

***Pending SBOE Approval**

**IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
POLICIES & PROCEDURES (ISUPP)
Five-Year Review Process
ISUPP 4010**

POLICY INFORMATION

Policy Section: *Academic Affairs*

Policy Title: *Five-Year Review Process*

Responsible Executive (RE): *Executive Vice President and Provost*

Sponsoring Organization (SO): *Faculty Senate*

Dates: *Effective Date: May 5, 2011*

Revised: *May 3, 2018 (prev.: 7-20-11)*

Annual Review: *May 3, 2019*

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. Purpose: The Five-Year Review process is designed to provide an overview of scholarly, service and teaching activity for a faculty member that spans a five-year period. It provides a mechanism for remediation, should a faculty member be found to need assistance in maintaining progress in any or all of these areas. It also documents failure to meet the requirements of the position, providing the means for dismissal in that circumstance.

B. Overview: The Five-Year Review process is an internal review conducted by the colleges for all continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and non-tenure track appointments). The Idaho State Board of Education requires five-year reviews of **all** tenured faculty members (*SBOE Policies and Procedures*, Section II.G.6.g), whereas the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) requires a comprehensive review at least every five years of all faculty members, e.g., tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track (NWCCU Standard 2.B.6, www.nwccu.org). As stated in the Accreditation Handbook of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation, “the requirement for the continuing evaluation of faculty performance is to be accomplished through the joint efforts of faculty and administration. The retention of a competent faculty helps ensure that the mission of an institution of higher education is being accomplished in a manner consistent with its accredited status.”

II. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Office of Academic Affairs has the authority and responsibility to update and review this policy as necessary in consultation with the faculty as represented by the Faculty Senate.

III. PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENT

A. Idaho State University Procedures.

1. The procedures outlined here are intended to assure fair and equitable treatment of faculty members throughout Idaho State University during their periodic reviews, and to ensure confidence that review recommendations will be fairly and equitably applied. The intent of the Five-Year Review is to summarize the faculty member's body of work covering five years of data. In addition to the Five-Year Review, the SBOE also requires an annual evaluation (*SBOE Policies and Procedures, Section II.G.6.a*). The Five-Year Review is not intended to carry the weight of a promotion or tenure review. Rather it is designed to verify satisfactory performance or issues requiring remediation.

a. The focus of the Five-Year Review at Idaho State University is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist a faculty member to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their academic responsibilities. If any deficiencies in academic performance are identified, a plan for professional development must be designed by the faculty member in collaboration with the program or department head.

b. Each academic unit (e.g., division, college, school, library, etc.) shall establish guidelines for Five-Year Reviews that are consistent with the Governing Policies and Procedures of the Idaho State Board of Education and with the policy set forth in this document. Idaho State University requires that peer review of a faculty member's five-year body of work be a component of that procedure, and the unit guidelines should clearly outline the peer review process.

c. The College or Division will notify Department Chairs during August of the list of faculty members due for a Five-Year Review the following academic year. Department Chairs will create Five-Year Review Committees according to the requirements set forth by their colleges and by this document. The general outline of the review process is as follows:

1. Dean notifies Chair of faculty who are due for review at the beginning of Fall term.
2. Chair implements college-approved departmental procedure for review (e.g., creates a review committee charged with performing review).
3. Candidate creates and turns in portfolio. Note that the academic unit will decide on the information to include in the faculty member's portfolio. For example, the academic unit may want the faculty member to include some of the following: Current curriculum vitae; the faculty member's self-assessment of teaching, scholarly activities and service; annual evaluations, promotion and/or tenure reports; formal inputs from colleagues and students.
4. Review committee reviews faculty member's portfolio and submits findings to Chair. The committee should provide a formal vote and the rationale for the vote.
5. Chair completes the five-year review form and provides results to faculty member, who may respond.

6. Chair forwards review results and faculty response, if any, to Dean or other School or College official, as per College or Division guidelines.
7. Documents proceed through administrative review, culminating in delivery to Provost.

d. Five-Year Reviews should address the sustained productivity of faculty members as defined by the scope of responsibility specified by the contract in force at the beginning of the evaluation period.

e. Routing of the Five-Year Review will follow the tenure and promotion routing guidelines for the specific College or Division.

1. Reviewers at each level of the review will have access to the recommendations made at previous levels. At each stage of the review process, the faculty member under review will have five working days to respond to the written recommendation. The faculty member's response will accompany all documents forwarded to the next level of review. All of the reviewers' recommendations and responses from the faculty member under review will be forwarded to the Provost. At each level, either a vote of the group or a recommendation from the administrator must be made. All votes must be accompanied with a statement of rationale for the vote. The faculty member shall have recourse to appeal should that faculty member believe the assessment of the Five Year Review is not representative of the documented efforts. Appeal processes are documented in **ISUPP 4041**: (<http://www.isu.edu/policy/4000/4041-Grievance-Procedures-for-Institutional-Faculty.pdf>) and **ISUPP 4039**: (<http://www2.isu.edu/policy/4000/4039-Policy-and-Procedures-for-Faculty-Suspension-Dismissal-Termination-for-Cause.pdf>).

2. As stated in SBOE policy, tenure and promotion evaluations take the place of periodic evaluations (e.g., Five-Year Reviews), when applicable: "Generally, the promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor is considered no earlier than the fifth 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, sixth or seventh 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" (SBOE Policies and Procedures, Section II.G.6.g). Failure of the faculty member to achieve promotion shall not be equated with an unacceptable rating in the Five-Year Review process. Similarly, an unacceptable Five-Year Review shall not constitute a judgment for a promotion review.

3. For all categories of faculty, performance at each level is determined by metrics of the individual's academic unit or, in absence of criteria at the departmental or program level, the criteria established by the College or Division. The Five-Year Review will result in one of the following recommendations.

- a. Performance meets expectations. Performance at this level does not require action.

b. Performance is below expectations. Performance at this level requires that a faculty member work with the department or program head to develop a plan for remediation.

1. The program head may elect to engage a committee of other faculty members to identify goals with specific strategies and outcomes to remediate the deficiencies identified. It is incumbent upon the program head to identify university resources to assist in this remediation process.

c. Performance is unacceptable. Performance at this level may have two outcomes:

1. Performance at the unacceptable level may lead to remediation procedures, as outlined in 3.b.1, above.

2. Performance at the unacceptable level may lead to termination proceedings, following procedures defined by ISU Human Resources, and determined by tenure status. Termination proceedings are subject to appeal by the faculty member (<http://www.isu.edu/policy/4000/4041-Grievance-Procedures-for-Institutional-Faculty.pdf>).

PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION

Approved by Kevin Satterlee
President, Idaho State University

Date: _____