raise of approximately \$9,500 in 2024.

**3) Ensure Faculty Below 80% of Target Are Raised to 80%.**

After funds are set aside for Promotion and Tenure, the remaining pool should be used to bring all faculty projected to be below 80% of target to that threshold.

*Rationale:* As in previous years, a minimally acceptable baseline of 80% of the target salary should be maintained for faculty who meet or exceed expectations. Over time, the institution should aspire to move this threshold towards 100% of target for those who consistently meet or exceed high performance expectations.

**4) Replace “Across-the-Board” Raises with a Proportional Formula.**

We recommend seventy-five percent of the fund remaining after steps 2 and 3 be used to provide raises based on the following:

If faculty are at, or above, 105% of target, no raise is received via the below formula. Otherwise, use the below formula for all faculty.

$$Raise_i = \frac{\$ \text{ away from } 105\% \text{ of } target_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \$ \text{ away from } 105\% \text{ of } target_i} * [Total \text{ Available}]$$

*i* indexes individuals 1 to *N*, where *N* equals the total number of individuals below 105%.

*\$ away from 105% target<sub>i</sub>* = Dollars of salary for each individual who is below 105% of target. This part calculates how much each employee’s salary currently falls short of a pre-set target salary. If an employee’s current salary is close (or above) the target, they are “behind” by only a small amount, while others with larger gaps are further “behind.”

$\sum_{i=1}^N \$ \text{ away from } 105\% \text{ of } target_i$  = Total of all employees' dollar amount below 105% of targets. This is the combined shortfall for all employees, adding up how much everyone is collectively behind 105% of total target salary. This value represents the overall raise amount necessary for all faculty to be at 105% of target.

*Total Available* = 75% of the amount remaining in CEC pool.

Each term should be calculated after steps 2 and 3 occur. Each employee's raise is determined by dividing their individual shortfall by the total shortfall for all employees. This gives a percentage that represents their "share" of the need. Multiplying this percentage by the total available gives the dollar amount each employee will receive.

*Rationale:* This formula ensures raises are proportional to each faculty member’s gap from their target salary, prioritizing those further behind. For example, someone at 80% of their target might move to 86%, while someone at 95% might move to 97%. This approach is: 1) Fair, it narrows salary gaps proportionally rather than applying a flat percentage increase or fixed dollar amount; 2) Equitable, it strategically directs funds toward achieving salary equity and alignment with target levels; and 3) Transparent, the calculation is based on objective targets and current salaries, eliminating arbitrary allocations.

**5) Performance-Based Raises.**

We recommend twenty-five percent of the CEC funds remaining after steps two and three be used in step five to provide incentives and rewards for faculty.

*Rationale:* Transparent and well-communicated performance-based raises incentivize productivity and help retain high-performing individuals who might otherwise pursue opportunities elsewhere.

**6) Apply Set-aside Tenure and Promotion Funds.**

Lastly, award all funds set aside in Step 2.

**Additional Recommendations**

In addition to the CEC recommendations, the committee would like to highlight and emphasize several factors that we believe are critical to support faculty morale, retention, and productivity.

First, faculty salaries have fallen significantly behind market rates such that recruiting new, high-quality faculty has become more difficult and (anecdotally) successful faculty are beginning to look for employment elsewhere. In just the past two years, the total deficit from actual to target faculty salaries has increased by approximately \$2.2 million.

Second, the current stagnation of regular and research faculty rates has led to a substantial decrease in real-wage earnings. For example, the average research faculty salary has increased ~17.5% since 2018, while the cost of living has increased by roughly 27%. This equates to a ~1.6% average real earnings loss each year. If this trend continues, the average research faculty member would earn just 61% (~1.6%\*25 years) of the salary provided to the same group in 2018. During this same period, some staff and higher-level administrative positions have had (average) raises that have vastly outpaced inflation. This outcome is untenable for a University with R1 aspirations. Indeed, it is likely not a coincidence that the U of I reached all-time research expenditure levels and is on the cusp of receiving R1 status following the committed effort to raise salaries that occurred when the market-based salary model was first introduced.

Lastly, the committee supports performance-based raises but is concerned that the opaque nature by which these funds are distributed has led to allegations of unfairness and favoritism. As such, we have proposed that the Faculty Affairs Committee develop a revised process with increased transparency.

These recommendations represent a thoughtful and strategic approach to achieving market-aligned compensation while addressing equity and performance concerns. Thank you for considering our recommendations. We look forward to working collaboratively to achieve these goals.

Sincerely,



On behalf of the Ad Hoc Faculty Salary Committee



**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).

d. **Promotion and Tenure Increments.** Recognizing and rewarding an individual's performance as a scholar, teacher, and faculty member pursuant to section A-2.a of this section includes providing increases in salary commensurate with that individual's change in rank. These promotion and tenure increases, or increments, are to be published by the Provost's Office pursuant to its authority outlined in B-2 of this section. Increments will be reviewed by the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Compensation Committee, every three years and adjusted to reflect increases in the Higher Education Price Index or the Consumer Price Index, which is higher.

### **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 July 2024.** Add a reference to FSH2700.

**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.

## AI Committee Roster

### Ex Officio

Name	Office
Joao Malanga	CETL
Nathan Hurlock	CDAR
Darren Kearney	OIT

Name	Department	College	Campus
Jean-Marc Gauthier	Virtual Technology and Design	CAA	Moscow
Konstantinos Kolias	Computer Science	COE	Idaho Falls
Max Wolpert	Music	CLASS	Moscow
Ryan Funkhouser	Psychology	CLASS	Moscow
Casey Johson	Philosophy	CLASS	Moscow
Kat Smith	Law	CLAW	Moscow
Tracey Johnson	Fish and Wildlife	CNR	Boise

### Interested but not on Senate Approved List

Name	Office
Andrea Ingram	Student Conduct – DOS
Kelly Christenson	Academic Support Services