Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: <u>Library Teaching and Learning Department</u>

<u>Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of QRF in Years One through Six</u>

Annual Performance Review (APR)
The following criteria and standards will be used to evaluate all Qualified Rank Faculty members (QRF) within the Library Teaching and Learning Department (LTL) as appropriate to each individual's position responsibilities and allocation of effort. The standard allocation of effort in LTL is 90% librarian effectiveness and 10% service. This allocation may be adjusted for an individual faculty member, with the written approval of the Department Chair and the Dean. As candidates progress, successful candidates will demonstrate a strong record of librarian effectiveness and service activity that reflect a growth in productivity.

1. Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

    Successful candidates will show evidence of strong Librarian Effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, receive positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, and make contributions to the department's mission to support the research needs of library users and to teach users to identify, locate, assess and use appropriately a full range of information resources to create new knowledge. QRF positions may also have unique elements and responsibilities, as defined in their position responsibilities, and candidates will be evaluated by those criteria.

    All of the following types of primary evidence are required in applicable position responsibilities:
    *   Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRA) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
    *   Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
    *   Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate <u>c</u>oordinators.
    *   Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.

- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity in at least 2 of the following types of secondary evidence:

- Demonstrated continuous effort at improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.
- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses)
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

2. Evidence of Service

The scope and level of service contributions by a successful candidate will increase over time, expanding from solely departmental level and UL service to service to the university and potentially service to the profession. Service beyond the UL is evaluated positively, but not expected. Chairing or taking a leadership role in a service activity is evaluated positively, but not expected. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

During years 1 and 2:
- Candidates should demonstrate departmental level service.
- Candidates may also serve at the UL level, but this is not required.

During years 4 and 5:
- Candidates should serve on a total of at least two committees, task forces, or other working groups.
- These two committees should be at the departmental and/or UL level.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's service contributions
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

Enhanced Performance Review (EPR)

This section addresses criteria and standards for Enhanced Performance Review.

Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

A consistent pattern of performance across the review period is required in all the following applicable position responsibilities:

- Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRAs) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
- Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
- Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
- Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.
- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.

- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity across the review period in at least 3 of the following types of secondary evidence:

- Demonstrated continuous record of improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Significant contributions to special projects that support effective instruction and reference services
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.
- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses)
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

2. Evidence of Service

The scope and level of service contributions by a successful candidate will increase over time, expanding from solely departmental level and UL service to service to the university and potentially service to the profession. Service beyond the UL is evaluated positively, but not expected. Chairing or taking a leadership role in a service activity is evaluated positively, but not expected. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

By the EPR:
- Candidates will have demonstrated effective service at the departmental, UL and/or university level.

- Candidates should have served on at least two committees, task forces, or other working groups.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those who can speak to the candidate's service contributions
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF APR and EPR Materials

The LTL Department Chair shall provide reasonable advanced notification of the upcoming review and solicit documentation from the faculty member.

1. Internal Procedures for Creation and Submission of APR Materials

   APR dossiers shall include the following, which will be submitted to the Chair of LTL:

   - The LTL QRF member's position responsibilities
   - Allocation of Effort, if different from the standard 90% librarian effectiveness and 10% service
   - Annual Data Outline (ADO) The ADO should include information for the academic year up until the date of review.
   - Other evidence supporting annual accomplishments with respect to librarian effectiveness criteria and service criteria.

2. Internal Procedures for Creation and Submission of EPR Materials

   The candidate submits a packet of materials through the electronic portfolio system. The core of the portfolio focuses on the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of librarian effectiveness and, service.

   The following supporting materials shall be included in the electronic portfolio for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR):

   - Curriculum Vitae   A current vita following the general format found in the Library Faculty Resume Outline. A category should be omitted if it is not applicable or if the candidate has no activities to list.

- <u>Narratives</u>   A narrative prepared by the candidate describing professional contributions, one for each of the following performance areas: librarian effectiveness and service. Each narrative is to be no more than two pages. Each narrative should (1) provide a philosophical statement; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence not included in full.
- <u>Librarian Effectiveness Evidence and Documentation</u>: Library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointment surveys, chat user surveys, records or examples of collection development work, records or examples of e-resources management and support, records or examples of substantive projects, peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, additional applicable evaluations, any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items, except that all available faculty and student evaluations and reviews must be included.
- <u>Service Evidence and Documentation</u>: copies of letters or other materials that document the quality of service. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items.
- <u>Annual Data Outlines</u> Include ADOs for the review period and an ADO for the year being evaluated up until the date of the review
- <u>Annual Evaluations</u> Include annual evaluations for the review period
- <u>Reappointment Recommendations (if any)</u>
- <u>Other:</u> Materials the candidate feels are pertinent, such as certificates, professional awards, etc.
- <u>LTL RTP document</u>

It is the responsibility of the candidate to make sure that documentation supplied for review is error-free and complete by the submission due date. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice and assistance with packet preparation from anyone they deem appropriate (department chair or colleague) up until the portfolio due date.

<u>Unit Faculty Involvement in the QRF APR Process</u>

The chair shall solicit feedback from other voting eligible faculty in LTL. Any feedback shall be written and submitted to the chair to be used in the evaluation process, including reviews by peers and/or coordinators, as needed.

<u>Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in QRF Promotion Review</u>

1. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor

    The following criteria and standards will be used to evaluate all QRF within LTL as appropriate to each individual's position responsibilities and allocation of effort. The standard allocation of effort in LTL is 90% librarian effectiveness and 10% service. This allocation may be adjusted for an individual faculty member, with the written approval of the Department Chair and the Dean.

In addition to the criteria and standards below, the candidate shall typically have a minimum of six years' experience as an QRF-Assistant Professor.

Evidence for Librarian Effectiveness

A consistent pattern of performance across the review period is required in all the following applicable position responsibilities:

- Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRA) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
- Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
- Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity across the review period in at least 3 of the following types of secondary evidence with significant successful activity in at least one type of evidence:
- Demonstrated continuous record of improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, and/or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.

- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses)
- Strong, continuous record of campus engagement activities (demonstrated by examples of materials used in engagement activities, lists of meetings/events attended). More weight will be given to engagement activities within assigned areas.
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration to their specific case

Evidence of Service

The candidate for promotion to QRF-Associate Professor must provide evidence of substantive service to BGSU. The scope and level of the candidate's service should increase over the review period or remain steady if the candidate's service was strong in the first few years. Service beyond the UL is evaluated positively, but not expected. Chairing or taking a leadership role in a service activity is evaluated positively, but not expected. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

For promotion to QRF-Associate Professor:
- Candidates must show evidence of service on at least one committee, task force, and/or working group, at the departmental and/or UL level, per year during the review period.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those who can speak to the candidate's service contributions
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

2. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor

In addition to the criteria listed below, the candidate shall typically have a minimum of six years' experience as a QRF-Associate Professor.

Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

Excellence in librarian effectiveness is evidenced not only by the performance indicators listed below but also by making continuous growth in librarianship, regularly suggesting and implementing enhancements in their own work and the work of the department.

A consistent pattern of performance since the previous promotion is required in all the following applicable position responsibilities:

- Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRA) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
- Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
- Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity since the previous promotion in at least 4 of the following types of secondary evidence:

- Demonstrated continuous effort at improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.
- Evidence of taking a leadership role in an instruction or reference activity during the review period
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, and/or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness

- Continuous record of campus engagement activities (e.g., examples of materials used in engagement activities, compiling a record of meetings/events attended). More weight will be given to engagement activities within assigned areas.
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses)
- Primarily positive reviews by the coordinator of collections that indicate active involvement in collection development and management.
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.
- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

Evidence of Service

Continued substantive service, including evidence of leadership roles, to the department, UL, university, and/or the profession is also required for promotion to Senior QRF- Professor. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

For promotion to QRF-Professor:
- Candidate must show evidence of service on at least one committee, task force, or working group per year during the review period.
- Candidate must show evidence of chairing or taking a leadership role in a service activity during the review period.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those who can speak to the candidate's service contributions

- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF Promotion Materials

The LTL Department Chair shall provide reasonable advanced notification of the upcoming review and solicit documentation from the faculty member.

The candidate submits a packet of materials through the electronic portfolio system. The core of the portfolio focuses on the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of librarian effectiveness and service. The packet prepared by the candidate shall consist of the following:

- Curriculum Vitae   A current vita following the general format found in the Library Faculty Resume Outline. A category should be omitted if it is not applicable or if the candidate has no activities to list.
- Narratives   A narrative prepared by the candidate describing professional contributions, one for each of the following performance areas: librarian effectiveness and service. Each narrative is to be no more than two pages. Each narrative should (1) provide a philosophical statement; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence not included in full.
- Librarian Effectiveness Evidence and Documentation: Library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointment surveys, chat user surveys, records or examples of collection development work, records or examples of e-resources management and support, records or examples of substantive projects, peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, additional applicable evaluations, any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items, except that all available faculty and student evaluations and reviews must be included.
- Service Evidence and Documentation: copies of letters or other materials that document the quality of service. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items.
- Annual Data Outlines Include ADOs for the review period and an ADO for the current year up until the date of review.
- Annual Evaluations Include Annual Evaluations for the review period.
- Reappointment Recommendations Include all prior Reappointment Recommendations, since the last promotion.
- Other: Materials the candidate feels are pertinent, such as certificates, professional awards, etc.
- LTL RTP document

It is the responsibility of the candidate to make sure that documentation supplied for review is error-free and complete by the submission due date. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice and assistance with packet preparation from anyone they deem appropriate (department chair or colleague) up until the portfolio due date.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

The following criteria and standards will be used to evaluate all TTF within LTL as appropriate to each individual's position responsibilities and allocation of effort. The standard allocation of effort in LTL is 70% librarian effectiveness, 20% scholarly/creative work, and 10% service. This allocation may be adjusted for an individual faculty member, with the written approval of the Department Chair and the Dean. As candidates progress on the tenure track, successful candidates will demonstrate a strong record of librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative work, and service activity that reflect a growth in productivity over the review period.

Annual Performance Review (APR)

1. Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

   Due to a wide variety of assigned professional functions, activities and responsibilities, librarian effectiveness is evaluated according to the following set of relevant criteria and each individual's position responsibilities. Most TTF positions also have unique elements and responsibilities, as defined in their position responsibilities, and candidates will also be evaluated by those criteria. As some TTF positions necessitate service on particular committees and task forces, service of this type will be evaluated as Librarian Effectiveness. Successful candidates will show evidence of strong librarian effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, receive positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, and make significant contributions to the department's mission to support the research needs of library users and to teach users to identify, locate, assess and use appropriately a full range of information resources to create new knowledge.

   All the following types of primary evidence are required applicable position responsibilities
   - Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRAs) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
   - Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
   - Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
   - Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.

- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity in at least 3 of the following types of secondaary evidence:

- Demonstrated continuous effort at improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.
- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses, theses advising/mentoring, supervising or advising honors or capstone projects, advising student organizations)
- Strong, continuous record of campus engagement activities (demonstrated by examples of materials used in engagement activities, lists of meetings/events attended). More weight will be given to engagement activities within assigned areas.
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities, such as teaching workshops or leading faculty learning communities, designed to improve teaching or research.
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

Librarian effectiveness of coordinators will be evaluated on the following criteria, as appropriate to specific position responsibilities in addition to the list of expectations above:

Effective performance is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:

- Maintains and assesses existing programs, policies, and procedures to continue and enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness

- Effectively manages resources and operations of the unit/function, striving to improve existing programs and developing new initiatives and policies to enhance service and work effectiveness.
- Successfully advocates for the unit/function and represents concerns to others within the department, UL and University.
- Participates in mentoring through peer evaluations, as appropriate.

2. Evidence of Scholarly/Creative Work

During the reappointment or tenure track process the candidate is expected to compile a record of high-quality, substantive and supporting scholarship (as defined below) over the review period. During years one and two, the candidate is expected to demonstrate and provide evidence of building a balanced research portfolio of scholarly/creative work from the categories listed below. Manuscripts under review/revision are demonstrative of research activity which indicates possible research productivity (e.g., peer-reviewed publications).

During years one and two candidates should begin to produce:
- Research projects
- Presentations (preferably peer-reviewed)
- Publications (preferably peer-reviewed)

During years 4 and 5 candidates should:
- Show a sustained (or increased) research activity and research productivity, so that the candidate will have a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications by the time they apply for tenure.

Scholarly activities have been classified into three tiers. Tier 3 scholarly activities are considered to be developmental in nature. They should either result in scholarship that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submitted work is accepted or they should provide the candidate with the opportunity to improve skills and knowledge that will later result in scholarship that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2. Scholarly/creative work should show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline. Evaluation criteria are based on a variety of factors, including but not limited to, the peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed nature of the publication, the audience addressed, the contribution to the profession, and the dollar amount of grants.

| TIER 1 | • Peer-reviewed articles accepted or published by refereed journals;
• Peer-reviewed published/accepted book chapters
• Books or textbooks published in/accepted for publication;
• Papers published in/accepted for refereed conference proceedings;
• Editorship of a journal, book, or monograph
• Invited presentations at national/international conferences; | **TIER 1** requires a body of work that is prestigious and significant, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from |

	• Keynote presentations at national /international conferences; • Presentations at national/international conferences selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • Securing a national or international grant, or a grant of at least $5,000. • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the chair.	ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions. Peer-reviewed activity implies reviews/assessment of the activity by scholars in the field. It also implies an invitation from a significant professional entity (e.g., organization, institution, publication) to participate in the given activity.
TIER 2	• Non-peer-reviewed professional articles or reports beyond the local level; • Non-refereed book chapters or contributions to reference works (including the Charleston Advisor); • Presentations at state/regional conferences, selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • Invited presentations at state/regional conferences; • Peer-reviewed conference contributions such as poster sessions, lightning talks, roundtables, etc.; • Serving as a grant reviewer/evaluator beyond the local level; • Serving as a manuscript reviewer; • Securing a state or regional grant or a grant of less than $5,000; • Multiple book reviews in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair.	**TIER 2** requires activity that, while it does not meet the standards for Tier 1, yet requires a body of work that is characterized by some level of prestige and significance, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions.
TIER 3	• Submitting a grant application; • Actively engaging in ongoing research and/or writing; • Submitting an academic article or book chapter for review; • Delivering a local lecture or presentation; • Conference papers, presentations, poster sessions not submitted through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • A single book review in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Multiple minor book reviews;	**TIER 3** requires activity that does not meet the standards for TIER 2. Scholarly activities that have been judged to be Tier 3 have either the potential of becoming Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submission is accepted; or are scholarly activities that may build a foundation for future scholarly activities that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2.

| | • Publishing one or more newsletter articles;
• Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair.
• Securing a local grant (Speed grant, Kerbel, etc.) | |

3. Evidence of Service

The scope and level of service contributions by a successful candidate will increase over time, expanding from solely departmental level and UL service to service to the university and the profession. Service beyond UL is evaluated positively, but not expected. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

During years one and two:
- Candidates should demonstrate departmental level service.
- Candidates should also seek opportunities to serve at the UL, university and/or professional level.

During years four and five:
- Candidates should show service on at least one committee, task force, or working group per year.
- Candidates should show evidence of chairing or taking a leadership role in at least one committee, task force, working group or project.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's service contributions
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

Enhanced Performance Review (EPR)

This section addresses criteria and standards for Enhanced Performance Review.

1. Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

A consistent pattern of performance across the review period is required in all the following applicable position responsibilities:

- Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRAs) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
- Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
- Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
- Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, and/or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Strong, continuous record of campus engagement activities (demonstrated by examples of materials used in engagement activities, compiling a record of meetings/events attended). More weight will be given to engagement activities within assigned areas.
- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity across the review period in at least 4 of the following types of secondary evidence:
- Demonstrated continuous record of improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Significant contributions to special projects that contribute towards effective collection management, e-resources management, instruction or reference services
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.

- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses, theses advising/mentoring, supervising or advising honors or capstone projects, advising student organizations)
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities, such as teaching workshops or leading faculty learning communities, designed to improve teaching or research.
- Record of pedagogical improvements as demonstrated by a unique or new approach to instruction
- Creation of course materials, pedagogical approaches, or media that are used by other librarians or other educational professionals
- Significant contributions to assessment initiatives within the department or UL
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

Librarian effectiveness of coordinators will be evaluated on the following criteria, as appropriate to specific position responsibilities in addition to the list of expectations above:

Effective performance is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Maintains and assesses existing programs, policies, and procedures to continue and enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness
- Effectively manages resources and operations of the unit/function, striving to improve existing programs and developing new initiatives and policies to enhance service and work effectiveness.
- Successfully advocates for the unit/function and represents concerns to others within the department, UL and University.
- Participates in mentoring through peer evaluations, as appropriate.

2. Evidence of Scholarly/Creative Work

Scholarly/creative work should show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline. Evaluation criteria are based on a variety of factors, including but not limited to, the peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed nature of the publication, the audience addressed, contribution to the profession, and the dollar amount of grants.

Candidates should provide a consistent record of a high-quality and balanced portfolio of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 scholarship activity over the review period from the categories listed below. Tier 3 scholarly activities are considered to be developmental in nature. They should either

result in scholarship that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submitted work is accepted or they should provide the candidate with the opportunity to improve skills and knowledge that will later result in scholarship that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2.

For the EPR the candidate must have:
- At least one peer-reviewed publication (e.g., journal article, monograph, book chapter) already published or under review
- At least 2 additional Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 works of scholarship

TIER 1	• Peer-reviewed articles accepted or published by refereed journals; • Peer-reviewed published/accepted book chapters • Books or textbooks published in/accepted for publication; • Papers published in/accepted for refereed conference proceedings; • Editorship of a journal, book, or monograph • Invited presentations at national/international conferences; • Keynote presentations at national /international conferences; • Presentations at national/international conferences selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • Securing a national or international grant, or a grant of at least $5,000. • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the chair.	**TIER 1** requires a body of work that is prestigious and significant, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions. Peer-reviewed activity implies reviews/assessment of the activity by scholars in the field. It also implies an invitation from a significant professional entity (e.g., organization, institution, publication) to participate in the given activity.
TIER 2	• Non peer-reviewed professional articles or reports beyond the local level; • Non-refereed book chapters or contributions to reference works (including the Charleston Advisor); • Presentations at state/regional conferences selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • Invited presentations at state/regional conferences; • Peer-reviewed conference contributions such as poster sessions, lightning talks, roundtables, etc.; • Serving as a grant reviewer/evaluator beyond the local level; • Serving as a manuscript reviewer; • Securing a state or regional grant or a grant of less than $5,000;	**TIER 2** requires activity that, while it does not meet the standards for Tier 1, yet requires a body of work that is characterized by some level of prestige and significance, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from

	• Multiple book reviews in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair.	ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions.
TIER 3	• Submitting a grant application; • Actively engaging in ongoing research and/or writing; • Submitting an academic article or book chapter for review; • Delivering a local lecture or presentation; • Conference papers, presentations, poster sessions not submitted through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • A single book review in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Multiple minor book reviews; • Publishing one or more newsletter articles; • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair. • Securing a local grant (Speed grant, Kerbel, etc.)	**TIER 3** requires activity that does not meet the standards for TIER 2. Scholarly activities that have been judged to be Tier 3 have either the potential of becoming Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submission is accepted; or are scholarly activities that may build a foundation for future scholarly activities that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2.

3. Evidence of Service

The scope and level of service contributions by a successful candidate will increase over time, expanding from solely departmental level and UL service to service to the university and the profession. Service beyond UL is evaluated positively, but not expected. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

By the EPR:
- Candidates should have demonstrated effective service on at least three committees, task forces, or working groups at the departmental and/or UL level.
- Chairing or taking a leadership role in a service activity is evaluated positively, but not expected.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization

- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's service contributions
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

The LTL Department Chair shall provide reasonable advanced notification of the upcoming review and solicit documentation from the faculty member.

1. Internal Procedures for Creation and Submission of APR Materials

APR dossiers shall include the following, which will be submitted to the Chair of LTL:

- The faculty member's position responsibilities
- Allocation of Effort if not the standard 70% Librarian Effectiveness, 20% Scholarly/Creative Work, and 10% Service
- Annual Data Outline (ADO) for current year
- Other evidence supporting annual accomplishments with respect to librarian effectiveness criteria, scholarly/creative work criteria, and service criteria. This evidence should include all available library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointment surveys, chat user surveys, peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, and additional applicable evaluations.

2. Internal Procedures for Creation and Submission of Mid-Probationary EPR Materials

The candidate submits a dossier of materials through the electronic portfolio system. The core of the portfolio focuses on the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work and Service. The dossier materials prepared by the candidate should consist of the following:

- Curriculum Vitae   A current vita following the general format found in the Library Faculty Resume Outline. A category should be omitted if it is not applicable or if the candidate has no activities to list.
- Narratives   A narrative prepared by the candidate describing professional contributions, one for each of the following performance areas: librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative work, and service. Each narrative is to be no more than two pages. Each narrative should (1) provide a philosophical statement; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence not included in full.
- Librarian Effectiveness Evidence and Documentation: Library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointment surveys, chat user surveys, records or examples of collection development work, records or examples of e-resources management and support, records or examples of substantive projects, peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, additional applicable evaluations, any

> letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items, except that all available faculty and student evaluations and reviews must be included.
> - Scholarly/Creative Work Evidence and Documentation: copies of publications or evidence of presentations or equivalencies; any letter that speaks to the quality of scholarship; letters from publishers for in-press materials. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items.
> - Service Evidence and Documentation: copies of letters or other materials that document the quality of service. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items.
> - Annual Data Outlines: Include all prior year ADOs and an ADO for the current year up until the date of review.
> - Annual Evaluations: Include all prior year Annual Evaluations
> - Other: Materials the candidate feels are pertinent, such as certificates, professional awards, etc.
> - LTL RPT document

It is the responsibility of the candidate to make sure that documentation supplied for review is error-free and complete by the submission due date. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice and assistance with credential file preparation from anyone they deem appropriate (department chair or colleague) up until the portfolio due date.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

The chair shall solicit feedback from voting eligible faculty in LTL. Any feedback shall be written and submitted to the chair to be used in the evaluation process, including reviews by peers and/or coordinators, as needed.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

1. Criteria and Standards for Tenure

   The following criteria and standards will be used to evaluate all TTF within LTL as appropriate to each individual's position responsibilities and allocation of effort. The standard allocation of effort in LTL is 70% librarian effectiveness, 20% scholarly/creative work, and 10% service. This allocation may be adjusted for an individual faculty member, with the written approval of the Department Chair and the Dean.

   Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

   A consistent pattern of performance across the review period is required in all the following applicable position responsibilities:

   - Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRAs) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)

- Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns. The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.
- Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
- Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, and/or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Strong, continuous record of campus engagement activities (demonstrated by examples of materials used in engagement activities, compiling a record of meetings/events attended). More weight will be given to engagement activities within assigned areas.
- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity across the review period in at least 4 of the following types of secondary evidence:

- Demonstrated continuous record of improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Significant contributions to special projects that contribute towards effective collection management, e-resources management, instruction or reference services
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those who can speak to the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.
- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.

- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning or teaching credit-bearing courses, theses advising/mentoring, supervising/advising honors or capstone projects, advising student organizations)
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities, such as teaching workshops or leading faculty learning communities, designed to improve teaching or research.
- Record of pedagogical improvements as demonstrated by a unique or new approach to instruction
- Creation of course materials, pedagogical approaches, or media that are used by other librarians or other educational professionals
- Significant contributions to assessment initiatives within the department or UL
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

Librarian effectiveness of coordinators will be evaluated on the following criteria, as appropriate to specific position responsibilities in addition to the list of expectations above:

Effective performance is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Maintains and assesses existing programs, policies, and procedures to continue and enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness
- Effectively manages resources and operations of the unit/function, striving to improve existing programs and developing new initiatives and policies to enhance service and work effectiveness.
- Successfully advocates for the unit/function and represents concerns to others within the department, UL and University.
- Participates in mentoring through peer evaluations, as appropriate.

Evidence of Scholarly/Creative Work

Scholarly/creative work should show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline. Evaluation criteria are based on a variety of factors, including but not limited to, the peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed nature of the publication, the audience addressed, contribution to the profession, and the dollar amount of grants.

Candidates should provide a consistent record of a high-quality and balanced portfolio of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 scholarship activity over the review period from the categories listed below.

For tenure, the successful candidate should have:
- At least two peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal article, monograph, book chapter)
- At least five additional Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 works of scholarship

Alternatively, the successful candidate could have:

- At least four peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal article, monograph, book chapter)

Tier 3 scholarly activities are considered to be developmental in nature. They should either result in scholarship that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submitted work is accepted or they should provide the candidate with the opportunity to improve skills and knowledge that will later result in scholarship that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2. Quality will also be determined by the judgment of the tenured faculty of the department and by the judgment of external reviewers as shown in the letters they submit as part of the tenure process. The candidate's scholarship portfolio as a whole should assure reasonable expectation of continued production of scholarship.

TIER 1	- Peer-reviewed articles accepted or published by refereed journals; - Peer-reviewed published/accepted book chapters - Books or textbooks published in/accepted for publication; - Papers published in/accepted for refereed conference proceedings; - Editorship of a journal, book, or monograph - Invited presentations at national/international conferences; - Keynote presentations at national /international conferences; - Presentations at national/international conferences selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; - Securing a national or international grant, or a grant of at least $5,000; - Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the chair.	**TIER 1** requires a body of work that is prestigious and significant, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions. Peer-reviewed activity implies reviews/assessment of the activity by scholars in the field. It also implies an invitation from a significant professional entity (e.g., organization, institution, publication) to participate in the given activity.
TIER 2	- Non peer-reviewed professional articles or reports beyond the local level; - Non-refereed book chapters or contributions to reference works including the Charleston Advisor; - Presentations at state/regional conferences, selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; - Invited presentations at state/regional conferences; - Peer-reviewed conference contributions such as poster sessions, lightning talks, roundtables, etc.; - Serving as a grant reviewer/evaluator beyond the local level; - Serving as a manuscript reviewer;	**TIER 2** requires activity that, while it does not meet the standards for Tier 1, yet requires a body of work that is characterized by some level of prestige and significance, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from

	• Securing a state or regional grant or a grant of less than $5,000; • Multiple book reviews in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair.	ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions.
TIER 3	• Submitting a grant application; • Actively engaging in ongoing research and/or writing; • Submitting an academic article or book chapter for review; • Delivering a local lecture or presentation; • Conference papers, presentations, poster sessions not submitted through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • A single book review in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Multiple minor book reviews; • Publishing one or more newsletter articles; • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair; • Securing a local grant (Speed grant, Kerbel, etc.)	**TIER 3** requires activity that does not meet the standards for TIER 2. Scholarly activities that have been judged to be Tier 3 have either the potential of becoming Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submission is accepted; or are scholarly activities that may build a foundation for future scholarly activities that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2.

Evidence of Service

The candidate for tenure must provide evidence of substantive service to BGSU or the profession. The scope and level of the candidate's service should increase over the review period or remain steady if the candidate's service was strong in the first few years. The candidate's service record should assure reasonable expectation of continued capability to serve and take on increasing leadership responsibilities in this area. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

For tenure:
- Candidates must show evidence of service on at least one committee, task force, or working group per year.
- Candidates should show evidence of chairing or taking a leadership role on at least one committee, task force, working group, or project.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:

- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those who can speak to the candidate's service contributions
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

2. Standards for Promotion

A. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor typically occurs concurrently with granting of tenure. Thus, the standards for promotion to Associate Professor mirror those for tenure. In rare cases, a faculty member may be hired at the Associate Professor level without tenure. Criteria for Associate Professor are the same as those for tenure, as detailed in *Academic Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review, 1. Criteria and Standards for Tenure.*

B. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved and can be expected to maintain a sustained record of excellence in librarian effectiveness, scholarship, and service. Successful candidates will have attained an established reputation in the field through outstanding scholarship and service to the discipline. Quality will also be determined by the judgment of the tenured faculty of the department who are already at the rank of Professor and by the judgment of external reviewers as shown in the letters they submit as part of the tenure process. It is typically expected that, before seeking promotion to Professor, a period of at least five years will have passed since the candidate was awarded tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Evidence of Librarian Effectiveness

Excellence in librarian effectiveness is evidenced not only by the performance indicators listed below but also by making continuous growth in librarianship, regularly suggesting and implementing enhancements in their own work and the work of the department. It is the responsibility of the candidate to notify the chair, within a reasonable time frame, if any peer evaluations will be needed as evidence of librarian effectiveness.

A consistent pattern of performance since the previous promotion is required in all the following applicable position responsibilities:
- Demonstrated leadership in library and university governance.

- Primarily positive student and other user evaluations of instruction and reference services (mostly positive as demonstrated in library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointments (IRAs) surveys, and/or chat user surveys)
- Primarily positive peer evaluations of instruction and reference services provided from direct observations or demonstrated progress made to address concerns.
  The peer evaluations should be coordinated by the Department Chair and performed by the appropriate LTL function and/or faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.
- Active involvement in the departmental mission critical activities as demonstrated by representative examples or records of collection development work, e-resources management and/or support, instruction activities, licensing, or reference services. This will be further assessed by the Chair and appropriate coordinators.
- Descriptions of projects undertaken to date, including the scope and impact of the project as well as the librarian's role in the project and skills and technology used. Evidence should show projects were successfully completed in a timely manner and supported department/UL/University mission and goals.
- Development of instructional and reference materials, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., producing tutorials, course- and subject-specific LibGuides, and/or interactive services; utilizing a unique or new approach to instructional or reference services)
- Strong, continuous record of campus engagement activities (demonstrated by examples of materials used in engagement activities, compiling a record of meetings/events attended). More weight will be given to engagement activities within assigned areas.
- Interacting and collaborating professionally and effectively with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and library users, demonstrated by a record of positive interactions with colleagues and others.
- Addressing concerns from previous evaluations.

In addition to the items above, faculty members must demonstrate successful activity since the previous promotion in at least 4 of the following types of secondary:

- Demonstrated continuous record of improving the candidate's level of knowledge of library and Internet resources, databases, and collections, with particular attention to assigned departments (e.g., watching webinars, completing tutorials, attending training or conference sessions)
- Mentoring LTL colleagues, especially probationary faculty
- Special projects that contribute towards effective collection management, e-resources management, instruction or reference services
- Awards and recognitions for professional activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's librarian effectiveness
- Record of assessment activities related to position responsibilities showing improvements in or upgrades to library collections and access, user services, or systems and software. May include examples of collection/usage statistics that show collections are being used effectively or adjustments to collections are being implemented to make collection use more effective.

- Evidence of completion of goals related to resource acquisition, access, or software implementation/upgrades, demonstrating prompt responsiveness to requests, problems, and/or unavailability of resources.
- Examples of policies, procedures or workflows developed showing policies and procedures are being created, updated and maintained adequately and that changes lead to improvements in access/service.
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside assigned areas (e.g., planning and/or teaching credit-bearing courses, theses advising/mentoring, supervising/advising honors or capstone projects, advising student organizations)
- Strong record of contributions to targeted or specialized collection management projects and initiatives
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities, such as teaching workshops or leading faculty learning communities, designed to improve teaching or research.
- Record of pedagogical improvements as demonstrated by a unique or new approach to instruction
- Creation of course materials, pedagogical approaches, or media that are used by other librarians or other educational professionals
- Significant contributions to assessment initiatives within the department or UL
- Other evidence of librarian effectiveness achievement that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case

Librarian effectiveness of coordinators will be evaluated on the following criteria, as appropriate to specific position responsibilities in addition to the list of expectations above:

Effective performance is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:
- Maintains and assesses existing programs, policies, and procedures to continue and enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness
- Effectively manages resources and operations of the unit/function, striving to improve existing programs and developing new initiatives and policies to enhance service and work effectiveness.
- Successfully advocates for the unit/function and represents concerns to others within the department, UL and University.
- Participates in mentoring through peer evaluations, as appropriate.

Evidence of Scholarly/Creative Work

Scholarly/creative work excellence is demonstrated by a continuous record of high-quality peer-reviewed publications. Research success for promotion to Professor is indicated not solely by publications, but also by the broader impact of the faculty member's work on the field. Measures of this include citation counts, impact factors of journals, reviews of published books, and acceptance rates for publications or presentations. Quality will also be determined by the judgment of the professors in the department and by the judgment of external reviewers as shown in the letters they submit as part of the promotion process. The candidate's scholarship portfolio as a whole should assure reasonable expectation of continued production of scholarship.

For promotion to professor, since the previous promotion, the successful candidate should have:

- At least three peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal article, monograph, book chapter)
- At least five additional Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 works of scholarship

Alternatively, since the previous promotion, the successful candidate could have:

- At least five peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal article, monograph, book chapter)

TIER 1	• Peer-reviewed articles accepted or published by refereed journals; • Peer-reviewed published/accepted book chapters • Books or textbooks published in/accepted for publication; • Papers published in/accepted for refereed conference proceedings; • Editorship of a journal, book, or monograph • Invited presentations at national/international conferences; • Keynote presentations at national /international conferences; • Presentations at national/international conferences selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • Securing a national or international grant, or a grant of at least $5,000. • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the chair.	**TIER 1** requires a body of work that is prestigious and significant, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions. Peer-reviewed activity implies reviews/assessment of the activity by scholars in the field. It also implies an invitation from a significant professional entity (e.g., organization, institution, publication) to participate in the given activity.
TIER 2	• Non peer-reviewed professional articles or reports beyond the local level; • Non-refereed book chapters or contributions to reference works (including the Charleston Advisor); • Presentations at state/regional conferences, selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • Invited presentations at state/regional conferences; • Peer-reviewed conference contributions such as poster sessions, lightning talks, roundtables, etc.; • Serving as a grant reviewer/evaluator beyond the local level; • Serving as a manuscript reviewer;	**TIER 2** requires activity that, while it does not meet the standards for Tier 1, yet requires a body of work that is characterized by some level of prestige and significance, determined by the venue, audience, and sponsoring organization. Some indications of the level of prestige and significance of a scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, the number of citations of the item, number of downloads from

	• Securing a state or regional grant or a grant of less than $5,000; • Multiple book reviews in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair.	ScholarWorks, awards, and recognitions.
TIER 3	• Submitting a grant application; • Actively engaging in ongoing research and/or writing; • Submitting an academic article or book chapter for review • Delivering a local lecture or presentation; • Conference papers, presentations, poster sessions not submitted through a competitive, peer-reviewed process; • A single book review in professional publications that are considered significant and authoritative (CHOICE, Library Journal); • Multiple minor book reviews; • Publishing one or more newsletter articles; • Production of a work judged to be the equivalent in the opinion of the department's EPR committee and the Chair; • Securing a local grant (Speed grant, Kerbel, etc.)	**TIER 3** requires activity that does not meet the standards for TIER 2. Scholarly activities that have been judged to be Tier 3 have either the potential of becoming Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the submission is accepted; or are scholarly activities that may build a foundation for future scholarly activities that will be judged to be Tier 1 or Tier 2.

Evidence of Service

Service should enhance the candidate's professional reputation. Substantive service, including evidence of leadership roles, to the department, UL, university, and/or the profession is required for promotion to Professor. Members may also lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs, but the service must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in order to be viewed as qualified, professional service.

For promotion to Professor:
• Since the previous promotion, the candidate must have served on at least one committee, task force, or working group per year at the departmental and/or UL level.
• Since the previous promotion, the candidate must have served on at least two committee, working group, or task force at the university and/or professional level.
• Since the previous promotion, the candidate must show evidence of significant leadership roles in service contributions.

Effective service is typically demonstrated by, but not limited to, the following:

- Record of membership on committees, task forces, etc. at the departmental and UL level with an explanation of the candidate's role on the committee or within the organization
- Evidence of service at the university and/or within professional organizations with an explanation of the candidate's role within the organization
- Evidence of taking leadership roles within LTL, UL and the profession,
- High-quality service may be evidenced at the national or regional level by serving as a committee chair, serving on an editorial or executive board of a scholarly journal, serving on a grant review panel, being elected to committee membership, or being elected to serve as an officer of a professional association.
- Awards and distinctions for service activities
- Positive letters of recognition from those with knowledge of the candidate's service contributions, including leadership roles
- Other evidence of service contributions that the candidate considers an appropriate demonstration of their specific case. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

The LTL Department Chair shall provide reasonable advanced notification of the upcoming review and solicit documentation from the faculty member.

The candidate submits a dossier of materials through the electronic portfolio system. The core of the portfolio focuses on the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work and Service. The dossier materials in this electric portfolio should consist of the following:

- Curriculum Vitae   A current vita following the general format found in the Library Faculty Resume Outline. A category should be omitted if it is not applicable or if the candidate has no activities to list.
- Narratives   A narrative prepared by the candidate describing professional contributions, one for each of the following performance areas: librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative work and service. Each narrative is to be no more than two pages. Each narrative should (1) provide a philosophical statement; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence not included in full.
- Librarian Effectiveness Evidence and Documentation: Library instruction student surveys, Individual Research Appointment surveys, chat user surveys, records or examples of collection development work, records or examples of e-resources management and support, records or examples of substantive projects, peer evaluations of instruction and reference services, additional applicable evaluations, any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. If the body of evidence is large, consider providing a representative sample rather than all items, except that all available faculty and student evaluations and reviews must be included.

- Scholarly/Creative Work Evidence and Documentation: copies of publications or evidence of presentations or equivalencies; any letter that speaks to the quality of scholarship; letters from publishers for in-press materials. Documentary evidence should be representative rather than all encompassing.
- Service Evidence and Documentation: copies of letters or other materials that document the quality of service. Documentary evidence should be representative rather than all encompassing.
- Annual Data Outlines: Include all prior year ADOs and an ADO for the current calendar year up until the date of review.
- Annual Evaluations: Include all prior year Annual Evaluations. Tenured faculty will not have Annual Evaluations to include in their dossier.
- Reappointment Recommendation (for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor)
- Other: Materials the candidate feels are pertinent, such as certificates, professional awards, etc.
- LTL RTP document

It is the responsibility of the candidate to make sure that documentation supplied for review is error-free and complete by the submission due date. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice and assistance with dossier preparation from anyone they deem appropriate (department chair or colleague) up until the portfolio due date. External reviewers will be solicited according to the procedures available from the Provost's Office.

Approved by the Department of Library Teaching and Learning (University Libraries)

LTL Chair_____*Robert Snyder*_____ Date ___01/04/2022_____
Robert Snyder (Jan 4, 2022 10:06 EST)

Approved by the UL Dean _____*Sara A.Bushong*_____ Date ___01/04/2022_____
Sara A.Bushong (Jan 4, 2022 10:15 EST)

Approved by the SVPAA_____ Date ___01/06/2022_____
Joe Whitehead (Jan 6, 2022 20:50 EST)

UL-LTL_RTP_FINALRevised_12-9-21 (003)

Final Audit Report   2022-01-07

Created:	2021-12-20
By:	Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAqOqiuOVxv3f8JT11oyoTXyO1-IQpJ3Dg

"UL-LTL_RTP_FINALRevised_12-9-21 (003)" History

Document created by Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
2021-12-20 - 2:39:48 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.110.180

Document emailed to Robert Snyder (robjsny@bgsu.edu) for signature
2021-12-20 - 2:52:48 PM GMT

Email viewed by Robert Snyder (robjsny@bgsu.edu)
2022-01-04 - 2:16:35 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.58.110

Document e-signed by Robert Snyder (robjsny@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2022-01-04 - 3:06:07 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.58.110

Document emailed to Sara A.Bushong (sbushon@bgsu.edu) for signature
2022-01-04 - 3:06:08 PM GMT

Email viewed by Sara A.Bushong (sbushon@bgsu.edu)
2022-01-04 - 3:15:25 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.59.71

Document e-signed by Sara A.Bushong (sbushon@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2022-01-04 - 3:15:58 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.59.71

Document emailed to Joe Whitehead (jwhitehead@bgsu.edu) for signature
2022-01-04 - 3:16:00 PM GMT

Document e-signed by Joe Whitehead (jwhitehead@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2022-01-07 - 1:50:58 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 65.24.171.218

Agreement completed.
2022-01-07 - 1:50:58 AM GMT