

# **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA**

## **LIBRARIES FACULTY PROCEDURAL MANUAL**

### **MISSION STATEMENT**

To support the present and anticipated teaching, research and service goals of the University of South Alabama, the mission of the University Libraries is to select, acquire, organize, promote and provide timely and efficient access to information resources. This includes instruction and critical evaluation of those resources.

### **VISION STATEMENT**

Be a comprehensive library of excellence, recognized for resources and services that positively impact the lives of those we serve in the University and the community.

### **GOALS:**

1. Educate users about responsible and effective use of informational resources.
2. Provide access to research materials at a level appropriate for successful academic performance.
3. Promote information literacy within the University community and the greater Mobile area.
4. Provide technology sufficient to support the research needs of the academic community.
5. Develop and contribute our professional skills to better serve the University, the Mobile community, and the profession.

**Updated July 24, 2017**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**PREFACE**.....3

**1.0 FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND SEARCHES**

1.1 Request to Fill a Faculty Vacancy ..... 4

1.2 Procedures in the University Libraries..... 4

1.3 Interview Process and Guidelines ..... 5

**2.0 ANNUAL LIBRARIES FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS**

2.1 Basis of Evaluation ..... 7

2.2 Annual Report (AR) ..... 8

2.3 Faculty Member’s Annual Self-Evaluation..... 8

2.4 Supervisory Evaluation Process..... 8

2.5 Annual Peer Review ..... 9

2.6 Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) Weights & Weighting Factors..... 10

2.7 Rating Process for AAP..... 10

**3.0 PROMOTION IN RANK**

3.1 Promotion Review Committee..... 12

3.2 Promotion Criteria ..... 13

3.3 Initiation of the Promotion Review Process ..... 13

3.4 Portfolio for Promotion..... 14

3.5 Promotion Review Process ..... 14

**4.0 TENURE**

4.1 Tenure Review Committee ..... 14

4.2 Initiation of the Tenure Review Process ..... 15

4.3 Portfolio for Tenure ..... 15

4.4 Tenure Review Procedures ..... 16

4.5 Mid-Tenure Review..... 17

**5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND SEVERANCE**

5.1 Reappointment..... 17

5.2 Criteria for Reappointment ..... 17

5.3 Procedure for Reappointment ..... 17

5.4 Severance..... 18

**6.0 UPDATING THE LIBRARIES FACULTY PROCEDURAL MANUAL** ..... 18

**APPENDICES**

A. Annual Report ..... 19

B. Goal Statement ..... 20

C. Supervisor’s Evaluation Outline ..... 21

D. Peer Reviewer Request..... 22

E. Request for Change in AAP Weighting Factors..... 23

F. AAP Evaluation of Faculty Form (default weights) ..... 24

G. AAP Evaluation of Faculty Form (changes in weights) ..... 25

H. AAP Evaluation of Faculty Guidelines..... 26

I. AAP Self-Evaluation..... 29

J. Guidelines for Promotion/Tenure Portfolio Presentations ..... 34

## PREFACE

Because the University Libraries' organizational and reporting structure crosses two academic divisions, it is necessary to provide a manual outlining procedures and guidelines to implement University policies. For example, this *Libraries Faculty Procedural Manual* (LFPM) specifies the unique courses of action for tenure, promotion and evaluation for the Executive Director of University Libraries, the Director of the Biomedical Library, the Dean of the College of Medicine and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. It also specifies the procedures for library supervisors relative to library administration.

It must be understood that no procedure or guideline stated in the LFPM may be in conflict with the University's *Faculty Handbook* (<http://www.southalabama.edu/academicaffairs/handbook.pdf>). It is vital that all members of the libraries faculty become familiar with first the *Faculty Handbook* and then the LFPM. Furthermore, it should be noted that the LFPM supersedes all prior editions of its predecessor document, *Criteria and Procedures for the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure*, including any procedures therein stated.

---

“Library administration” in this document shall refer to the Executive Director of University Libraries and the Director of the Biomedical Library. A reference in this document to the “appropriate library administrator” shall refer to either the Executive Director of University Libraries for librarians in the Academic Affairs Division or to the Director of the Biomedical Library for librarians in the Health Sciences Division. It should be understood that when the Manual requires Biomedical Library faculty to submit paperwork to the Executive Director of University Libraries or library administration, it normally is submitted first to the Director of the Biomedical Library, who then submits it to the Executive Director of University Libraries.

## **1.0 FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND SEARCHES**

### **1.1 Request to Fill a Faculty Vacancy**

A libraries faculty appointment is the act of initiating the appropriate request by the Executive Director of University Libraries or the Director of the Biomedical Library to employ a professional librarian in the libraries faculty based on Ch.3.18 of the *USA Faculty Handbook* (Faculty Recruitment). This University policy covers the responsibilities of the search committee, and guidelines concerning announcements, advertisements, candidate files, candidate interviews, unsolicited applications, appointment and other requirements that must be followed by library administration and search committee members. Librarians appointed to a faculty search committee need to become familiar with the University's policy, as well as a number of additional procedures or guidelines applicable to the libraries as outlined below.

### **1.2 Procedures in the University Libraries**

This section covers the formation and role of the libraries faculty search committee appointed by the Executive Director, the interview process and guidelines, recommendation process, appointment, and post- appointment/mentoring guidelines.

#### **a. Formation and Role of the Search Committee**

The Executive Director will appoint between three and five members of the libraries faculty to constitute a search committee of which one will be appointed chair. A majority of the committee will be from the library in which the vacancy occurs, and if possible, from the area – public or technical services.

The Executive Director will call the first committee meeting and outline its expectations, responsibilities, anticipated opening and closing dates of the search, tentative schedule for interviews, budget or other constraints, and the candidates' presentation requirements. The successful candidate may also need time to give proper notice to his or her employer, to buy or sell property, move, etc.

The committee chair will call all subsequent meetings, be the sole spokesperson for the committee, meet with library administration as appropriate, and maintain a detailed record regarding candidates, meeting dates, and minutes, etc. The Executive Director will fill any vacancy that occurs on the committee.

#### **b. Website and other Job Descriptions and Announcements**

Members of the committee will develop a detailed job description for the library's web site and notices to graduate schools or other allowable entities such as professional organizations. This announcement will include a full position description with major duties and responsibilities, as well as all position and application requirements (education, experience, skills, number of references, letter of application, submission requirements), and certain University wording regarding affirmative action and equal opportunity. The statements must be forwarded to the Executive Director for approval. The Executive Director will send them to the appropriate vice president if required. Such announcements, therefore, may be posted only with the permission of the Executive Director.

#### **c. Correspondence**

All correspondence regarding the vacancy is normally directed to the chair of the search committee with all original documentation being retained in the Executive Director's or Director's files.

See <http://www.southalabama.edu/recordsmanagement/USArda.pdf>

### 1.3 Interview Process and Guidelines

#### a. Ethical Considerations

Committee members will be receptive to all feedback, but the committee chair will make all written or oral statements emanating from the committee. References for the candidate will be held in strict confidence by the committee and library administration. Additional professional references (beyond those submitted by applicants) may be requested by the committee chair or library administration with the permission of the applicant. These may be written or oral. Oral communications will be summarized in writing and provided to the committee and library administration. Discretion should be shown when additional references are sought to avoid jeopardizing an applicant's current position.

Care must be taken by all those who participate in the interview process, in whatever capacity, to avoid asking questions which may be construed as discriminatory or of a personal nature. This would include soliciting information regarding a candidate's age, race, religion, marital status, children, social and political affiliations or persuasions, arrest record, medical condition, and sexual orientation.

There is no requirement or obligation to interview internal or local applicants, particularly if it would cause an otherwise unqualified applicant to think she or he is qualified. The chair should consult with library administration as appropriate in such cases.

#### b. Screening and Telephone Interview Procedures

If a closing date was approved by the Executive Director, the committee chair should schedule a meeting of the committee within a week of that date for the purpose of reviewing all applications. The committee should screen out applicants who do not meet requirements. The committee will then review references in all remaining applicants. All applications will be screened in an objective and impartial manner using the qualifications and requirements stated on the position description.

After receiving all of the requested references, the committee will finalize the list of candidates for telephone interviews. The committee will also develop a set of questions to ask all candidates. The committee chair will then meet with the appropriate library administrator to review the applicants and the list of questions. The chair will schedule the telephone interviews based on the availability of the committee members and the library administration.

Telephone interviews are required for a number of important reasons. The questions asked should help to screen-out candidates who do not meet the English proficiency requirement, clarify information in the candidate's letter of application and curriculum vita, determine if the applicant is still interested, answer questions the candidate has about the position, and establish the candidate's relative strengths and weaknesses vis-à-vis other candidates. Such information may be very important in deciding whether to invite the candidate for an on-campus interview. For internal and local/regional candidates (where travel reimbursements are not a consideration), the committee may meet with the candidates face-to-face.

All invited candidates, however, need to be asked the same set of questions. The committee shall develop an evaluation form for each candidate and be responsible for providing the form to everyone who attends presentations, meetings with the candidate, etc. After the last interview, candidates may be screened out in consultation with library administration. If one or more candidates are screened out, the search committee should reexamine the candidate pool and consult with the appropriate library administrator to determine whether to include additional applicants for telephone interviews.

The University of South Alabama if authorized by the Executive Director will pay for interviews at conferences at which both library representative and the candidate (s) are attendees. Such off-campus

interviews, however, shall NOT be a substitute for on-campus interviews. For further details, see USA "Travel and Entertainment Regulations." See <http://www.southalabama.edu/travel/>

c. Campus Interview Process

The committee chair, in consultation with library administration, shall finalize an itinerary for each campus interview. The itinerary should be similar, if not identical, for each candidate while allowing for adjustments due to the candidate's or Executive Director's schedule or other variables. The committee chair normally invites the selected candidates for interviews and establishes the itineraries, which are suitable to all parties. The itinerary will be sent to the candidates, committee members, and library administration as soon as possible. The Executive Director normally meets with all candidates at the end of the interview day to answer salary, rank, and other questions that candidates may have about the University's appointment process.

Library administration will maintain all candidates' files, so that libraries faculty can have timely access to the applicants being interviewed. It is expected that the information will be kept confidential.

Library administration will arrange air travel and make local arrangements for lodging for the candidates, as well as pay for the candidates' out-of-pocket expenses for meals or other necessary expenses.

The committee chair will remind all participants in the interview process of the ethical considerations discussed above (1.3a). The committee chair will encourage all participants in the interview process to complete and return an evaluation form for each candidate. It is appropriate for paraprofessional employees, particularly from the department involved, to be given the opportunity to meet and question the candidates and express their opinions by means of an evaluation form as well. The chair will make sure that the results are considered by the committee as one component of its deliberations leading to a recommendation.

d. Evaluation of Candidates and Committee Recommendations

Following the conclusion of the final interview, the committee will meet expeditiously to evaluate the candidates and make a recommendation to library administration. The recommendation will be made in writing and include a slate of all acceptable candidates along with a summary of the candidates' strengths and weaknesses. The committee shall also list all unacceptable candidates who interviewed on campus along with its rationale. It should be understood that library administration may proceed toward the appointment of any acceptable candidate. In case the committee cannot recommend a candidate, a written statement to library administration shall state why and make a recommendation to extend the search, or reopen it with any suggestions to make it more attractive to potential candidates.

The committee needs to keep in mind that administration will not recommend someone for a tenure-track position who lacks a track record that is predictive of future success in scholarship, such as presentations at professional conferences and publications.

Should the Executive Director disagree with the committee's recommendation(s), the committee shall be extended the opportunity to discuss the matter.

e. Library Administration's Recommendation and Communication with the Candidate

The Executive Director directs all communications with the recommended candidate and University administration as outlined in the *USA Faculty Handbook* or as required by University administration. Library administration shall make the announcement of the appointment once the candidate has signed an official letter of appointment issued by the President and will work with the chair of the search committee

to notify the unsuccessful candidates. The search committee is dissolved when this announcement is made.

f. Records Retention

Documentation for each search will be retained by library administration in accordance with the University's Records Disposition Authority:

<http://www.southalabama.edu/recordsmanagement/USArda.pdf>

g. Mentoring New Faculty Members

The chair of the search committee or a libraries faculty member designated by the search committee will act as a mentor to the new faculty member and meet with him or her on a timely basis to review the faculty evaluation, mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion procedures and guidelines, including the Annual Report. The chair of the search committee will inform library administration of the name of the new faculty member's mentor.

## **2.0 ANNUAL LIBRARIES FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS**

### **2.1 Basis of Evaluation**

The annual faculty evaluation process is a required professional practice established as the basis of faculty recommendations and management decisions with respect to reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure, promotion, and merit raises. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to review, understand, and follow the respective policies outlined in the *USA Faculty Handbook* and the procedures outlined in the LFPM, including the due dates listed in *Calendar for Evaluations/Promotions/Tenure*. Because the due dates are subject to change for any number of reasons from year to year, the Executive Director normally sends email reminders to the faculty about the dates; nonetheless, it remains the responsibility of each libraries faculty member to observe the applicable dates.

The annual evaluation is based on a number of important factors including, but not limited to, the following:

- the faculty member's job responsibilities, goals, and the accomplishment of these goals;
- the evaluation of activities in the areas of professional development, research, and scholarly activity;
- service to the University; and
- subjective criteria such as productivity, communication ability, adaptability, use of technology, rapport with others, etc.

Each library department is required to have goals and action plans, which support the University Libraries' mission and goals. Each faculty member is also required to have an annual goal statement (Appendix B) correlating to the departmental goals, and/or libraries objectives. Personal objectives, action plan, and a self-evaluation are written for the categories of job performance, research/professional development, University service, and special service or assignment, if applicable. These statements establish the basis for the supervisor's or the library administrator's evaluation of the libraries faculty member.

Each faculty member assumes the responsibility of scheduling a meeting with his or her supervisor to reach an agreement on individual goals and action plans. When librarians have more than one supervisor, the Executive Director will name one as primary supervisor. The completed statement of goals and action plans is forwarded to the appropriate library administrator.

The supervisor, when necessary, may schedule a mid-year or more frequent meeting with the evaluated librarian to review progress and discuss possible modifications in goals and action plans. Anytime such a discussion occurs, the supervisor will write a summary of the meeting, which is to be signed, dated by both the librarian and the primary supervisor, and sent to the appropriate library administrator. The evaluated librarian may attach a written comment, if there is a disagreement with the supervisor's summary. These statements are incorporated in the Annual Report (Appendix A).

## **2.2 Annual Report (AR)**

Each faculty member is responsible for submitting an Annual Report as outlined in Appendix A. The evaluation period for all librarians is January 1 – December 31. Submit a complete paper copy, or an electronic copy, to the supervisor by the due date recorded on the evaluation calendar. Only that part of the AR that concerns the year under consideration is used in the Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) and supervisory evaluation process. An electronic copy should always be submitted to the Administrative Assistant in the Executive Director's office. Because of the limitations of Digital Measures for librarians, the Goal Statement (Appendix B) will continue to be used for Annual Reports.

## **2.3 Faculty Member's Annual Self-Evaluation**

All faculty members will prepare their Annual Report, which will include their vita, goal statement, and annual self-evaluation (Appendix A, and Appendix I). The reviewee will submit the complete AR, including supervisor's evaluation, to the Executive Director by the due date. Files submitted without all required materials will be considered incomplete. Late or incomplete files may jeopardize the librarian's consideration for merit increases, promotion, or tenure. Unfamiliarity with calendar due dates or procedures will not be considered justification or a proper defense for late submissions. Unforeseen emergencies should be referred to the Executive Director as soon as possible.

## **2.4 Supervisory Evaluation Process**

The supervisor will read the AR and make an independent assessment of the contents, taking into account the criteria for promotion in rank and tenure. The faculty member should be judged with a rigor relevant to the level of expectations for the rank held. See *USA Faculty Handbook* 3.10. The AAP weighting scale is on the AAP Self-Evaluation Rating Scale (Appendix I).

Those conducting evaluations should employ the following guidelines:

1. Understand the requirements, responsibilities, and duties of the particular position held by the librarian, as well as all of the criteria to be applied both generally and specifically given the librarian's position description and faculty rank.
2. Apply a process of objective reasoning and judgment based on demonstrated performance with respect to each librarian's responsibilities, goals, and activities. Bias, favoritism, and the belief that effectiveness or ineffectiveness in one instance, or during part of the evaluation year, implies the same in other or all factors, or for the entire rating period should be avoided. Each librarian should be evaluated on his or her performance as a whole for the entire rating period, as opposed to a few isolated instances and activities.
3. Meet with the librarian in a private and professional environment at a time when other matters are not pressing. Welcome dialog and questions. Remember that the librarian has a right to know how well she or he is doing, as well as the opportunity to provide a response that is received in an open-minded, unbiased, and professional manner with the intent of helping the person become more effective and productive.



4. The supervisor will subsequently prepare a draft summary of the interview embodying his or her evaluation and afford the faculty member an opportunity to read and comment on the draft. Using the form provided in Appendix C, the supervisor prepares the final evaluation copy, which will become part of the Annual Report. The faculty member will read and sign the supervisor's evaluation form. The faculty member may choose to prepare a written rebuttal of the supervisor's evaluation. If submitted, this rebuttal is forwarded directly to the appropriate library administrator, and becomes part of the Annual Report. In cases when a faculty member reports to more than one supervisor, each supervisor will conduct a review of the job performance in the appropriate area. The primary supervisor, however, is responsible for reviewing the librarian's research/professional development and University service activities. The completed Supervisory Evaluation narrative is submitted to the appropriate library administrator, who may write a review (optional) for those eligible for promotion, tenure and reappointment. If completed, it becomes part of the AR, to which the supervisor and faculty member have access. The Director of the Biomedical Library will send the completed AR to the Executive Director. The dates by which these actions occur are listed in the *Calendar for Evaluations/Promotion/Tenure*.
5. For librarians who have other responsibilities outside of their department, the primary supervisor should consult with the appropriate secondary supervisor.

## **2.5. Annual Peer Review**

The purpose of annual peer review is to assess and document job performance and effectiveness, research/professional development and University service from sources other than the supervisory evaluation. The process of peer review, by other members of libraries faculty, is required only for non-tenured faculty based on the calendar dates in the *Calendar for Evaluations/Promotion/Tenure*, as well as the following guidelines:

1. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure will submit to the Executive Director either two or three names of members of the libraries faculty who have agreed to evaluate them. Faculty members will not do peer evaluations for their supervisors. It is recommended that no more than one non-tenured libraries faculty member may be named (Appendix D). Peer reviewers may be selected from any of the libraries and should be able to evaluate the individual's job performance, research/professional development, and/or service. Conflict of interest should be avoided when choosing peer reviewers.
2. Peer reviews are not conducted by any member of the library administration. Supervisors will not do peer reviews for faculty members who report to them. Additional reviews may be requested from outside the libraries for librarians with other University and external professional responsibilities, such as teaching or faculty development activities. The peer reviews are included in the AR. All letters of evaluation will be requested by library administration.
3. All peer reviews for annual evaluations are considered confidential and will only be available to library administration and the appropriate review committee. Upon request by the reviewee, the library administration will make available to said reviewee a compilation of the peer reviews with the names of the reviewers removed. (See the *Calendar for Evaluations/Promotion/Tenure* for specific dates.)
4. The peer reviewer should be selected for his or her knowledge of the reviewee for a specific area(s). However, this should not limit the reviewer's comments in the other areas (i.e., job performance and effectiveness, research/professional development, and University service). The designated libraries faculty peer reviewer will evaluate the librarian based on the Annual Review Report, the criteria in 2.1, and the reviewer's personal observation and knowledge. The faculty

member should be judged according to the level of expectation for the rank held. It is important to note that the guidelines required in supervisory evaluations should also characterize peer reviews. Peer reviews should exemplify candor and serious judgment, because they provide an important additional perspective in the evaluation process.

- Faculty members may not provide reciprocal peer reviews for each other within the same evaluation year.
  - Faculty members may not provide a peer evaluation for the same person for two years in a row. Changes to this may be requested from the Executive Director.
  - Peer reviews are not limited within faculty rank.
  - Faculty members should provide qualitative comments based on direct knowledge of shared work or projects.
  - Peer evaluations may not be a re-stating of activities listed in a faculty member's annual report.
  - Comments should be offered on quality of shared work, scholarly output, and service.
5. The Executive Director will publish a list of the peer reviewers for non-tenured faculty up for promotion and/or tenure. Librarians may review their individual lists for accuracy and may suggest in writing reasons for changes in the list.
  6. An evaluator may petition the Executive Director to be relieved of responsibility for individual evaluations. The Executive Director will consider such requests and will inform the evaluator and the faculty member of the decision.
  7. If a faculty member would like a peer reviewer to observe her/his work activity, the observation period may be random or agreed upon in advance by the individual and the peer reviewer.

## **2.6 Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) - Weights and Weighting Factors**

The AAP form as modified for the libraries faculty is used to document the faculty member's job performance, professional development, and University service based on the following guidelines:

Within two weeks before or after the beginning of the year, the librarian must decide whether to request a change in weighting factors (Appendices E) or accept the default weights (Appendix F). The defaults apply if the librarian fails to request a change by the deadline. These weights are flexible and may be negotiated individually by faculty members. However, if the requested percentage for job performance exceeds 60%, the librarian's primary supervisor must sign the form and agree. Any change from 60% for job performance requires the faculty member to provide a written justification, that is, reasons for desired change such as a special assignment. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, the appropriate library administrator will resolve the differences. The Director of the Biomedical Library will sign the form and submit it to the Executive Director of University Libraries for BL faculty. All requests must be signed by the Executive Director who will either provide copies to the librarian and supervisor, or call a meeting to discuss the requested changes.

Once the Executive Director approves a change in weighting factors for the evaluation year, modification may only be authorized by the Executive Director due to significant change in job responsibilities.

## **2.7 Rating Process for AAP**

The primary supervisor will meet with the appropriate library administrator and develop a consensus concerning the quantitative scores for the period. When there is more than one supervisor, a group meeting will be held for this purpose. In addition, supervisors will be included in all meetings concerning faculty

members under their direction. In the event a consensus cannot be reached, the appropriate library administrator will make the final decision. The preservation of the confidentiality of the proceedings of these deliberations is the obligation of all those involved. Each individual participating in the assignment of numerical ratings, as well as the faculty member being rated, will sign the AAP Numerical Ratings form (Appendix F or G). The appropriate library administrator will maintain the AAP numerical ratings as a separate file. Performance evaluations are intended to assess the work of faculty members in relation to the rank they hold and to serve as a basis for merit raise distributions. Numerical ratings will not be made available to either the Promotion or Tenure Review Committees for use in their deliberations.

The faculty evaluation process as described above culminates in the AAP Evaluation of Faculty Form (Modified for Libraries Faculty, Appendix F or G).

a. Job Performance

Levels of job performance are graded on a scale of 0-10 for each of the categories used in the Affirmative Action Plan (AAP). The following definitions describe the interpretation to be used:

10	Excellent:	Performance is exemplary, exceeds requirements, and obtains the best possible results as measured against national professional standards.
7.5	Very good:	Performance consistently fulfills requirements; work is frequently beyond that expected as measured against national professional standards
5.0	Adequate:	Performance is consistently adequate and satisfactory, as measured against national professional standards.
2.5	Needs improvement:	Performance occasionally meets requirements; while work is not totally unacceptable, performance is below that which is expected as measured against national professional standards.
1.0	Unsatisfactory:	Performance is consistently unacceptable; seldom meets position requirements; exhibits major performance problems as measured against national professional standards.
0	No performance	Position requirements are not met.

b. Professional Development and University Service Activities

The list of professional development and University service activities listed in the *USA Faculty Handbook* and in Appendix I of this Manual is not intended to be inclusive. Other activities may be added as agreed upon by faculty and the appropriate administrator. Activity levels and points listed are suggestions and are not binding. While criteria are not cumulative, additional activities or the quality and substance of a single activity may justify a higher level. The purpose of this guideline is to encourage achievement and privilege the highest level activities. An activity or accomplishment may only be counted in one category unless there are clearly delineated multiple components.

Proper documentation in the AR, showing the level of participation in the activity, is the responsibility of the reviewee. Itemizing and characterizing the activities at the appropriate level is beneficial to the reviewee, so that a fair evaluation can be made. This is particularly important when there are multiple authors, team-based projects, etc. If work is shared, the librarian should specify his/her particular contribution and time spent. Quantity/quality of work completed will determine the number of points awarded. The philosophy behind this documentation is that of professional achievement, as expressed by professional organizations such as AHIP, ALA, ACRL, etc.

The faculty member should read and sign the AAP evaluation form. If the faculty member wishes to prepare a written rebuttal of the AAP evaluation, it should be submitted within ten days directly to the Executive Director of University Libraries to become a part of the permanent file.

### **3.0 PROMOTION IN RANK**

For general criteria for promotion, see *USA Faculty Handbook* Sec. 3.10.

When time in service for promotion to the next rank is fulfilled, the faculty member may be nominated by the supervisor or may petition for consideration.

#### **3.1 Promotion Review Committee**

The Promotion Review Committee is comprised of all tenured Senior Librarians for consideration of promotions to the senior level, and all tenured Associate and Senior Librarians for consideration of promotions to the Associate level. Refer to *USA Faculty Handbook* 3.4.1 for library ranking and their instructional counterparts.

Members of the library administration are not eligible to serve on the committee. The Executive Director convenes the first meeting of the committee by **November**, if there are candidates. The committee will select its chair and secretary from among the members holding the rank of Senior Librarian. A quorum shall consist of one more than half of the committee members. Recommendations of the Promotion Review Committee are advisory to library administration. The Promotion Review Committee reviews the candidate's documentation and renders a recommendation for or against promotion. The chair and secretary will word the rationale and attach it to the signature page. All voting is by secret ballot.

The Promotion Review Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating, in a fair and objective manner, all pertinent records, and documents of the candidates under consideration. The preservation of the confidentiality of all records and deliberations of the committee is the obligation of each committee member, but especially the duty of the committee chair. Each member is responsible for having a thorough knowledge of the applicable sections of this document and the *USA Faculty Handbook*. The chair calls all subsequent meetings of the committee and is responsible for ensuring that reports and recommendations are made in accordance with the requirements of this document.

The members of the promotion committee will review all material submitted by candidates with the following understanding:

- Evidence and assessment of scholarly publications, professional development, service, collegiality, and job performance are the essence of tenure and promotion recommendations. Assessment is expected to consider a wide range of variables as follows:
  1. The degree to which a candidate's activities, publications, etc. advance librarianship, knowledge in the field, his/her own professional growth or skills, etc.
  2. The effort that goes into single authored works versus a publication with multiple authors, or the level of effort and expertise that the various participants exert in grant applications, grant awards, library projects, committee activities, multi-authored publications, and the like. The feedback from internal and external peer reviews, commentaries, book reviews, and others.
  3. The type of venues where exhibits, posters, workshops, or demonstrations are held.
  4. The size of the audience reached, readership, etc.
  5. The increasing level or quality of work and activities expected of librarians as they advance from assistant to associate librarian and from associate to senior librarian, or instructor to senior instructor rank.

## **3.2 Promotion Criteria**

A qualitative evaluation of the candidate's activities is essential for the granting of promotion. (See Section 3.10.3 of the *USA Faculty Handbook*). The Promotion Review committee should focus on the candidate's record based on performance in the three areas described in the criteria for evaluation for the entire period of service relevant to promotion to the rank under consideration. However, in its deliberations, the Promotion Review Committee takes into consideration the information in the annual reports as a whole, and does not confine its judgment merely to the information in the individual's current or most recent files. The committee should look for increased quality performance in all three categories over the years of service being considered, keeping in mind that high-quality job is the most important area as it counts for 60% or more of the evaluation.

Candidates for promotion understand that it is their responsibility to update Digital Measures to use for their vita for inclusion in their portfolio for promotion. Dates must be included in all Digital Measures entries for activities. The Provost requires the use of Digital Measures (DM) for the vita; however, the Digital Measures reports may require the use of MS Word or other editing software to assure accuracy, completeness, proper formatting, and so forth.

### **Reviewers for Promotion**

Candidates for promotion submit to Library Administration:

- One to three names of peer reviewers from the libraries faculty
- One to three names of University faculty
- One or more external (non-USA) reviewers chosen by the candidate (optional)

Library Administration will contact the reviewers to request letters of recommendations. Reviewers must have personal knowledge of candidate's qualifications for consideration for promotion.

#### **a. Promotion from Assistant Librarian to Associate Librarian**

An assistant librarian under consideration for promotion to associate librarian should demonstrate maturity and a quality job performance, and should have begun to make noteworthy contributions in the area of professional service. The assistant librarian's record in research/professional development should show a genuine contribution to the profession and to personal professional growth. She or he should have achieved a level of competence, which gives evidence of maturity, insight, and credibility in all professional endeavors. Positions requiring specialized knowledge or skills may require the librarian to have an additional advanced degree, certification, or course work.

#### **b. Promotion from Associate Librarian to Senior Librarian**

An associate librarian under consideration for promotion to senior librarian should show a sustained career effort illustrated by sustained superior performance. She or he should have built on prior activities in the area of job performance, service, and development and may have begun to undertake new initiatives.

Promotion to Senior Librarian often is related to significant contributions as a mentor to other librarians and/or leadership in the University Libraries faculty. Positions requiring specialized knowledge or skills may require the librarian to have an additional advanced degree, certification, or course work.

## **3.3 Initiation of the Promotion Review Process**

The Executive Director will send out an intent statement to those faculty members eligible for first-

time promotion, and publish a list of individuals eligible for consideration. Eligible individuals will indicate their plans to pursue promotion by returning the intent form to library administration. The candidate's list of names, internal (required) and external (optional), for professional references will be provided to library administration. The faculty member will also include a written statement outlining his or her fulfillment of the general criteria for promotion in rank.

### **3.4 Portfolio for Promotion**

The candidate prepares a portfolio applying for promotion according to the guidelines in Appendix J, "Guidelines for Promotion/Tenure Portfolio Presentations adapted for Libraries Faculty." A binder for this purpose, with the appropriate tabs, is prepared by the Administrative Assistant in the Library Administration office for each candidate. Tab dividers may be moved to a larger binder if necessary.

The candidate is responsible for completing Section I, II, and IV of the Promotion Portfolio (see Appendix J), which is submitted to the University Libraries administration. The University Libraries administration is responsible for coordinating Section III (Evaluations) and Section V (Recommendations). The completed Promotion Portfolio resides with the University Libraries administration.

### **3.5 Promotion Review Process**

The Promotion Portfolio is retained in the office of the Executive Director except when in the possession of the faculty review committee for deliberations. After the recommendation by the Promotion Review Committee has been determined and signed by all voting members of the committee, it is submitted to the Executive Director. (For additional details of the process, see: 4.4, Tenure Review Process.) Library administration may make optional response to supervisory evaluations for those up for promotion.

Before the Executive Director moves the recommendation forward, Academic Affairs requires that candidates for promotion be given a summary of the committee's recommendation and that candidates sign a form acknowledging this and in addition specify whether they want to proceed or withdraw with consideration.

## **4.0 TENURE**

For requirements for eligibility for tenure, see *USA Faculty Handbook* Sec. 3.11.4.2.

With the exception of years in service, criteria for the award of tenure in the libraries faculty are the same as criteria cited for promotion in rank. The candidate for tenure is to be evaluated based on the criteria for promotion to the rank she or he currently holds.

Tenure consideration is mandatory once sufficient years in service have been achieved by tenure-track faculty. Consideration for promotion in rank and consideration for award of tenure are handled separately.

Tenure-track libraries faculty at the rank of assistant, associate, or senior librarian hold, or have the potential to hold, tenure. Libraries faculty at the instructor rank are not eligible for tenure.

### **4.1 Tenure Review Committee**

The Tenure Review Committee consists of all tenured members of the libraries faculty, whatever their rank, excluding members of the library administration. The Executive Director convenes the first

meeting of the committee according to the calendar. The committee selects a chair and secretary at this first meeting. Rank is not a consideration in the selection of the chair except when considering promotion to senior librarian. A quorum for activity shall consist of one more than half of the tenured members of the libraries faculty. The recommendations of the Tenure Review Committee are advisory to library administration. The Tenure Review Committee reviews the candidate's documentation and renders a recommendation for or against the granting of tenure. The recommendation of the Committee must be written at the time of the meeting and signed by the faculty members present. The chair and secretary will word the rationale, which will be attached to the signature page. All voting is by secret ballot. The Tenure Review Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating, in a fair and objective manner, all pertinent records and documents of the candidates under consideration. The preservation of the confidentiality of all records and deliberations of the committee is the obligation of each committee member, but especially the duty of the committee chair. Each member is responsible for having a thorough knowledge of the applicable sections of this document and the *USA Faculty Handbook*. The chair calls all subsequent meetings and is responsible for ensuring reports and recommendations are made in accordance with the requirements of this document.

The Tenure Review Committee shall meet annually to review all tenure-track faculty and provide library administration with recommendations for renewal or non-renewal of contracts.

The Committee may consult with the Executive Director and/or the Director of the Biomedical Library. The recommendation of the Committee must be written at the time of the meeting and signed by all faculty members present. Proxy votes for those unable to attend will not be accepted.

#### **4.2 Initiation of the Tenure Review Process**

Faculty members are considered for tenure when they have fulfilled the required time in service. The Executive Director will publish a list of those eligible to apply for consideration for tenure and request names for internal and external professional references. The candidate for tenure consideration prepares a cover letter to be included in the portfolio justifying his or her qualifications to be awarded tenure. The candidate should use the "Guidelines for Promotion/Tenure Portfolio Presentations as adapted for Libraries Faculty" (Appendix J).

#### **4.3 Portfolio for Tenure**

The candidate applying for tenure will prepare a "Portfolio for Tenure" in a binder obtained from library administration consisting of all the documentation outlined in Appendix J. If the candidate is also applying for promotion, the portfolio should be titled "Portfolio for Tenure and Promotion." The complete portfolio is submitted to the Executive Director. Library administration may make optional responses to supervisory evaluations for those up for tenure. The Provost requires the use of Digital Measures (DM) for the vita; however, the Digital Measures reports usually require the use of MS Word or other editing software to assure accuracy, completeness, proper formatting, and so forth. Both internal and external reviews are required for tenure.

#### **Internal Reviews of Candidates for Tenure**

Internal reviews of the candidate's research/professional development and service contributions are to be included in all tenure applications, per the following guidelines:

- Internal – Two or three reviews by USA Libraries faculty members chosen by the candidate.
- University – One to three reviews from faculty of the University, but outside reviews may also be chosen by the candidate.

### **External Reviews of Candidates for Tenure– USA Faculty Handbook 3.11.4.3**

An external review of the candidate's scholarship will be included in all tenure applications. Obtaining the reviews will be the responsibility of library administration in accordance with the following procedures:

- The candidate, the chair of the Tenure Committee, and all libraries tenured faculty will have an opportunity to submit names of external referees who are recognized scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship.
- The chair of the Tenure Committee will select at least three names from the three lists and will request that these individuals provide a written review of the candidate's scholarship. The candidate will be notified of the names of those selected to serve as referees. The external review will then be included in the candidate's tenure portfolio and will be a component of all levels of the tenure review process.

These requests will be mailed or emailed with curriculum vita and relevant documentation. All such letters of recommendation shall be available to library administration and the appropriate review committee.

#### **4.4 Tenure Review Procedures**

The portfolio is retained in the office of the Executive Director except when in the possession of the faculty review committees for deliberations. The committee chair is responsible for the security of the files during the meetings and for returning them to the Executive Director's office. Documents that are ambiguous or lacking in detail will be returned through the Executive Director for amplification. Items not germane to the consideration of work performance or academic qualifications, such as letters of recommendation that were part of the candidate's AAP evaluations, pre-employment record, personal financial data, medical records, police and court records, and records of political activity should not be included in the annual report or portfolio.

The Executive Director will notify the members of the faculty review committees, and if appropriate, the Biomedical Library Director that the documentation for the review process is ready. The chairs of the review committees will establish dates for their meetings and notify committee members of that date when the documentation is ready. The committees will convene by the date suggested in the *Calendar for Evaluations/Promotion/Tenure*.

When a Biomedical Librarian is up for review, the Biomedical Library Director may submit a written recommendation with rationale, and may request a recommendation (optional) from the dean of the College of Medicine.

These recommendations will be submitted to the Executive Director by the required date. The committee chairs will prepare a letter/memo to the Executive Director of University Libraries for each candidate for promotion and/or tenure stating the recommendations of the committees. The faculty review committee's report should include the following items:

1. The name of the person reviewed.
2. The recommendation, with rationale, for the committee's action on each recommendation.
3. The count of the committee's vote on each recommendation.
4. The names and signatures of the committee members as the last item of the report, with the chair so designated.

The committee chairs will forward the recommendations and documentation of the review committees to the Executive Director. For Biomedical Library faculty, the Executive Director consults with the Director of the Biomedical Library concerning the recommendations.



Before the Executive Director moves the recommendation forward, Academic Affairs requires that candidates for tenure be given a summary of the committee's recommendation and that candidates sign a form acknowledging this and in addition specify whether they want to proceed or withdraw with consideration.

The Executive Director completes the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Recommendation and submits it to the Provost, Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs. Recommendations concerning Biomedical Library faculty are submitted to the Dean of the College of Medicine. In cases of joint appointments in other colleges (as defined in 3.3.2 of the *USA Faculty Handbook*), the Executive Director of University Libraries consults with the appropriate dean. See the *Calendar for Evaluations/Promotion/Tenure* for suggested dates.

After the decision of the Board of Trustees has been released, the candidate whose tenure or promotion request was denied may request from the Executive Director an oral summary of reasons for both the committee's and the Executive Director's recommendations.

#### **4.5 Mid-Tenure Review**

Tenure-track faculty will be formally reviewed mid-way through the probationary period by the Tenure Review Committee. This review is intended to assist tenure track faculty by focusing on issues and criteria related to the candidate's progress toward tenure. The tenure committee submits a written evaluation to the supervisor and the Executive Director, which becomes a part of the individual's Annual Report. The candidate's supervisor and appropriate library administrator will be responsible for ongoing counseling. The candidate will receive a copy of this evaluation during consultation with the appropriate library administrator.

### **5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND SEVERANCE**

#### **5.1 Reappointment**

Reappointment is the annual issuance of a letter of reappointment by the appropriate library administrator and University Administration, which results in a year's appointment for non-tenured faculty. Biomedical Librarians approval is from the dean of the College of Medicine. For dates, see "The Standards for Notice of Non-Reappointment" in the *USA Faculty Handbook* (3.15.2).

#### **5.2 Criteria for Reappointment**

- A. Effective performance of duties
- B. Administrative performance, if applicable
- C. Research and professional development activities
- D. Ability to work effectively with libraries faculty and staff
- E. Potential to grow and develop to meet the needs of the institution
- F. Willingness to assume additional committee and project responsibilities
- G. Continuing education and teaching, if applicable

These criteria state potential areas of professional activities, not absolute performance requirements. Specific performance criteria for promotion in rank and tenure are outlined elsewhere.

#### **5.3 Procedure for Reappointment**

All tenure-track and instructor librarians will be considered for reappointment by the appropriate library administrator. For appropriate dates, see "The Standards for Notice of Non-Reappointment" in the

*USA Faculty Handbook* (3.15.2).

For tenure-track and instructor librarians, documents that may be relevant to reappointment should be in the faculty member's annual report portfolio. The documents to be used for reappointment may include the following:

1. Self evaluation
2. Peer evaluation
3. Supervisory evaluation
4. Supplementary material submitted by the faculty member
5. Additional evaluations, where applicable

#### **5.4 Severance**

The appropriate library administrator will review the above documents, and in cases of non-reappointment, the Executive Director makes a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; for Biomedical Librarians, the recommendation is also forwarded to the Vice President for Health Sciences. The Executive Director may ask the Tenure Review Committee to make recommendations in cases where non-reappointment is being considered. Formal procedures for non-reappointment are contained in section 3.15, 'Severance Policy and Procedures' of the *USA Faculty Handbook*.

#### **6.0 UPDATING THE LIBRARIES FACULTY PROCEDURAL MANUAL**

The Executive Director of the University Libraries will make all changes to this document based on changes in University policy, the organizational or reporting structure, technology such as electronic portfolios or submission software, or requests recommended by the chairs of the tenure and promotion committees. Non-tenured faculty members may also provide feedback to the chair of the tenure and promotion committee at any time. The Executive Director shall communicate all changes to the libraries faculty and make certain the latest copy of the Manual is available on the appropriate website.