



BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

University Policy 4380

Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

Effective Date

January 1987

Last Revision Date

August 02, 2024

Responsible Party

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, (208) 426-1202

Scope and Audience

This policy applies to University faculty.

Additional Authority

- NWCCU Standard 2.F.4
 - Idaho State Board of Education Policy, Section II.G. (Policies Regarding Faculty - Institutional Faculty Only)
 - Idaho State Board of Education Policy, Section II.L. (Discipline - Adequate Cause - All Employees)
 - Idaho State Board of Education Policy, Section II.M. (Grievance and Appeal Procedures - All Employees)
 - University Policy 4290 (Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation)
 - University Policy 4340 (Faculty Tenure and Promotion Guidelines)
 - University Policy 4000 (Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct)
 - University Policy 4720 (Faculty Due Process Policy)
-

1. Policy Purpose

To establish 1.) policy and procedures to fulfill the Faculty's professional responsibility to and the Idaho State Board of Education's requirement that, at intervals not to exceed five (5) years following the award of tenure, the performance of each tenured faculty member be reviewed by the faculty members of their department or equivalent unit and the department/unit head or designee (see Idaho State Board of Education Policy, Section II.G.), and 2.) policy and procedures for the selection of professors to receive a Professorial Performance Award.

2. Policy Statement

The Idaho State Board of Education requires that the performance of each tenured faculty be reviewed at least once every five (5) years following the receipt of tenure by the faculty members of their department or equivalent unit and the department/unit head. The faculty member's performance is reviewed as to their continuing effectiveness in teaching/librarianship, scholarship, service, other assigned responsibilities, and overall contributions to Boise State University, their profession, and their community (see University Policy 4000 - Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct). Departments/units must establish standards for post-tenure review aligned with this policy and reflective of the faculty member's tenure home.

Department standards must be approved by the college dean

3. Definitions

3.1 Academic Freedom

The freedom of teachers, students, and academic institutions to pursue knowledge wherever it may lead, without undue or unreasonable interference. At the minimum, academic freedom means that faculty are entitled to freedom to engage in the entire range of activities involved in the production of knowledge, including choosing a research focus, presenting research findings to colleagues, and publishing research findings; the freedom to determine the content of and instructional methodologies used in their courses (subject to institutional curriculum development processes, institutional and Idaho State Board of Education policies, and accreditation requirements); and the freedom to participate in institutional governance (see University Policy 4000 - Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct).

3.2 Disciplinary Action

Dismissal, suspension without pay, and/or involuntary demotion are actions that may be taken for Adequate Cause with regard to a Faculty Member. Disciplinary Action does not include administrative decisions, including without limitation, decisions in such matters as denial of

tenure, denial of promotion, position description, performance evaluation, salary determination, and/or to challenge the contents of personnel files (see section 6 in University Policy 4000 - Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct).

3.3 Professorial Performance Award

The Performance Award is a recognition of those who continue to perform in an exemplary manner through service, teaching, scholarship, innovation, leadership, and other professorial achievements. The Professorial Performance Award is an honor, not a form of promotion review or a creation of a “senior professoriate.” It is intended both to recognize those professors whom faculty should emulate and to reward professors who demonstrate outstanding and continued performance at the University. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the rank of professor with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process.

3.4 Standard Review

A standard review is the process by which all tenured faculty are reviewed during the post-tenure review process defined in this policy.

4. Responsibilities and Procedures

4.1 Shared Responsibilities for Tenured Faculty Success

As stated in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (University Policy 4000), “The administration and the Faculty have a joint responsibility to protect and encourage Faculty in their teaching, learning, scholarship, university and public service, and efficient and effective operations of the University.” As applied to tenure, that shared responsibility requires tenured faculty to continue to meet standards and expectations. At the same time, this shared responsibility requires the university “to create a climate that strives for Inclusion and Equity and is suitable for Scholarship, effective teaching and learning, and service so all Faculty, Staff, and Students can thrive.”

4.1.1 University

The University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and unimpeded intellectual debate. The grant of indeterminate tenure to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources. The University is responsible for providing guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, assisting faculty in enhancing their professional skills and achieving their professional goals, and ensuring that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the

University. The periodic review of tenured faculty requires that the university offer opportunities and rewards for this continual growth and professional development.

4.1.2 Tenured Faculty

- a. The faculty who earn tenure do so only after rigorous review to establish that their teaching, scholarly, creative, or research activity, librarianship, and service meet the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the university and the expectations of their unit. To ensure that tenured faculty continue to meet those standards, they participate in performance reviews at the university, annually and periodically, over the course of their careers, each serving a different purpose in their professional development and career progress:
 - The annual evaluation of faculty performance conducted by their supervisors, which is a summative review and is part of all the other reviews listed below;
 - A comprehensive peer review for advancement in rank (promotion) and tenure, which is a summative review; and
 - A comprehensive, periodic peer review of tenured faculty, which is both a formative review to support a tenured faculty member's continued growth as a scholar, teacher, and member of the university community and a summative review.
- b. The periodic review of tenured faculty requires that faculty members continue to grow professionally and contribute to the university, students, the community, and their discipline.
- c. In no case should post-tenure review be used to shift the burden of proof from the institution's administration (to show cause why a tenured faculty member should be dismissed) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why they should be retained).

4.2 Procedures

Tenured faculty members will be reviewed at least once every five (5) years following the receipt of tenure with the review occurring in the unit(s) that conducts the faculty member's annual evaluation. This review covers the five-year period leading up to the review. Post-tenure review should never supplant annual evaluation by infringing on the purpose of annual evaluation process.

4.2.1 Standard Review or Professorial Performance Award

Tenured faculty will follow the procedures for a Standard Review unless they are eligible for and choose to apply for a Professorial Performance Award (see section 4.2.4).

4.2.2 Steps in the Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

The steps in the periodic review of tenured faculty process will mirror the timeline for the University's promotion and tenure process, and are as follows:

- a. The Provost's Office notifies the department/unit heads of faculty who are due for review that academic year.
- b. The department/unit head implements college-approved department/unit procedures for review.
- c. The candidate(s) create and turn in review materials described in section 4.2.6. Note that the academic unit will decide on any additional information to be included in the faculty member's review materials.
 - Candidates applying for the Professorial Performance Award will submit the materials required for the Award (not the materials defined in section 4.2.7 -Standard Review) according to the department's policies.
 - All candidates who apply for the Professorial Performance Award must follow the post-tenure review timeline. Materials will be reviewed both for the purposes of periodic review and for earning this award.
- d. For the standard review, the designated review committee reviews faculty member's materials and submits recommendations to the department/unit head of either
 - Satisfactory Performance, or
 - Unsatisfactory Performance
- e. If the faculty member applies for the Professorial Award, the designated review committee reviews the materials and submits a recommendation to the department/unit head of either
 - Recommend for the Award/Satisfactory Performance,
 - Recommend Against the Award/Satisfactory Performance, or
 - Recommend Against the Award/Unsatisfactory Performance

- f. For both a standard review and the Professorial Performance Award review, the department/unit head reviews the faculty member's materials and submits a recommendation to the dean.
- g. For both a standard review and the Professorial Performance Award review, the dean reviews the faculty member's materials and submits a recommendation to the Provost.
- h. The Provost will notify the faculty member of the outcome of the post-tenure review process, and, if applicable, of the Professorial Performance Award.
- i. In the event that the dean, Provost, or University President disagrees with the recommendation of the designated review committee and/or the department/unit head,
 - The burden of proof lies with the administrator challenging the recommendation;
 - An appeal process can be initiated at the faculty member's discretion and arbitrated by the Faculty Senate's Faculty Grievance Committee. At the conclusion of the appeal process, the Faculty Grievance Committee makes a recommendation to the University President.

4.2.3 Notification and Eligibility

Each year, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies department/unit heads and deans, in writing, as to the members of their units whose performance is to be reviewed during the year and as to the dates by which review procedures are to be completed. The Provost's Office will notify eligible faculty by April 1 of their fourth (4th) year that they will undergo review during the fall of their fifth (5th) year.

4.2.3A Standard Review Eligibility Exceptions

Sabbatical Leave: Sabbatical leaves are considered part of the faculty member's five (5)-year cycle, however, the review may be postponed by one year if it falls in a year when the faculty member is on sabbatical leave.

Other Forms of Leave: Family or medical leave during the review period may result in the review being postponed by one (1) year.

Phased Retirement: Faculty members on phased retirement or whose retirement date has been approved by the university no longer retain tenure and therefore will be exempt from review under this policy (see University Policy 4470 - Faculty Voluntary Phased Retirement Program).

Associate Professors in the Promotion Process: Generally, the promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor is considered no earlier than the fifth (5th) full year after attaining the rank of associate professor, which is generally contemporaneous with the granting of tenure. In such cases, if a review for promotion to full professor is scheduled during the fifth (5th), sixth (6th), or seventh (7th) full year after the award of tenure, then the promotion review may, if it meets substantially similar criteria and goals of the post-tenure review, take the place of the periodic performance review described here.

If an associate professor is eligible for post-tenure review during the same period they are applying for promotion to full professor, then a post-tenure review form will be included with the recommendations at each level indicating if, for the purposes of post-tenure review, the candidate's performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

4.2.3B Professorial Award Eligibility

- a. To be eligible for this award, a faculty member must
 - Be a full-time, tenured faculty member at the rank of professor and have been in rank at Boise State University for at least five (5) years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award. Professors are not eligible to apply until the beginning of their fifth (5th) year;
 - Show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last five (5) years before the performance review;
 - Demonstrate that their productivity and exemplary performance are of a quality at or above that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards;
 - Fulfill the expectations for faculty members outlined in University Policy 4000 (Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct);
- b. Candidates who have been subject to disciplinary action are disqualified from applying for the award for five (5) years;
- c. Candidates who apply but are not granted a Professorial Performance Award must wait at least two (2) academic years before applying again.

4.2.4 Establishing Unit Standards for Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Performance

- a. After earning tenure, a faculty member's professional needs and goals change over time, so a periodic review must be responsive to where a faculty member is in their career development and be consistent with their workload if it is to be effective. Post-tenure review must be conducted in a manner that respects the rights of faculty members involved, including academic freedom, tenure, and due process. Tenured faculty performance must be determined by criteria established by the individual's academic unit.
- b. Departments/units must establish standards for minimum satisfactory performance during the post-tenure review period and standards for determining which reviewees who apply for a Professorial Performance Award qualify for the award. Copies of the unit's approved criteria and procedures for post-tenure review must be provided to faculty members in the unit. It is recommended that this be included in the unit's policies and procedures upon initial hire.
- c. The written standards for faculty post-tenure review should be developed and periodically reviewed by the faculty and approved by the dean. The basic standard for appraisal should be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with their position, not whether the faculty member meets the current standards for the award of tenure or promotion.

4.2.4A Standards

The review standards must:

- a. State the expectations of the unit for tenured faculty in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, service, other assigned responsibilities, and overall contributions to the department (as appropriate to the unit and position) consistent with University Policy 4000 (Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct);
- b. Describe those expectations in light of disciplinary practices, workload assignments, and the overall mission of the unit as part of Boise State University;
- c. Remain sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, strengths, and interests who contribute to the mission of the institutions in distinct ways and to accommodate the variation in a faculty member's activities over time (e.g., serving as an academic leader in the department/program, college/school, or university; developing new academic programs; shifting workload from scholarly activity to teaching and/or service and

vice versa; community engagement work; serving as a leader in a professional organization; significantly changing one's scholarly agenda; and so on);

- d. Recognize that innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes not yield results.

4.2.5 Establishing Unit-Defined Standards for Professorial Performance Award

Departments/Units are responsible for defining specific standards and guidelines for the Professorial Performance Award.

4.2.5A Standards

- a. The standards for determining which candidates qualify for the award must:
 - Align with the department's criteria for tenure, promotion, and annual performance reviews;
 - Reflect the department's own disciplinary standards of excellence;
 - Be articulated and distinguished from the unit's performance criteria for "exceeding expectations"; and
 - Require demonstrated excellence in at least two (2) of the three (3) areas of responsibility according to their assigned workload.
- b. In defining standards, units must keep in mind that the Professorial Performance Award review process is a rigorous review of the faculty member's performance. The Professorial Performance Award is neither a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor, nor granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies. The Award recognizes professors who continue to perform in an exemplary manner through service, teaching, scholarship, innovation, leadership, and other professorial achievements. Faculty members who have received disciplinary action of any kind during the review period may be deemed ineligible for the award by the unit head or the dean, with approval from the Provost.
- c. The standards for receiving the Professorial Performance Award must be recommended by a majority of the faculty in the units who are eligible to vote (according to the unit's bylaws and policies), by the department/unit leader, by the dean, and by the Provost. Provision must be made for a review of the criteria at least every five (5) years or whenever standards for promotion to full professor change.

4.2.6 Review Procedures

Unit directors will initiate the process and ensure unit member participation and input into the review process according to the requirements set forth by their colleges, academic units, and this policy. All those involved in the evaluation process must recognize that it is a confidential personnel matter and take appropriate steps to protect confidentiality. The review shall be carried out free of bias or prejudice by factors such as race, religion, sex, color, national origin, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, disability, political affiliation, or veteran status.

4.2.6A Joint Appointments

Faculty members with joint appointments will submit the required Post-Tenure Review materials that reflect the representative effort for each unit to the department/unit head of their administrative home. The review committee for faculty members holding joint appointments must include one member from both units.

4.2.6B Tenured Faculty in Administrative Positions

Faculty members serving in administrative positions below the level of the dean are also subject to periodic review, but 1.) the dean, or designee, shall take the place of the unit head in the review process; 2.) the Post-Tenure Review materials shall include administrative accomplishments; and 3.) to the extent possible, the review committee should include at least one (1) administrative faculty.

4.2.7 Standard Review Materials

Reviewee submits the following materials to the designated peer review committee:

- Current CV
- Previous four annual performance evaluations
- Optional: Faculty Member's Statement: the faculty member under review may choose to provide a brief narrative statement of their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period and a brief statement of their goals and projected contributions over the next five (5) years (up to a total of six (6), double-spaced pages). The years under review are the five (5) most recent academic years prior to the evaluation. Faculty members with joint appointments should address the representative effort in each unit.

4.2.8 Professorial Performance Award Materials

- a. Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments for at least the previous five (5) years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the unit. Applications for the Professorial Award constitute supplemental material to the Post-Tenure Review materials defined in section 4.2.7. The review process will proceed according to the process outlined in this policy.
- b. Units are responsible for detailing any additional guidelines or materials that candidates must include in their application beyond those described in this policy. The total pages for the Post-Tenure Review Portfolio and the additional materials needed to apply for a Professorial Performance Award cannot exceed ten (10).

4.3 Review Committee Composition

- a. The faculty member under review will be reviewed by a Post-Tenure Review Committee. A unit's existing Promotion and Tenure or Personnel Committee may also function as the Post-Tenure Review Committee. However, if the unit's P&T Committee functions at a school or college level, as well, the unit would need a separate Post-Tenure Review Committee, so as to avoid duplicative assessments of a faculty member's performance.
- b. Alternatively, the unit may create a process for assembling a Post-Tenure Review Committee that is different from an existing peer review committee. The Post-Tenure Review Committee must meet the following requirements:
 - The faculty member who is under review may not serve on the review committee.
 - An administrator with evaluative/direct supervisory responsibilities (e.g., department/unit head), who manages and oversees tenured faculty may not serve on the review committee.
 - Only tenured faculty on the committee may vote.
 - The committee shall consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members and may include faculty from other promotion/tenure units, if needed and/or relevant, contingent upon their willingness and availability to serve.
 - In the event that the College Promotion and Tenure Committee must review a faculty member's progress on an Improvement Plan (see section 5.2.1.2), a member of the

department/unit's Post-Tenure Review Committee who also serves on the college-level committee cannot cast a vote on both committees.

4.3.1 Review Committee Responsibilities

4.3.1A Standard Review

- a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will evaluate the faculty member's overall performance and their contributions in their assigned areas of responsibility. Applying the standards of the unit, the committee will determine whether the faculty member's performance in each area, as well as their overall performance, is satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The determination must be supported by a majority of the committee.
- b. In making its evaluations, the committee must bear in mind that 1.) faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of contributions to the mission of the department, the College, and the University; 2.) a faculty member's activities vary over time according to their strengths, interests, and career path; and 3.) innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes not lead to results fail.

4.3.1B Professorial Performance Award Review

- a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee in the department will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. The written evaluation must include the following:
 - Justifications of the committee's recommendation based on specific evidence in the candidate's materials and on the unit's standards;
 - Dissenting assessments of the candidate's materials based on specific evidence in the candidate's materials and on the unit's standards;
 - The distribution of votes in support of the recommendation and against.
- b. The candidate's materials will be forwarded to the department/unit head for review and recommendation, and then to the dean and Provost.
- c. If the above review process results in a recommendation of "unsatisfactory performance" for the purposes of periodic review, then the process will proceed accordingly (see section 5 - Outcome of the Post-Tenure Review Process).

4.3.2 Department/Unit Leader Responsibilities

4.3.2A Standard Review

The department/unit leader will review the faculty member's materials in terms of the unit's standards for post-tenure review and determine whether the faculty member's performance in each area, as well as their overall performance, is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

4.3.2B Professorial Performance Award Review

The department/unit head will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the standards and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award. They will indicate their recommendation of either Recommend for the Award/Satisfactory Performance; Recommend Against the Award/Satisfactory Performance, or Recommend Against the Award/Unsatisfactory Performance.

4.3.3 Dean's Responsibilities

4.3.3A Standard Review

The dean will consider the assessments of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Department/Unit Leader and indicate an assessment of 1.) Satisfactory or 2.) Unsatisfactory.

4.3.3B Professorial Performance Award Review

- a. The dean will review all application materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the standards and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award. They will indicate their recommendation of either Recommend for the Award/Satisfactory Performance; Recommend Against the Award/Satisfactory Performance, or Recommend Against the Award/Unsatisfactory Performance.
- b. A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award made by a department/unit and the department/unit leader must attempt to reach a consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used.
- c. If any change has been made to the department's recommendations, the dean must notify the candidate, in writing, of the change and its rationale. Within seven (7) working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the Provost. All

statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations are forwarded to the Provost.

4.3.4 Provost's Responsibilities

4.3.4A Standard Review

The Provost will consider the recommendations of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, the Department/Unit Leader, and the dean and indicate their assessment. After the Provost's review, the Office of the Provost will notify faculty of the outcome of the post-tenure review process, and the post-tenure review file will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

4.3.4B Professorial Performance Award Review

- a. The Provost will review all application materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluation process is conducted in a manner consistent with the standards and procedures approved by the unit.
- b. If the Provost does not agree with recommendations for Professorial Performance Awards made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach a consensus through consultation. If this fails, the Provost's decision will prevail. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the Provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.

5. Outcome of the Post-Tenure Review Process

- a. There are three (3) possible outcomes from the post-tenure review process:
 - **Performance is Satisfactory.** Performance at this level does not require action.
 - **Professorial Performance Award.** The Professorial Performance Award will include a base salary increase for the faculty member (as determined by the Provost). Upon official notification from the Office of the Provost, Human Resources and Workforce Strategy will consolidate the Professorial Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year. The Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.
 - **Performance is Unsatisfactory.** Performance at this level requires that a faculty member, in consultation with the department/unit head and dean, formulate plans and

- timelines (“Improvement Plan”) to clearly resolve the issues identified in the post-tenure review process.
- b. A person whose record includes a pattern of unsatisfactory performance as defined in section 4.2.3 in any area of assignment during the previous five (5) years and who has not met previous requirements for improvement shall develop an Improvement Plan in concert with their supervisor and in consultation with Human Resources and Workforce Strategy (see section 5 - Developing an Improvement Plan below). If the faculty member and their supervisor cannot agree upon the elements to be included in the Improvement Plan, the faculty member may appeal to the dean who will make the final decision on disagreements. A faculty member who is under an Improvement Plan is exempt from periodic review until the performance review period has elapsed, at which point the five (5)-year cycle for review is reset.
 - c. Barring exigent circumstances, a faculty member who does not submit the required materials for post-tenure review after official notification of the requirement will receive an automatic unacceptable evaluation. Official notification requires an email with a timestamp on or before the deadline.
 - d. Performance at this level may have two (2) outcomes:
 - Performance that is deemed unsatisfactory may lead to an Improvement Plan to clearly resolve the issues identified in the post-tenure review process.
 - Performance that is still deemed unsatisfactory after the Improvement Plan process has run its course (as outlined below) may lead to Disciplinary Action.

5.1 Developing an Improvement Plan

- a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will meet with the faculty member to develop an Improvement Plan for up to a three (3)-year period (unless additional time is approved by the department/unit head and the dean). The purpose of the Improvement Plan is to address unsatisfactory performance in any area of performance before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member’s overall performance. The Improvement Plan should address specific areas for improvement identified during the post-tenure review process and identify actions to strengthen the faculty member’s performance.
- b. The plan must:
 - Describe specific reasons why performance has been unsatisfactory;

- Provide a list of specific, measurable outcomes needed to meet performance expectations in the future;
 - Describe the process to be followed to achieve outcomes;
 - Address the types of support that will be provided, if available, to facilitate the Improvement Plan;
 - Describe any alteration in job responsibilities that may be necessary to implement the Improvement Plan (which may include redirecting the faculty member's work responsibilities to particular areas of strength, according to the department/unit's workload policy);
 - Provide a specific and appropriate timeline for accomplishing the outcomes (up to a three (3)-year period);
 - Describe benchmarks and expectations;
 - Describe the specific, appropriate criteria to be used in evaluating progress in the Improvement Plan;
 - Include the dates by which the Post-Tenure Review Committee will assess the faculty member's progress toward the outcomes (see section 5.1).
- c. The Improvement Plan must be approved by the department/unit head, the dean, the faculty member, and the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

5.2 Progress Reviews

It will be the responsibility of the department/unit head and the Post-Tenure Review Committee to make a recommendation as to whether, at the end of the designated timeline, the faculty member whose performance was deemed not satisfactory has been successful in the completion of the Improvement Plan. It is understood that the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will likely have changed since the faculty member's initial periodic review, but those members must apply the same standards that were established when the Improvement Plan was initially approved. The department/unit head will report that finding to the appropriate administrative officer at least one (1) level above the faculty member's unit.

- a. **Annual Department/Unit Head Review:** During the annual faculty evaluation process each year, the department/unit head will review the faculty member's progress toward achieving the goals or outcomes of the development plan. A report on the faculty member's

progress toward those goals or outcomes will be included in the faculty member's annual performance evaluation.

- b. **Peer Review:** The unit's Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the faculty member's progress at the end of the period defined in the Improvement Plan.

5.2.1 Outcomes of the Progress Reviews

5.2.1A Achieves Improvement Plan Goals

- a. If the Post-Tenure Review Committee determines the faculty member has met the conditions of the plan, the Committee will make a recommendation to the department/unit head that the faculty member's performance is satisfactory.
- b. If the department/unit head concurs with the committee's recommendation, the department/unit head forwards the case to the dean for review.
- c. If the dean concurs with the committee and department/unit head's recommendation, the dean forwards the case to the Provost for review.
- d. If the Provost concurs, then the Improvement Plan is considered complete and the Office of the Provost will notify faculty of the outcome of the post-tenure review process, and the post-tenure review file will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.
- e. If the faculty member's performance is deemed satisfactory at the end of this process, the faculty member's five (5)-year clock for periodic review of tenure will be reset and no further action will be taken.

5.2.1B Does Not Achieve Improvement Plan Goals

If the Post-Tenure Review Committee determines that the faculty member has not achieved the Improvement Plan goals, then the Post-Tenure Review Committee will forward the case to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee for their review according to the following process:

- a. If the Post-Tenure Review Committee determines that the faculty member has not achieved the Improvement Plan goals as articulated in the Plan's timeline, the faculty member may request a meeting with the committee within five (5) working days of the notification. If requested, the committee must grant a meeting with the faculty member within five (5) working days of the request. Within three (3) working days of meeting with the candidate, a written final recommendation shall be added to the case materials and made available to the

faculty member. The case materials will then be forwarded to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- b. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the relevant case materials to ensure the process is followed at each level. The College Committee then votes on whether the faculty member has achieved satisfactory performance or has not achieved.
- c. If the College Promotion and Tenure Committee determines that the faculty member has not achieved the Improvement Plan goals, the faculty member may request a meeting with the committee within five (5) working days of the notification. If requested, the committee must grant a meeting with the faculty member within five (5) working days of the request. Within three (3) working days of meeting with the candidate, a written final recommendation shall be added to the case materials and made available to the faculty member. The case materials will then be forwarded to the dean and the Provost.
- d. If the final majority vote of the College Promotion and Tenure Committees is that the faculty does not achieve satisfactory performance, then the case is forwarded to the dean, who will review the case materials and make a written recommendation to the Provost explaining the reasons for the recommendation.
- e. If the dean determines that the faculty member has not achieved the Improvement Plan goals, the faculty member may request a meeting with the dean within five (5) working days of the notification. If requested, the dean must grant a meeting with the faculty member within five (5) working days of the request. Within three (3) working days of meeting with the candidate, a written final recommendation shall be added to the case materials and made available to the faculty member. The case materials will then be forwarded to the Provost.
- f. If the dean and Provost determine the faculty member has not achieved the Improvement Plan, they will determine the appropriate resolution, which may include disciplinary action or termination for adequate cause (see University Policy 4720 - Faculty Due Process and Appeal Procedures and University Policy 4480 - Faculty Grievance Procedure). If the dean and the Provost disagree on whether the faculty member has achieved the Improvement Plan, the Provost makes the final decision.
- g. The Office of the Provost will notify faculty of the outcome of the post-tenure review process, and the post-tenure review file will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

6. Disciplinary Action

- a. The Provost may implement disciplinary action if any of the following occur:
 - The faculty member fails to participate in the Improvement Plan process;
 - The faculty member fails to achieve the performance outcomes of the Improvement Plan by the established date(s); during the annual performance review by the department/unit head; and/or after the final review of the Improvement Plan by the Post-Tenure Review Committee.
- b. Disciplinary action may include but is not limited to reassignment of duties; loss of eligibility for sabbaticals or for campus travel funds; salary change, and so on. The Provost may also initiate suspensions without pay, demotion actions, or termination of employment procedures for the faculty member.
- c. Except for performance issues that meet the conditions for adequate cause, a single negative review cannot be the sole factor in revoking tenure, as it is only one measure in the ongoing evaluation of all faculty members.

7. Procedures Related to Dismissal

If a tenured faculty member's performance is judged to have been consistently unsatisfactory during the period under review and/or during the annual progress reviews and/or during the final review for the Improvement Plan, that performance rating may constitute adequate cause. In each case, the issue of whether or not adequate cause for dismissal exists is to be determined by an equitable procedure, affording protection to the rights of the faculty member and to the interests of the state of Idaho and its system of higher education. The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the institution and its administrative officers and will be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole. In the event that the faculty member receives a Notice of Contemplated Action, the faculty member has the right to due process as defined in University Policy 4720 (Faculty Due Process and Appeal Procedures).

- a. Each year the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies departmental administrators (the dean in the case of a college that is not departmentalized), in writing, as to the members of their units whose performance is to be reviewed during the year and as to the dates by which review procedures are to be completed. Each administrator communicates the names to the unit's faculty members and asks them to indicate whether they question the performance of any member who is under review.

- b. Exception for Associate Professors in the Promotion Process – Generally, the promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor is considered no earlier than the fifth (5th) full year after attaining the rank of associate professor, which is generally contemporaneous with the granting of tenure. In such cases, if review for promotion to full professor is scheduled during the fifth (5th), sixth (6th), or seventh (7th) full year after the award of tenure, then the promotion review may if it meets substantially similar criteria and goals of the post tenure review, take the place of the periodic performance review described here.
-

Revision History

July 1995; July 2003; September 2011; January 2015; October 2016; August 02, 2024