

College of Arts and Sciences
Tenure and Promotion Policy
AS-4340
Approved 3/20/17

0. SCOPE

This policy governs the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank for tenure-eligible faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences.¹

For the purposes of tenure review and promotion to Associate professor, the provisions of this policy apply to all tenure-eligible faculty whose initial contract date is January 1, 2017 or later. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate professor whose initial contract date is prior to January 1, 2017 may² elect to be evaluated either according to current policy or to the college guidelines governing immediately prior to current policy.³

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor may elect to be evaluated either according to current policy or to the college guidelines in force immediately prior to current policy through fall 2018. Thereafter, all candidates for promotion to Professor shall be evaluated according to current policy.

1. PREAMBLE

As an institutional practice, the granting of tenure serves two related purposes. For the individual, tenure simultaneously serves as recognition of significant academic achievement and represents a presumption of long-term employment with the institution. For the broader university community, the practice of tenuring faculty signals its durable commitment to the core values of the academy, including most centrally free inquiry and the free exchange and critique of ideas.

Promotion in rank similarly acknowledges achievement and carries with it additional responsibility, privileges, and compensation.

In order for tenure status and rank to legitimately serve these purposes, the principles and processes for their awarding must be transparent and compelling.

¹ This policy also serves as a reference for the promotion of Clinical and Research faculty within the college; see University Policies #4490 and #5010.

² As they are used in this policy, 'may' indicates permissibility, 'shall' is directive, 'must' indicates a necessary condition, and 'should' indicates a best practice.

³ For faculty members in Anthropology, Communication, History, Psychological Science, and Sociology, the latter would be the SSPA policy most recently in force.

Whereas University Policy #4340 (hereafter, 'university policy') outlines the most general expectations and requirements regarding faculty tenure and promotion, this policy specifies requirements for the development of departmental tenure and promotion policies and articulates the process and principles for college-level review of applicants.

2. RELATION BETWEEN TENURE STATUS AND RANK

Except under extraordinary circumstances and with Dean approval, the review for awarding tenure and for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor in COAS shall be one and the same, and they shall be approved or denied jointly.

3. TENURE CLOCK ADJUSTMENT FOR TIME IN RANK AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

University policy establishes a typical five-year probationary period for tenure-eligible faculty, after which time (i.e., at the outset of the faculty member's sixth full year at Boise State) the application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is submitted. The length of the probationary period may be extended for reasons relating to childbirth or adoption, significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care, disability or chronic illness, and other circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member. (See §II.B and .C of university policy.)

Within COAS, the practice of shortening the tenure clock for faculty who are hired into the college after having served in a previous faculty position – whether at another institution or at Boise State – is commonly known as awarding “credit for prior time in rank” or “credit for prior service.” Such adjustments are negotiated between the Departmental Chair and the candidate at the time of hire, with approval from the Dean. How such adjustments are understood can significantly affect how evaluation occurs at the time of application for tenure and/or promotion. Two options are described below. Departmental policies shall include or reference the language in §3.1, and formal offers of employment that include any award of credit for prior time in rank shall contain language clearly describing the nature of the probationary period, consistent with the sections below.

3.1 PROBATIONARY PERIOD SHIFT

The standard way in which credit for prior time in rank is countenanced in COAS is by shifting the probationary period, such that achievements documented to have occurred at the faculty member's prior institution within the most recent time frame specified in the award of credit (e.g., two years of credit for prior service) are directly included in the faculty members body of work for the purposes of evaluation. At the time of rendering its ultimate recommendation regarding tenure and promotion, the department commits to “counting” and evaluating those achievements in the same way that the corresponding achievements at Boise State are done so, within the evaluative framework set out in departmental policy.

When the probationary period shift option is employed as described, the five-year probationary period is strictly observed; however, some number of those five years (specified in the formal offer letter) will have occurred prior to entering the tenure track at Boise State.

3.2 ABBREVIATED PROBATIONARY PERIOD

In extraordinary circumstances and with Dean approval, a formal offer of employment may specify an abbreviated probationary period for the incoming faculty member, based on documented meritorious achievements at another institution.

Within the abbreviated probationary period approach, the achievements at the faculty member's prior institution are not included in the departmental evaluation upon which the final recommendation is based. Rather, those achievements function as justification to permit a more limited evidentiary basis for making that recommendation.

This approach to tenure clock adjustment would be appropriate for a candidate who has a strong academic record in rank, but whose most recent years at the prior institution are not representative of the overall record (for reasons having to do with reassigned workload or other explanatory factors that wouldn't otherwise diminish confidence in the candidate's abilities and prospects).

When a Department Chair wishes to extend an offer that includes an abbreviated probationary period, an appeal must be made to the Dean prior to issuing the formal offer of employment. If approved, the length of the abbreviated probationary period shall be clearly specified in the formal offer letter.

4. ANNUAL REVIEW AND ITS RELATION TO TENURE AND PROMOTIONAL REVIEW

The evaluation of faculty in COAS shall occur on an annual basis, conducted by the Department Chair or by a Dean-approved designee of the Chair.⁴ The purpose of annual review is manifold: ensuring quality of learning environment and outcomes for students; promoting the academic and scholarly aspirations of the department and university; supporting faculty in their professional development; and providing a basis for significant employment decisions, including the granting of tenure and promotion.

⁴ See University Policy #4290, "Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation," for further details. Departmental policy may establish evaluation practices in which tenured faculty periodically receive an abbreviated evaluation, provided that they receive a full evaluation (i.e., the type of evaluation that is standard for pre-tenure faculty, per departmental specifications) no less frequently than once every three years. Any abbreviated evaluation must be sufficiently detailed to serve as the basis for merit-based salary adjustments and the like.

In addition to the Chair's annual evaluation, pre-tenure faculty shall also be evaluated by departmental review committee on an annual basis.⁵ The committee (whether called a 'personnel committee', 'mentoring committee', 'tenure progress review committee', or otherwise) shall be composed of a subset of tenured faculty members in the department.⁶ Departmental bylaws or policy shall govern the composition and procedures of the committee; deviation from established bylaws and policies is permissible only with prior approval by the Dean.

The annual review of pre-tenure faculty conducted by the Chair differs in scope and character from the review conducted by committee. For example, the Chair's review will emphasize single-year performance relative to time- and individual-specific goals, whereas the committee's review shall focus on progress since hire relative to the expectations for tenure and promotion established in departmental policy. (See §5 below.) Such differences notwithstanding, both types of review shall be structurally and materially informed by the reviewee's assigned workload for the evaluation period in question, as required by university policy.

Because a faculty member's tenure is associated with his or her home department, the substantive standards for tenure review at both the departmental and college level are just those criteria articulated in departmental policy. Certain mandatory features of those criteria are described below.

The review for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor also originates in the applicant's home department. However, because the rank of Professor implies a degree of institutional engagement and status that extends beyond the faculty member's department, additional expectations and criteria are applicable. Those expectations and criteria are articulated in §7 below.

Faculty members who hold administrative positions outside their home department are subject to annual performance evaluation by an immediate supervisor who is not the Chair of their home department.⁷ Moreover, the performance expectations for the individual in the administrative role are typically very different from those placed upon a non-administrative faculty member. For these reasons, administrative faculty can be subject to conflicting standards of evaluation with respect to annual performance, on the one hand, and the departmental expectations for promotion to Professor, on the other. In such cases, the administrative faculty member, his or her immediate supervisor, the Chair of his or her home department, and the Dean shall, at the time that the extra-departmental appointment is made or as soon thereafter as feasible, work collaboratively to compose a committee to serve the function of the

⁵ See University Policy #4320, "Faculty Peer Review."

⁶ Or relevant departments. See §6.2.4 below for provisions relating to the evaluation of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarly activities.

⁷ Such faculty members virtually always hold the rank of Associate Professor, for which reason the language in this paragraph is couched in terms of promotion to Professor. In the rare case where the faculty member in question is untenured, similar principles and processes shall be observed.

departmental committee charged with promotional review. That committee shall include at least two tenured members of the candidate's home department (preferably at the rank of Professor), but it may include tenured faculty members from other units. The standards of review shall be established as described in §7 below.

5. DEPARTMENTAL TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES

Each department of COAS shall develop, ratify, and implement a policy governing the granting of tenure and promotion within the department. As part of the ratification process, the departmental policy shall be reviewed for approval by the Dean. Specific requirements for departmental policies are spelled out in §§6.1-6.3 and §7.1 below.

University policy provides generic examples of activities relevant to performance in teaching, scholarship⁸, and service, the three primary areas of faculty responsibility and evaluation. However, the expectations and duties placed upon individual faculty members can vary significantly across departments, based on factors such as number of full-time faculty, range of degrees offered, and nature of disciplinary practices.

Therefore, departmental tenure and promotion policies shall include more determinate and detailed activity descriptions for each of the three areas of evaluation so as to reflect the particular methods, products, and values that are distinctive of the department's discipline(s), consistent with the overall mission of the university.

In relation to these more determinate activity descriptions, the departmental policy shall articulate criteria for each area of evaluation that (minimally) define a level of performance deemed to meet departmental standards and expectations with respect to granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and to granting promotion to Professor.⁹ These criteria need not be formulaic, mechanical, or artificially precise, since policy is always subject to interpretation as a matter of practical necessity. However, the criteria shall be sufficiently specific to provide clear and substantive guidance for both candidates and reviewers.

Departmental tenure and promotion policies shall state, as exhaustively as is practically possible, the criteria of evaluation employed in the annual review of pre-tenure faculty conducted by departmental review committee. In each instance, the

⁸ The term 'scholarship' is used in this policy to refer to research, creative activity, and all other related forms of activity that constitute the area of faculty evaluation that is coordinate with teaching and service. (See §6.2 for greater detail.) Departmental policies that prefer a different term for such activities may use it in place of 'scholarship'.

⁹ Within such a scheme where standards are appropriately high, 'meets expectations' and 'satisfactory' can indicate a level of performance that is highly praiseworthy. As they are used within this policy, neither of these expressions implies mediocrity in any sense.

committee's evaluation shall clearly indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure relative to those criteria. If the candidate is not making satisfactory progress, the committee shall offer written recommendations for improvement. Those recommendations need not be any more formulaic, mechanical, or precise than the criteria themselves, but they shall provide clear direction to the candidate for action, and equally to the committee for subsequent evaluation.

6. MANDATORY FEATURES OF DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA

6.1 TEACHING

The defining feature of any university per se is its persistent role in the education of students. Thus, the highest premium must be placed on the institutional importance of teaching in the professional development and evaluation of faculty members.

Teaching and learning in COAS take on a plurality of forms. Faculty work with students in person and online, from large sections to one-on-one, from first-year students to doctoral candidates. They engage in educational activities in class rooms, laboratories, studios, libraries, performance spaces, technical shops, the community, and the field. This diversity of educational venues reflects the plurality of goods embodied in and promoted by the College.

Departmental tenure and promotion policies shall contextualize the character of the teaching enterprise(s) within the department by articulating relevant expectations and criteria, including expectations regarding new course preparation, mentoring of students, and other considerations that may be standard within the department.

While departmental workload policies permit individualized workload assignments, every tenure-eligible faculty member in COAS is expected to sustain a high level of performance in teaching, relative to whatever form teaching takes for them and whatever portion of their workload is assigned to teaching.¹⁰

Teaching and learning are reciprocal activities, and since teaching occurs for the sake of learning (and not conversely), student learning must be the ultimate goal and measure of success in teaching. Therefore, two types of faculty behavior provide the strongest evidence of commitment to the teaching mission of the university: ongoing assessment of student learning relative to course-, program-, and university-level learning outcomes, and ongoing effort to improve teaching practices. Student satisfaction is also important, though tertiary to assessment and pedagogy.

¹⁰ The typical assigned workload for Clinical and Research faculty in COAS will differ from those assigned to tenure-eligible faculty and may be limited to one or two of the traditional three areas. The departmental criteria employed in consideration of their candidacy for promotion in rank will be limited to those areas relevant to their assigned workload. See University Policies #4490 and #5010.

Student mentoring is not expected of every faculty member of COAS, due to the uneven distribution of such opportunities across departments and programs. However, it is a high-value activity that can cut across multiple areas of evaluation, and it shall be appropriately recognized and rewarded where it is undertaken successfully. Similarly, interdisciplinary team teaching is not required of faculty members, but it shall be recognized and rewarded when undertaken successfully.

6.1.1 Assessment

Departmental policies shall include criteria to incentivize and reward (through positive evaluation) faculty engagement in authentic assessment of student learning that provides meaningful information for the purposes of informing instructional or programmatic decisions. Relevant evidence and activities may include:

- Professional development regarding assessment strategies through workshops and programs offered by the CTL or other groups, including discipline-specific organizations;
- Syllabi and other course materials that reflect learning outcomes-oriented course structure and a commitment to formative and summative assessment relative to those outcomes;
- Participation in curriculum design and course mapping to support program-level learning outcomes;
- Participation in concentrated assessment efforts relating to accreditation or evaluation (e.g., of Foundational Studies courses);
- Documenting assessment activities and results in self evaluations or course reflections.

6.1.2 Pedagogy

Departmental policies shall include criteria to incentivize and reward (through positive evaluation) faculty engagement in the development of their teaching practices. Relevant evidence and activities may include:

- Professional development in pedagogy through workshops and programs offered by the CTL or other groups in support of teaching and learning;
- Experimentation with and implementation of innovative and/or evidence-based instructional practices for the discipline;
- Reciprocal peer observation, feedback, and reflection with disciplinary colleagues, preferably implementing a thoughtfully-selected classroom observation protocol that aligns with learning outcomes;
- Engagement with pedagogic literature and theory through the scholarship of teaching and learning;¹¹

¹¹ If such activities result in publications, presentations, or other appropriate products, those may also be regarded as achievements in research, in addition to counting as evidence of the development of teaching practices. See §6.2.1 below.

- Documenting purposeful changes to teaching practices in self evaluations or course reflections.

6.1.3 Student Satisfaction

University policy requires faculty to conduct student evaluations of teaching in their scheduled classes.¹² The documented results of such evaluations constitute a required element of the application for tenure and promotion, by university policy (§IV.A.9).

Because there are myriad influences affecting the quality and reliability of student evaluations, they must be regarded as raw data in need of further analysis for proper interpretation and subsequent action. Relevant activities may include:

- Critical reflection on course evaluations to extract actionable information;
- Documenting changes to course content or structure in response to student evaluations;
- Documenting changes to assessment strategies in response to student evaluations;
- Documenting changes to pedagogy in response to student evaluations.

6.1.4 Student Mentoring

Many COAS faculty engage in mentoring activities with students, particularly in the area of scholarship. This practice is especially common in graduate programs, but it also occurs at the undergraduate level. To the extent that fostering student scholarship is a high-impact practice for faculty, mentoring shall be recognized and rewarded (through positive evaluation) within the department and college.

The character of mentoring work is quite variable, and depending on the methods, goals, and products involved, successful mentoring by faculty may be recorded and evaluated as teaching, scholarship, or service.¹³ It is incumbent upon candidates and departmental review committees to be clear about how particular mentoring activities are being “counted” for the purposes of evaluation.

In departments where student mentoring is either expected or common, departmental policies shall articulate principles and/or criteria of evaluation as fully as is practical.

6.1.5 Interdisciplinary Team Teaching

COAS faculty sometimes have occasion to teach a course in partnership with colleagues from other departments or colleges. It is a common misconception that such teaching arrangements reduce the time and effort required on the part of the instructors involved. Quite the contrary is true, particularly when the course is

¹² See University Policy #4300, “Student Evaluation of Faculty.”

¹³ Cf. §6.2.1 below.

thoughtfully designed and when both (or all) instructors are deeply engaged with the students and course material.

To the extent that interdisciplinary team teaching fosters high levels of student engagement and learning, it shall be recognized and rewarded (through positive evaluation) within the department and college.

6.2 SCHOLARSHIP

Boise State is an emerging research university, and as such, the importance of scholarship is co-equal at the institutional level with the importance of teaching.¹⁴ The ultimate purpose of scholarship is to create value: intellectual value, cultural value, and societal value.

As with teaching, scholarship takes a plurality of disciplinary forms in COAS, reflecting a diversity of values, goals, methods, products, and audiences. This diversity is highly valuable to the institution and the human interests that it serves.

While departmental workload policies permit individualized workload assignments, every tenure-eligible faculty member in COAS is expected to produce high-quality and disciplinarily-relevant scholarship, relative to whatever form scholarship takes for them and whatever portion of their workload is assigned to scholarship.¹⁵

Departmental tenure and promotion policies shall contextualize the nature of scholarship within the department by articulating relevant expectations and criteria regarding productivity and quality, as outlined below.

6.2.1 The Boyer Model

University policy endorses the Boyer model of scholarship (§III.B.2), which recognizes four distinct types of scholarship¹⁶:

- The scholarship of **discovery and creation**, by means of which novel disciplinary products are produced and published, exhibited, performed (etc.). Examples include: journal articles, monographs, musical performances, poster presentations, sculptures, theatrical performances, and so on;
- The scholarship of **synthesis and integration**, by means of which extant disciplinary methods or products are brought together in novel ways, resulting

¹⁴ See footnote 8 for the use of 'scholarship' in this policy.

¹⁵ See footnote 10 for considerations regarding Clinical and Research Faculty.

¹⁶ See Boyer, E. L., "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate." Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. The articulation here is adapted for the breadth of COAS disciplines. An abundant body of literature exists addressing the four types of research and different approaches to assessing them.

in publication, exhibition, performance (etc.). Products largely overlap with those of the first type of scholarship;

- The scholarship of **application and engagement**, by means of which disciplinary expertise is brought to bear on issues that extend beyond the traditionally narrow academic sphere, with results amenable to implementation, publication, exhibition, performance (etc.). Examples include: governmental or industry reports, patents, public art, translational science, and so on;
- The scholarship of **teaching and learning**, by means of which disciplinary expertise is brought to bear on educational issues, with results amenable to publication, exhibition, performance (etc.). Examples include: book chapters, conference presentations, journal articles, master classes, and so on.

While the need and opportunity for these different types of scholarship can vary across disciplines and over time, no department may regard any particular type as intrinsically illegitimate or derivative as a matter of policy or practice.

In negotiating workload assignment and expectations for tenure, faculty shall work closely with their Chair and departmental review committee to identify an appropriate distribution of scholarship among the four types.

There is no college-level requirement that faculty be productive in multiple areas of the Boyer model, and particular types of scholarship may rightly be dominant within particular fields or traditions. However, tradition must never become rigid or assumed, and in the absence of clearly documented agreement between department and candidate to the contrary, novel scholarship products shall be evaluated according to the criteria articulated in departmental policy.

6.2.2 Peer-Review and Venue

Judgments regarding the quality, relevance, and impact of scholarship are often tied to two principal factors: the process by which the work in question was selected for publication, performance, exhibition, or implementation, and the venue in which it is published, performed, exhibited, or implemented.¹⁷ Departmental policies shall articulate, to the greatest practical extent, how such factors affect the evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship.

Peer-review is rightly called out in various policies and contexts as a leading standard of quality for scholarship. And yet the mechanisms that constitute peer-review can differ quite dramatically from discipline to discipline. Therefore, departmental policies shall address the standards of review that are relevant for their respective disciplines.

¹⁷ 'Implementation' is included for the scholarship of application and engagement. See above.

Quality of venue is sometimes established by a discipline's national organization, by disciplinary tradition, or by shared understanding among a local community of scholars. Departmental policies shall address the issue of venue by providing guidelines concerning the relative merit of venues available to practitioners within the discipline, whether they be academic presses, exhibition spaces, performance halls, or otherwise. In particular, departmental policies shall spell out what 'national and international recognition' means within the context of their disciplinary practices.¹⁸

Selection process and venue can have interactional effects. For example, invited pieces published in especially prestigious print venues can warrant evaluation equivalent to or even superior to that of a blind peer-reviewed counterpart, insofar as the invitation from the prestigious venue can serve as evidence of the author's high reputation and status within the field. Similar considerations apply to other types of scholarship and their forms of promulgation.

If a department employs specific metrics of impact or quality for the purpose of evaluation relative to tenure and promotion (e.g., H-index or critical reviews), the processes and standards shall be described in departmental policy.

6.2.3 Sponsored Work

The commitment of support by external entities is always a sign of promise for the scholarly project in question, and in some cases the project would not be possible without the support.

In departments where extramural funding is common or expected, departmental policy shall articulate the standards of evaluation relative to the types of grants secured, frequency of success, dollar amounts awarded, and any other pertinent factors. These expectations shall be articulated in the formal offer letter and observed in the annual evaluation process.

It is a college-level expectation that faculty members who receive substantial startup funding will build a record of extramural funding capable of sustaining the ongoing costs associated with their research program.¹⁹

6.2.4 Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Scholarship

Increasingly, scholarship in COAS is conducted by faculty members trained in multiple disciplines and by teams of faculty members. While interdisciplinarity and collaboration are highly valued within the college, evaluating scholarly products and partitioning credit in such circumstances can strain traditional methods of evaluation.

¹⁸ See §III.C of university policy.

¹⁹ Substantial startup packages are those in the five-figure dollar range and above. They are investments made on the part of the university that (a) create initial conditions that make the faculty member's research program possible, and (b) carry with them an expectation that substantial extramural funding will result.

Candidates for tenure and promotion have a reasonable expectation to be mentored and evaluated by experts within or very near to their field of scholarship. Therefore, candidates whose scholarship draws substantially from multiple, diverse disciplines may reasonably expect to have representatives from multiple units serving on his or her mentoring committee. Departments shall, to the extent reasonably practicable, customize the departmental review committee by recruiting representatives from other departments or colleges when necessary for fair and full review of a candidate.

Candidates are encouraged to articulate in annual evaluation documents their specific role in the creation of collaborative scholarly products or multi-investigator grant proposals. Departmental policies shall articulate principles (if not specific processes) guiding candidates, Chair, and committees in the determination of credit for collaborative scholarship products.

Successful collaborative scholarship is often made possible by interpersonal skills and qualities of specific individuals who act as team leaders or integrators. Because such traits are valuable both for the immediate project and for the larger culture of scholarship within the department and college, candidates are encouraged to articulate in annual evaluation documents their leadership role in collaborative scholarship, in addition to their first-order disciplinary contributions. Chair and committee evaluations shall recognize documented leadership of this type as a form of scholarship success in its own right.²⁰

6.3 SERVICE

Faculty service is both necessary for the operation of the university and a source of significant value for the university as a social institution. Despite this, service tends to be both under-recognized and -deployed, relative to university mission.

Higher education operates according to principles of shared governance, a fact that requires faculty to participate in institutional policy-making, operational deliberation and action, and maintenance of curricula, the fundamental academic structures of a university. There are few, if any, modern social institutions that place such a high level of responsibility on its members to carry out the first-order work of the institution (in our case, teaching and scholarship) while also creating and sustaining the organizational structures and processes that make such work possible.

University policy enumerates four types of service (§III.3): service in support of students (e.g., advising); service to the profession (e.g., editorial work); service to the institution (e.g., committee work, holding administrative posts); and service to the community (e.g., pro bono consulting). While illustrative of the range of possibilities, these four types are neither mutually exclusive nor jointly exhaustive of the service roles assumed by faculty in COAS. Where appropriate, departmental policies shall include discipline- or department-specific examples of service to guide candidates in

²⁰ See §7.1.2 below for additional considerations relating to leadership.

planning their service commitments and to inform subsequent assessment of their service performance.

While departmental workload policies permit individualized workload assignments, every tenure-eligible faculty member in COAS is expected to contribute relevant and high-quality service to the university's interests, relative to whatever form service takes for them and whatever portion of their workload is assigned to service.²¹

Of particular interest to the college are service activities that are long-term or expansive. The former includes administrative posts such as Department Chair and Program Director, which have the potential to enable and enhance the core academic activities of faculty and students. The latter includes the application of disciplinary expertise to issues that don't (or don't yet) fall within the normal scope of business of the university. In such situations, faculty effort and expertise can hold the promise of creating significant societal value as well as value for the institution.

Any service activities resulting in publications, presentations, or other appropriate products may also be regarded as achievements in scholarship. (See "scholarship of application and engagement" in §6.2.1 above.)

7. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

7.1 Standards

While the general character of a tenured faculty member's work does not differ fundamentally from that of an untenured colleague, the security and autonomy afforded by tenure provide an opportunity for faculty to consider how they might apply their expertise and aspiration in ways that make broader or more significant contributions to the university's multifaceted mission. University policy states that the rank of Professor "should be reserved for those individuals who are truly and demonstrably outstanding among their peers." Within COAS, this notion involves two components:

- Ongoing success in teaching, scholarship, and service; and
- Distinction relative to one or more of the three areas

These shall serve as the college-level criteria for promotion to Professor, as described below. Departmental policy may impose additional substantive expectations for the purposes of evaluating faculty on the path to applying for promotion to Professor, so long as they are consistent with the criteria below.

²¹ See footnote 10 for considerations regarding Clinical and Research Faculty.

7.1.1 Tripartite Success

This criterion is the foundation for promotion to Professor. Any COAS faculty member who is promoted to Professor must have met expectations in all three areas of performance evaluation for a minimum of three years immediately prior to application for promotion to Professor.²² Evaluative judgments of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service shall reflect assigned workload and the criteria articulated in departmental policy, as described in §5 and §6 above.²³

7.1.2 Distinctive Contributions

Success in teaching, scholarship, and service is a necessary condition for promotion to Professor in COAS, but it is not sufficient. In order to receive the highest level of recognition available within academic ranks, faculty members must demonstrate successes that distinguish their record from others' in ways that matter to the institution.

This may be achieved by excelling in one of the three areas of responsibility. A faculty member whose record of performance in teaching, scholarship, or service is genuinely outstanding satisfies this criterion and its counterpart in university policy. In this type of case, the character of the faculty member's work may resemble that of untenured peers, except that it meets a higher standard of expectation with respect to productivity and/or quality. This is distinction by "doing traditional work in a traditional way, but doing more or doing better."

One way in which a faculty member's record might document excellence in one or more of the three areas is by documenting leadership in that area. It is often the case that the first-order activities and products of the university either require or are improved by focused facilitation, coordination, advocacy, and/or direction of vision. Thus, a faculty member who demonstrates sufficiently impactful leadership thereby demonstrates excellence (and therefore distinction) in the area in question.

Distinction can also be achieved through the integration of two or more of the three areas of responsibility. In this type of case, there may be no single area in which the candidate's work exceeds the threshold warranting promotion; however, if the impact of the integrated activities is sufficiently high, it's possible for the candidate to

²² For the proper understanding of 'meets expectations', see footnote 9. Some candidates' dossiers might include annual evaluations that predate this policy and do not overtly employ the language of meeting expectations. In such cases, the Chair and departmental review committee shall be responsible for interpreting those evaluation documents in order to determine whether this condition is satisfied.

²³ The tripartite expectation typically will not apply to Clinical or Research Associate Professors seeking promotion to Clinical or Research Professor. For such candidates, the expectation applies only to the areas in which they have been evaluated for the five years prior to application for promotion. See footnote 10.

demonstrate distinction through the synergistic effects of integration. This is distinction by “doing traditional work differently, creating distinctive types of value.”

Alternatively, one may distinguish her or his record by engaging in novel activities that are more difficult to categorize within the traditional tripartite scheme, but which clearly advance the mission and work of the institution. Cases of this type are bound to be more rare, are by definition difficult to illustrate by example, and may challenge conventional evaluative techniques. Nonetheless, the progressive spirit of COAS embraces the possibility of distinction through contributions that resist easy categorization, by “doing novel work that, although untraditional, is of such clear value as to demand recognition.”

7.2 Support

Achieving the kind of distinction described above requires not only the concerted, individual effort of the candidate, but also the rhetorical and material support of the candidate’s academic community.

In order to ensure that such support exists for tenured faculty, departmental policy shall include specific provisions for assisting them in articulating and pursuing distinction that is consistent with their strengths, aspirations, and institutional goals.

This may involve the formation of a committee whose work parallels the work of the departmental review committee charged with evaluating pre-tenure faculty on their progress toward tenure. It may involve the implementation of a mentoring system within the department or with other partners. Other support mechanisms might be well suited to the disciplinary context of a department. Departmental policy may also fulfill this requirement by referencing the college-level support mechanism described below. Where a departmental alternative to the college mechanism exists, faculty members may elect to participate in either (or both). All COAS faculty at the rank of Associate Professor who aspire to be promoted to Professor are expected to participate in a support program; all faculty at the rank of Professor should contribute to such programs as opportunity permits.

The college shall implement a system for the production and review of post-tenure prospectuses, which shall focus primarily on the requirement set out in §7.1.2 above. A faculty member’s submission of a prospectus for review serves as a signal that she or he intends (but is not required) to apply for promotion to Professor within a determinate period of time. Once endorsed at the departmental and college levels, the prospectus shall serve as a touchstone for the faculty member’s progress toward promotion. The outcome of favorable review is endorsement, not approval, because the prospectus’s owner is not seeking permission to pursue the aims articulated therein. Rather, she or he is seeking a commitment on the part of the reviewing bodies (department and college) to evaluate achievements consistent with the prospectus

positively for purposes of promotional review.²⁴ This can be especially valuable when the faculty member wishes to take on work or projects that depart from traditional expectations. There is potential value to be had in allowing a faculty member's expertise and aspirations to diverge from more well-worn patterns, so long as they align with departmental and college goals. Endorsement of the prospectus ensures that this is the case.

The prospectus shall be drafted by the faculty member who owns it, and then refined as needed through iterative review with department Chair (and a departmental review committee, if such exists), whose endorsement is required for the prospectus to become active. The prospectus shall include a section in which the department Chair articulates how the elements of the candidate's vision and plans contribute to the advancement of departmental goals or values. A prospectus template is attached to this policy as Appendix A.

Departmentally-endorsed prospectuses shall be submitted to the Dean's office for college-level review by October 15. The appropriate college committee shall review prospectuses for consistency with departmental policy and for clarity, actionability, evaluability, and soundness of justification. Committee-endorsed prospectuses shall proceed to review by the Dean on the same criteria. Once Dean-endorsed, the prospectus shall be retained by the faculty member for inclusion in his or her promotion dossier.

In the event that a candidate and department Chair and/or departmental review committee are unable to come to agreement regarding the candidate's prospectus, the candidate may request a meeting of disagreeing parties with the Dean (or designee) to seek resolution.

Revision of prospectuses is permissible. The new prospectus, however similar to or different from its predecessor, shall be subject to the review process described above.

Faculty members promoted to Associate Professor under this policy who opt for this form of college-level support (rather than an alternative provided by departmental policy) are eligible to apply for promotion to Professor no fewer than three years after

²⁴ It is not the case that an endorsed prospectus imposes necessary conditions for promotion. Rather, it describes broad conditions whose satisfaction would, with the satisfaction of other formally-identified conditions (including those in §7.1), ordinarily be jointly sufficient for an affirmative recommendation for promotion from the department. Distinction is required by §7.1.2; the prospectus describes one way in which that requirement could be satisfied, but it can be satisfied in other ways. The prospectus is intended to serve as a mechanism for identifying opportunities for faculty that would be supported by the department. Its purpose is expansive, not limiting.

having a prospectus endorsed at the departmental and college level.²⁵ Faculty members who were promoted to Associate Professor under prior college policies are not required to observe the three-year pre-application timeline, but must signal their intent to apply for promotion by submitting a retrospectus for review no later than one year prior to the submission of their promotional materials.

Endorsement of a prospectus at the departmental and college level does not assure a favorable promotional decision for the candidate, since the prospectus itself provides no direct evidence for successful achievement of any of the goals articulated therein or of the requirements set forth in §7.1.

8. COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEW FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Departmental and college level review shall observe the timeline established in accordance with the timeline in §IV.C of university policy. Candidates are responsible for initiating the review process and for assembling materials according to the timeline and format prescribed by policy. Department Chairs are responsible for transmitting application materials from the department to the college for review.

There are two independent stages of review at the college level within COAS: committee review, and Dean review. Each abides by the same set of standards.

8.1 COMMITTEE REVIEW

At the beginning of each fall semester, the Dean's office shall coordinate with Department Chairs in composing four COAS Tenure and Promotion Committees, as described in §8.1.2 below. Each committee shall have a chair, elected by majority vote of the committee members. Each committee chair shall work with an Associate Dean as an administrative liaison. In this capacity, the Associate Dean is vested with delegated authority from the Dean to assist with logistical matters and substantive questions of evaluation and policy interpretation, thereby allowing the committee and the Dean to genuinely conduct their respective reviews independently of one another and free from undue influence.

The charge of the college committee is to: (a) conduct four types of review for each dossier that is submitted in application for tenure and/or promotion, and (b) to issue a formal recommendation to grant or deny such, on the basis of the review outcomes.

²⁵ Since university policy requires five years at the rank of Associate Professor (i.e., the beginning of the fifth year in rank is when one may apply for promotion), the three-year window affords faculty, on even the most ambitious timeline, a minimum of one full academic year post-tenure before the prospectus is submitted to the college for review. It is the endorsement of a faculty member's original prospectus that starts the three-year waiting period clock for her/him; prospectus revision does not reset the waiting period clock.

8.1.1 Four Review Types

The COAS Tenure and Promotion Committee shall conduct each type of review described below for each dossier submitted in application for tenure and/or promotion. Each review type articulates a necessary condition, the process for responding if that condition is not met, and the possible outcomes. For the sake of ease and understanding, each review type is introduced by the fundamental question that it addresses.

8.1.1.1 Formal Review

Is the dossier in good order?

To be eligible for full consideration by the committee, the dossier must be complete and properly organized. All of the documents described in university policy and other applicable policies must be present and arranged in the prescribed order.²⁶ If this is not the case, the committee chair shall, with the Associate Dean's consent (and assistance, if requested), ask the applicant's department (the Chair or another appropriate departmental member) to remedy the identified issues within three business days or a mutually-agreed-upon date from the time of notice. If the ensuing response is inadequate or the formal flaws egregious, the committee may recommend that the dossier be remanded to the department without further review. Exercising delegated authority from the Dean, the Associate Dean shall determine how to proceed.

8.1.1.2 Procedural Review

Did the department and candidate observe timelines and other procedural requirements?

In order for the final recommendations from the Chair and departmental review committee to be compelling, they must be founded on processes that progress with regularity, rigor, and transparency. To establish this in the particular case, the dossier must provide clear evidence that the candidate and department each have judiciously observed the procedures prescribed in relevant policies, particularly with respect to evaluation processes and timelines. If it does not, the committee chair shall, with the Associate Dean's consent (and assistance, if requested), call upon the candidate's department to address questions and concerns relating to the identified issues in person or in writing within three business days or a mutually-agreed-upon date from the time of notice. The quality of the ensuing response may figure as partial justification for a recommendation from the committee that is contrary to the final recommendations of the department.

²⁶ At this stage of review, two of the documents required by university policy will invariably be absent: the college committee's recommendation and the Dean's recommendation.

8.1.1.3 Criterial Review

Did the department apply its own evaluative criteria in a fair and consistent manner?

In order for the department's final recommendations to be compelling, they must be founded on a fair and accurate assessment of the candidate's performance. To establish this in the particular case, the dossier must provide clear evidence that the department exclusively and correctly applied the departmental policy criteria (and in the case of candidates for promotion to Professor, the criteria in §7 above) in evaluating the candidate in each instance of review. If it does not, the committee chair shall, with the Associate Dean's consent (and assistance, if requested), call upon the candidate's department to address questions and concerns relating to the identified issues in person or in writing within three business days or a mutually-agreed-upon date from the time of notice. The quality of the ensuing response may figure as partial justification for a recommendation from the committee that is contrary to the final recommendations of the department.

8.1.1.4 Summary Review

Is the department's final recommendation justified, all things considered?

In order for the department's final recommendations to be compelling, the totality of evidence in the application must support them. In particular, the recommendations must be self-consistent and supported by a preponderance of annual evaluation ratings by the department. If this is not the case, the committee chair shall, with the Associate Dean's consent (and assistance, if requested), call upon the candidate's department to address questions and concerns relating to the identified issues in person or in writing within three business days or a mutually-agreed-upon date from the time of notice. The quality of the ensuing response may figure as justification for a recommendation from the committee that is contrary to the final recommendations of the department.

8.1.2 Committee Structure

At the beginning of each fall semester, the Dean's office shall coordinate with Department Chairs in composing four COAS Tenure and Promotion Committees.²⁷ Two committees shall serve to review applications for tenure and/or promotion in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences,²⁸ and two shall serve to review applications in

²⁷ See University Policy #4310, "Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee Duties and Composition."

²⁸ For the purposes of this policy, the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences division consists of the following departments: Art, Communication, English, History, Music, Philosophy, Sociology, Theatre Arts, and World Languages.

Mathematics and the Natural Sciences.²⁹ Within each division, one committee shall review applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, while the other committee shall review applications for promotion to Professor. In addition, the latter committee type shall also review post-tenure prospectuses for endorsement, as described in §7.2 above.

The composition of each committee reviewing applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall ordinarily³⁰ consist of one tenured representative from each of the departments within the division plus (optionally) one untenured faculty member selected by the Dean from a list of nominees identified by Department Chairs. The Dean may add members when necessary to accommodate specific kinds of applications, including those from Research Faculty or Clinical Faculty for promotion in rank, or from faculty in interdisciplinary programs.³¹ The vote of such members shall be limited to the motivating case(s) in question.

The composition of each committee reviewing applications for promotion to Professor shall consist of one departmental representative at the rank of Professor from each of the departments within the division plus (optionally) one tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor selected by the Dean from a list of nominees identified by Department Chairs. If a department has no faculty at the rank of Professor who are available to serve, the Dean shall either select a tenured member to represent the department (if the department has an applicant for promotion), or may exempt the department from representation (if there is no applicant from the department). The Dean may add members when necessary to accommodate specific kinds of applications such as those described in the preceding paragraph.

8.1.3 Committee Procedure

In the interest of protecting candidates and the integrity of the process, each COAS Tenure and Promotion Committee is to conduct its business in strict confidence, restricting substantive communication and deliberation to the time and location of formal committee meetings. Any notes taken by committee members, whether electronic or hand-written, shall be destroyed at the completion of the committee's work.

The committee shall limit its discussions to the materials contained in the candidate's portfolio and shall limit its deliberations to the four types of review described in §8.1.1 above. Informal and unsolicited opinions, whether written or verbal, shall not

²⁹ For the purposes of this policy, the Mathematics and Sciences division consists of the following departments: Anthropology, Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Geosciences, Mathematics, Physics, and Psychological Science.

³⁰ 'Ordinarily' because extraordinary circumstances might justify or require adjustments to the prescribed composition. For example, conditions might arise in which it would be best, all things considered, to allow a small department to opt out of committee representation, provided that there is no candidate from that department.

³¹ See University Policies #4490 and #5010.

be considered. However, departmental representatives may assist the other committee members in understanding disciplinary context and departmental policy and procedure when discussing a departmental colleague's application.

Committee recommendations shall be determined by formal vote and shall reflect the majority. Each committee member shall vote either to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion for each candidate. Abstention is not permitted, though a committee member may, with Associate Dean approval, formally recuse herself or himself from a specific case for appropriate reasons. Recusal shall be announced and effected at the earliest possible opportunity, and the recused shall not participate in discussion or deliberation about the relevant case.

Formal voting for all candidates reviewed by a committee shall take place at a single committee meeting, conducted by secret ballot. When conducting the formal vote, the committee chair shall tally, announce, and record the vote count, which shall be communicated in writing to the Associate Dean as a bare count (i.e., free from information that would associate individual committee members with particular votes). The vote count shall not be recorded except as just described, nor shall it be communicated to any individual outside the committee other than the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean shall hold the recorded vote count in strict confidence and shall destroy the record by January 15 unless the Dean deems it necessary to take custody of the record.

If the committee's recommendation is consistent with the department recommendations (whether to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion), no further documentation by the committee is required or permitted. If, however, the recommendation is contrary, the tally shall also reference the deciding factors, as they relate to the four types of review described in §8.1.1 above. In a case where the Chair and committee recommendations from the candidate's department are in conflict, deciding factors for the college committee shall be included with the vote count that is communicated to the Associate Dean.

In the event of an evenly-split committee vote, the Associate Dean shall meet immediately with the committee to arbitrate. If the split is entrenched, the Associate Dean shall, time permitting, conduct an independent, expedited review of the dossier in question and shall facilitate a meeting with the committee seeking resolution. If the vote remains evenly split by November 30, the recommendation of the committee shall be to deny tenure and/or promotion.

Once the committee's decisions have been formalized, the Associate Dean shall orchestrate the production and distribution of letters notifying candidates of the committee's recommendation within the timeline specified in university policy (§IV.B.6). Committee chairs shall be responsible for proofreading and signing the letters. The original shall be sent to the candidate, with photocopies sent to the candidate's Chair and inserted under the appropriate tab in the candidate's dossier. The Associate Dean shall also facilitate any subsequent meetings between the

committee and candidates to discuss a recommendation to deny tenure and/or promotion, including any formal appeals, as provided by university policy (§IV.B.6).

8.2 DEAN REVIEW

The Dean shall conduct an independent evaluation of each dossier in accordance with the four review types described under §8.1.1 and shall notify the candidate of his or her recommendation in writing, consistent with university policy (§IV.B.7).

8.3 EXTERNAL LETTERS OF REFERENCE

University policy requires a minimum of three external letters in a candidate's application materials (§IV.B.2). The candidate's Department Chair (or designee) is responsible for soliciting these letters in accordance with the timeline and process established in university policy. A sample solicitation letter is attached to this policy as Appendix B.

Neither university policy nor this policy impose any restrictions on external evaluators with respect to tenure status or academic rank. Generally speaking, external evaluators should hold the tenure status and rank to which the candidate is applying, in order for the evaluative perspective to be fitting. This general observation is qualified, however, by the fact that the purpose of external letters is to provide an unbiased, detailed, and well informed evaluation of a candidate's record, and in some cases the individual most capable of providing that might be at an earlier stage of career. Additionally, some institutions outside the U.S. employ different rank structures and observe different conventions regarding tenure. Departmental policy may impose rank restrictions on external evaluators, where warranted, but should be cognizant of the considerations just mentioned.

Letters from individuals who have never held academic positions (e.g., from industry, government, or non-profit sectors) may be included in a candidate's application materials, where appropriate, provided that at least two letters are from academics (current or retired) with appropriate credentials and expertise.

The role of external letters is to confirm, illuminate, or qualify features of the dossier relative to scholarly activity, helping local reviewers to situate those features in a broader context and to reach a more confident judgment regarding merit. As one type of evidence among many to be considered by reviewers in evaluating a candidate's record, the weight given to any particular letter by a reviewer should be determined by a number of factors, including:

- The evaluator's documented expertise in the candidate's area(s) of scholarship;
- The degree to which the evaluator displays a sensitivity to institutional context (including the candidate's workload, the level of support provided to the candidate to conduct scholarship, the expectations and criteria established in departmental policy, etc.);

- The degree to which the letter provides evidence that the evaluator conducted a thorough and thoughtful review of the candidate’s scholarly record;
- Any potential conflicts of interest or other factors that might unduly predispose the evaluator toward a favorable or unfavorable review.

External letters and the identities of their authors are confidential and shall be accessible only to individuals directly responsible for making recommendations and decisions regarding the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate in question. No materials visible to the candidate shall identify any external evaluator or evaluator’s institutional affiliation. Letters of final recommendation from departmental committees, Department Chairs, and the Dean may paraphrase or quote material contained in an external evaluator’s letter, provided that the material in question neither contains nor intimates any identifying information about the evaluator.

9. DEADLINES AND CUSTODY OF EXTERNAL LETTERS

University policy establishes timelines to be observed by candidates, departments, and the college (§IV.C) as well as required practices for the transmission and retention of confidential letters (§IV.B). These are also described in Appendix B.

10. ADJUDICATION OF POLICY INTERPRETATION

Conditions will arise about which this policy is either silent or indeterminate with respect to process or standards. In such cases, the candidate, Department Chair, and departmental committee shall work collaboratively to resolve the issue to their joint satisfaction. If the parties are unable to do so, the Dean shall arbitrate and seek resolution. If any party is dissatisfied with the Dean’s resolution, an appeal for arbitration may be made to the Provost, whose determination is final.

APPENDIX A – Post-Tenure Prospectus Template

Faculty Member: _____ Department: _____

Date of hire: _____ Year tenured: _____

Planned year of application for promotion: _____

COAS CRITERION: TRIPARTITE SUCCESS (§7.1.1 COAS POLICY AS-4340)

Candidate: Describe how you plan to meet the requirement for tripartite success and indicate any special forms of support that you will need in order to be successful . (500 words max.)

Chair: Describe any concerns or suggestions that you have relative to the candidate’s plan. (200 words max.)

COAS CRITERION: DISTINCTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS (§7.1.2 COAS POLICY AS-4340)

Candidate: Describe how you intend to distinguish your record and indicate any special forms of support that you will need in order to be successful. (1,000 words max.)

Chair: Explain how the candidate’s vision and plans contribute to the advancement of departmental goals or values. (400 words max.)

Endorsements

Candidate Date

Dept. Chair Date

Dept. Comm. Chair (if implemented) Date

COAS Comm. Chair Date

Dean Date

APPENDIX B – Guidelines for External Letters of Evaluation

University Policy 4340 (§IV.B.2) and COAS policy AS-4340 (§8.3) require that a minimum of three letters from external experts in the candidate's field be included in the tenure and promotion application.

Procedure:

A. The Candidate

By April 1 of the year in which the candidate intends to submit the application for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate shall supply the Department Chair with:

1. A list of at least four names and addresses of potential external evaluators. No more than one external evaluator may be a co-author, co-PI, former dissertation director, former professor, or other individual with a vested interest in the success of the candidate. Nor may more than one external evaluator be an individual who has never held an academic position. External evaluators must have a record of excellence in the candidate's area of specialty.
2. A portfolio representing the candidate's scholarly productivity since being hired or tenured at Boise State (typically, a minimum of five years). The portfolio shall consist of a current curriculum vitae and the optimal form of all scholarly products during the evaluation period (electronic or print copies of articles, books, or chapters; links to, or electronic media containing, photos of works of art, video or audio recordings of performances; etc.).

B. The Department Chair

1. The Chair shall secure a minimum of three external evaluators, at least one of whom is not included on the candidate's list.
 - a. By April 30, the Chair shall have identified at least three individuals willing to serve in this capacity.
 - b. By May 10, the Chair shall make the candidate's portfolio available to each external evaluator along with Departmental Tenure and Promotion guidelines and a link to the college policy. The Chair shall request that responses be received by September 1.
2. The Chair shall ask external evaluators to assess the candidate's scholarly record in terms of its quality, productivity, and significance. External evaluators shall not be asked to make a recommendation regarding the issue of tenure and/or promotion. The Chair shall ask each external evaluator to provide a copy of his or her CV, to describe how knowledge of the candidate's work was acquired, and to disclose any potential conflicts of interest. Letters should go out in a standardized format, and the candidate should be able to see the template letter, though not the names of individuals to whom it was sent.

3. Once the deadline for submitting materials to the department has passed, the Department Chair shall add the external letters and the CV of each evaluator to the candidate's application materials under the appropriate tab. Candidates shall not have access to the application materials until the conclusion of the entire review process, whereupon the Dean's Office shall remove and keep on file all external letters and CV's. The application materials shall be returned to the Department Chair, who shall check to be certain external letters have been removed prior to returning application materials to the candidate.
4. During the review process, the Chair shall keep on file a copy of each external evaluation received. At the conclusion of the process, the Chair shall destroy all copies of external evaluations (hard copy and electronic), except those kept on file in the Office of the Dean.
5. In the event the Department Chair is a candidate for tenure or promotion, an appropriate individual approved by the Dean shall assume the above duties regarding the Chair's candidacy.

Departments may adapt the letter below to meet their needs and provide any context relevant to the evaluation. A department may, for example, wish to specify what degrees it offers, level of support provided to the candidate in the form of studio space, graduate research assistants, startup funding, etc.

The italicized paragraph shall be included in all letters to external evaluators. Candidates have the right to review the template letter but shall not be told to whom it is being sent.

Dear <recipient>,

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an outside evaluator of the scholarly record of <candidate>, who is a candidate for <promotion to the rank of Professor / tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor> in the Department of <department> at Boise State University. We know how busy your schedule is and appreciate your willingness to serve in this capacity.

In accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences' Tenure and Promotion Policy, we are requesting that you assess the candidate's scholarly record in terms of its quality, productivity, and significance. We are not requesting that you make a recommendation regarding the issue of <tenure and> promotion.

As you review the candidate's materials, it is important for you to know that Boise State University endorses the Boyer Model of scholarship, which recognizes four

distinct types of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery and creation; the scholarship of synthesis and integration; the scholarship of application and engagement; and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Each of these types of scholarship is regarded as fully legitimate. <candidate>'s scholarship falls primarily in the area of <Boyer type(s)>.

It is also important for you to know that <candidate>'s typical workload assigned to scholarship during the evaluation period has been <X%> of total effort.

Relative to those to those two data points, we ask that your letter focus on the following considerations and questions:

1. **Quality** – Does the candidate's record of scholarship represent sound work in the field?
2. **Productivity** – Is the frequency and overall quantity of <publication/exhibition/performance> in the candidate's record appropriate?
3. **Significance** – How would you characterize the impact of the candidate's scholarship?

In your letter, please describe how you first learned about the candidate's work and the extent of your personal-professional familiarity with one another.

Please send your evaluation directly to me on institutional letterhead, and include a copy of your curriculum vitae. We have no specified length or format for either.

Only individuals directly responsible for making recommendations and decisions regarding tenure and promotion will have access to your letter. The candidate will not be informed that you have written, and your letter will not be accessible to the candidate unless the University is legally required to make it so.

In order for us to complete a timely <tenure and> promotion review, I would appreciate receiving your evaluation by September 1.

Thank you again. If you have questions, please contact me at <contact info>.

Sincerely, (etc.)