Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Special Collections (University Libraries)

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six

Most NTTF members in Special Collections have an allocation of effort based exclusively on Librarian Effectiveness and Service (e.g., 90% Librarian Effectiveness and 10% Service). While service may or may not be part of the allocation of effort, scholarly and creative work is not. Contributions other than in the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define their total contribution. Evaluation of NTTF shall take the faculty member’s allocation of effort into account.

Librarian Effectiveness

Effective librarianship is modeled through ongoing development of knowledge required to do one’s job effectively and mastery of professional skills that reflects evolving changes in scholarship and professional practice, as well as subject and/or collection expertise; effective service to internal and external clienteles, such as patrons, donors, scholars, and vendors; and effective communication inside and outside the library.

Evaluation of librarian effectiveness will be based upon the duties outlined in the candidate’s position responsibilities and allocation of effort. Successful candidates will evidence strong librarian effectiveness from the outset and/or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, using their efforts to develop and organize collections and provide access to a wide range of information resources that directly support the University’s roles of teaching, research, and service through instruction, public service, and/or cataloging and description. Candidates should make annual progress toward successful completion of a variety of complex and simple projects as defined in the criteria and standards for promotion. Many complex projects will be divided over multiple years; for APRs, candidates should illustrate how their annual work contributes to a long-term project.

Broadly, librarians will be evaluated on:

- ongoing development of knowledge required to do their job effectively and mastery of professional skills that reflects evolving changes in scholarship and professional practice, as well as subject and/or collection expertise;
- effective service to internal and external clienteles, such as patrons, donors, scholars, and vendors; and
- effective communication inside and outside the library.

More specifically, librarians will be evaluated on a variety of criteria, based on their specific duties.

Core Criteria for All Librarians
Core Criteria will be evident in all library work and will be reflected in documentation of specialized work, based on position responsibilities. These criteria are evidenced by:

- High-quality interactions with patrons who use library services, as indicated by direct user feedback, indirect measures as appropriate (transcripts, statistics, etc.), or peer evaluation.
- Output that demonstrates subject and collection expertise as well as application of contemporary library and archival practices. Such evidence might include policies, white papers, planning documents, instructional materials, correspondence, or related materials.
- Participation in library and university governance, including contributions to peer reviews and assessments, merit processes, and policy formation.
- Establishment of collaborations and partnerships with assigned departments and subject areas to facilitate student learning and collection access.
- Demonstrated support of unit’s mission and strategic initiatives.

**Specialized Criteria Based on Position Responsibilities**

Candidates will provide evidence of a selection of the following accomplishments, dependent on their role in their unit and department and their position responsibilities. Balance among specialized criteria will also be dependent on the unit’s annual strategic goals.

**Cataloging and Description**

- Production of high-quality original and copy cataloging records and/or archival finding aids that meet national standards, at a pace commensurate with collection needs.
- Creation of Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) and/or Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) records that have been approved through appropriate funnel or workflow.
- Accurate and timely database maintenance for cataloging records in the integrated library system and/or consortial catalogs, including monitoring, correcting, troubleshooting, and providing quality control of records.
- Maintenance of current documentation, policies, and other materials that support the processing of materials and the training of students and peers in cataloging.
- Participation in library-wide decision-making about cataloging policy, projects, and procedures.

**Outreach, Instruction, and Reference**

- Contributions to unit’s efforts to improve visibility of collections through social media, web presence, face-to-face interactions, and/or other appropriate outlets.
- Effective reference service in face-to-face and virtual environments as evidenced by peer review and patron satisfaction.
• Creation and maintenance of learning objects, such as LibGuides, modules for Canvas Commons, tutorials, etc., in keeping with instruction needs of the unit.
• Positive quantitative and qualitative course evaluations that are typically equal to or greater than the average scores for the department for which the course is taught, for all credit-bearing courses taught.
• Positive student reviews of and faculty feedback for instruction and library sessions.
• Participation on graduate thesis and dissertation committees and direction of independent study courses, practicum projects, and internships.

Digitization

• Collaboration with colleagues to identify and prioritize collections for digitization, as well as to plan and assess digitization projects.
• Evidence of adherence to digitization standards, policies, and norms within the digitization community.
• Successful publication of digitized collections.

Collection Development

• Responsible management of collection, including identifying, selecting, and acquiring of materials for the instructional and research needs of unit’s patrons, as well as the weeding or deaccessioning of materials that are out-of-scope, beyond repair, better suited at other institutions, or otherwise no longer suitable for continued preservation. This management is evidenced through reference and instruction transactions that demonstrate patron success with locating relevant materials in the collection, collection use, and collection analysis.
• Timely acknowledgement of all gifts received.
• Active solicitation of new materials in coordination with unit staff.
• Promotion and stewardship of effective relationships with appropriate donors.

Collection Processing and Organization

• Physical and intellectual organization of collections according to library and archival standards, including judicious rehousing of materials, training and evaluation of staff, students or interns who may assist in processing, and the development of processing plans, where appropriate.
• Assessment of collections for preservation or conservation treatment, including recommendations for outsourcing of such work. Appropriate reformatting (or making recommendations for reformatting) of materials for preservation and access, where necessary.
• Appropriate reformatting (or making recommendations for reformatting) of materials for preservation and access, where necessary.
• Constructive contributions to unit policies and procedures for processing and organization.
Evidence that may be used in the NTTF member's record of librarian effectiveness includes, but is not limited to:

- annual reviews from department, Chair, and Dean (required);
- documentation of projects and services (required);
- a peer-review from a department or UL colleague of at least one area of librarian effectiveness each year (required);
- philosophical statements of librarianship and pedagogy (optional);
- self-evaluation of librarian effectiveness (optional);
- unsolicited positive student/library users' feedback; peer observations and evaluations (optional);
- examples of workflow or policy documents written in whole or in part by the candidate (optional);
- examples of work product like websites, research guides, metadata records, or finding aids edited in whole or in part by the candidate (optional);
- licensure or professional examinations, awards, and distinctions (optional); and
- unsolicited written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning performance, preparedness, and librarian effectiveness (optional).

Activities marking successful librarian effectiveness will depend on a candidate's position responsibilities, and will be largely represented by projects that are closely aligned to the strategic goals of the unit, the department, the University Libraries, and the University. Complex projects typically involve collaboration, development of expertise, and substantive contribution to a layered work product. Simple projects may be done independently, use existing expertise, and be shorter in duration. They may be a single part of a larger complex project. By the time of the EPR, the candidate should demonstrate completion, in the most recent 3 years, of at least 1 complex project and 2 simple projects.

Service

If the NTTF member has an allocation of effort that includes service, the successful candidate’s scope and level of service will increase over time, expanding from solely department-level service to university and possibly even professional service beyond the university. By the time the NTTF reaches their first EPR, successful candidates will have ideally assumed service responsibilities beyond the department level. The candidate shall thereafter pursue service at the university level and begin to participate in some service to the discipline external to BGSU by the time of the second EPR.

Evidence used to represent service includes, but is not limited to:

- description of significance and scope of activities (required);
- documentation of significant contributions and achievements (required);
- documentation of leadership positions held (required if relevant);
- professional recognitions (required if relevant);
- documentation demonstrating organization of professional conferences and symposia (required if relevant);
- records of membership or affiliation and attendance (optional); and
• testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others (optional).

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

Annual Performance Review (APR)

APRs shall be based on the following list of documents, all of which the candidate will submit for review:

1. Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate
2. Annual Data Outlines, including activity up to the date of review (unscored)
3. Annual review evaluation letters and reports from all levels
4. Librarian Effectiveness Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
5. Service Documentation (if applicable)
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence

Each narrative is to be no more than two pages and should (1) provide a philosophy for understanding how the materials represent the candidate’s career goals; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence that may not be included in the dossier.

Evidence should include any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. Documentary evidence should be representative rather than all-encompassing.

Enhanced Performance Review (EPR)

For the Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) the candidate submits a dossier of materials for review. The core of the portfolio focuses on the candidate’s philosophies of and accomplishments in the areas of librarian effectiveness and service (if applicable). The dossier shall be assembled by the candidate. Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of the following:

1. Current Curriculum Vitae
2. Annual Data Outlines, including activity up to the date of review (unscored)
3. Approved unit Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (part II)
4. Annual and Enhanced performance review evaluation letters and reports from all levels
5. Librarian Effectiveness Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
6. Service Documentation (if applicable)
   b. Narrative
c. Evidence

Each narrative is to be no more than two pages and should (1) provide a philosophy for understanding how the materials represent the candidate’s career goals; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence that may not be included in the dossier.

Evidence should include any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. Documentary evidence should be representative rather than all-encompassing.

The faculty member is encouraged to consult with other more senior faculty to identify effective narrative styles and types of evidence for the dossier.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

For APRs of NTTF members, Bargaining Unit faculty above the rank of the candidate shall provide feedback to aid the candidate’s annual evaluation and progress toward promotion.

The following procedure will be followed:

1. The Chair shall notify the candidate and the eligible bargaining unit faculty members of the upcoming APR and request that the candidate submit their documentation, including activity up to the date of review, to the Chair, who will distribute it to all eligible bargaining unit faculty members. The candidate should include any evidence that they think will help peers understand their progress toward promotion in the areas of librarian effectiveness, and, if relevant, service.
2. The Special Collections Faculty Facilitator, a tenured department faculty member at or above the rank of all candidates for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, convenes a meeting of department bargaining unit faculty eligible to participate in the APR review to discuss the candidate’s annual evaluation and progress toward promotion.
3. The group of eligible department faculty submits a written evaluation of the candidate to the Department Chair, summarizing the group’s feedback.
4. The Chair forwards the faculty’s evaluation to the candidate and to the Dean.
5. The Chair submits an independent evaluation of the candidate to the Dean, copying the candidate.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in NTTF Promotion Review

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Candidates for promotion from Instructor to Lecturer shall:

a. Typically have a minimum of six years’ experience as an Instructor.
b. Demonstrate ability as an effective librarian, with evidence of sustained, high-quality performance and continued professional development. Specifically, librarians will be evaluated on their cumulative mastery of the core and specialized criteria, as relevant, outlined under “Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six” above. Activities marking successful librarian effectiveness will depend on a candidate’s position responsibilities, and will be largely represented by projects that are closely aligned to the strategic goals of the unit, the department, the University Libraries, and the University. Complex projects typically involve collaboration, development of expertise, and substantive contribution to a layered work product. Simple projects may be done independently, use existing expertise, and be shorter in duration. They may be a single part of a larger complex project. Using the following examples as a guide, the candidate should demonstrate completion of at least 2 complex projects and 4 simple projects by the time of promotion to Lecturer.

The following project descriptions and outcomes represent hypothetical activities that would, in concert with a broad selection of activities, model success in the different areas of librarian effectiveness. These examples are not exhaustive or prescriptive but illustrate activities a successful candidate for promotion to Lecturer might have undertaken and what evidence could be used to represent those activities in their dossier.

Cataloging and Description

- Complex Example
  After initial training in local practices related to cataloging, the candidate works independently to create original and copy catalog records for a variety of collection formats. Using this expertise, the candidate works with the head librarian to develop a multi-year project to address a backlog of 20,000 items that need cataloging. Together, and in consultation with current cataloging standards for the format, they develop a list of core fields to be addressed, consider who should be doing the work (dividing between a work force that includes student assistants, classified staff, and the faculty librarian), and outline specific goals and milestones for the project. The candidate then develops documentation for the project and trains appropriate staff. The candidate initially reviews all work of others contributing to the project and helps staff to correct work as appropriate, gradually working with each individual to catalog independently, with only occasional spot checks by the candidate. As the project progresses, the candidate revises procedures and documentation to allow for changes in best practices and to facilitate smoother flow of the work. By the conclusion of the project, all items in the backlog have been cataloged, a majority of milestones were met on schedule, and the records created meet national standards for cataloging of that
particular format. (evidence: project plan, including milestones; training
documentation; sample catalog records annotated to show candidate’s input)

• Simple Example
The candidate has a database of digitized images with more than 14,000
entries that needs to be moved into a new system. Much of the metadata is
unusable as is, so will need to be reconfigured to match current metadata
standards, both at the local and national levels. The candidate first cleans up
some of the metadata in Excel, then works with library IT personnel to clean
up additional fields in order to prepare the metadata to be cross-walked over
to the new digital platform. (evidence: samples of metadata before and after
cleanup; screenshot of one or two records on display in the new platform)

Outreach, Instruction, and Reference

• Complex Example
The candidate notices that many undergraduate users in the collection’s
subject area are visiting the collection for the first time in their third and
fourth years and that they commonly express regret that they did not know of
the library’s resources earlier in their academic careers. As a result, the
candidate coordinates efforts with the appropriate teaching faculty to map the
curriculum of the academic unit to existing information literacy frameworks.
The candidate develops a plan to integrate library instruction into three entry-
level courses and two intermediate courses, with planned individual research
appointments for students in a senior capstone project. Faculty members in
the liaison areas support this project and work with the librarian not only to
allow for the in-class instruction but also to require for-credit assignments that
serve as assessment to judge the effectiveness and timing of the instruction.
The librarian uses the information gathered in assessment to restructure the
instruction program further for subsequent years and also to create two new
library guides to provide different facets of off-site research support for
students in this discipline. (evidence: project proposal; curriculum map;
instruction plan; correspondence with faculty; sample assignments; student
feedback in aggregate; summation of assessment gleaned from assignment;
new instruction plan; library guides)

• Simple Example
Candidate provides several instruction sessions each year at the request of
teaching faculty members who sought short introductions to collection
resources and services for their students. Student feedback is predominantly
positive, and candidate uses this feedback to improve teaching further.
(evidence: instruction notes/outline; student feedback; selected peer reviews)

Digitization
- **Complex Example**
The candidate coordinates a project to digitize a collection of 1,534 postcards documenting a more productive era from an abandoned town near the university, as a part of a larger digitized collection of resources documenting the history of Northwest Ohio. They work with the head librarian on metadata field planning, consult with the library IT department on ingestion procedures, and supervise 2 student assistants in digitizing the collection and inputting metadata. The candidate verifies the digital image files and metadata before ingestion, then double-checks the collection in the digital platform before making the collection public. They then work with the library outreach personnel to publicize the collection to researchers, who begin using the collection widely. The library’s web site use counts, as a whole, go up 15% as a result of this collection being available for use, and two classes begin using this collection for class projects, one studying early 19th century industry in Northwest Ohio and one studying short-form correspondence. (evidence: rationale for digitizing the collection and for the standards used; metadata schema/fields to use; a sample of the spreadsheet used to input metadata; rationale for hiring student assistants; process workflow from digitization of the images to making the collection public; examples of outreach strategies; snapshot of use statistics from web site)

- **Simple Example**
A user identifies materials needed for digitization for research purposes. The candidate performs the digitization according to library’s digitization standards, delivers digital files, and stores the digital masters appropriately for preservation. (evidence: correspondence with patron)

**Collection Development**

- **Complex Example**
A new donor offers a large gift of materials to the unit. The gift includes books, manuscripts, three-dimensional objects, and other materials. First, the candidate evaluates the gift and how it would fit the collection development policies. The candidate communicates with the donor and the Development Office on the terms of the gift—including exploring the possibility of the donor issuing a cash gift to offset processing costs—records the agreement using the Instrument of Gift, and makes arrangements for the delivery of the materials, followed by a letter of formal acknowledgement for the receipt of the materials. The candidate then decides how the gift will be processed and stored and eventually creates the finding aid. Following the creation and publication of the finding aid, the candidate arranges publicity for the gift to promote usage. (evidence: correspondence with donor; Instrument of Gift; finding aid; promotional materials)

- **Simple Example**
The candidate reviews the department’s periodical subscription and decides
what subscriptions to maintain or cancel. (evidence: communication to patrons about potential cuts; rationale used to make decisions)

Collection Processing and Organization

- Complex Example
  Working with a committee that spans several departmental units, the candidate helps to select a new archival management tool, taking into account the number and complexity of finding aids available in each unit. The committee assesses and prioritizes the needs related to each collection and configures the management tool to accommodate the most pressing needs. Once the selected tool is implemented locally, the candidate conducts a pilot test by loading two finding aids from their unit’s collections and gets feedback from other unit staff and from users. Taking this feedback into account, the candidate works with the committee to make modifications to the system. (evidence: project plan indicating candidate’s contributions; screenshots of completed management system with unit’s finding aids)

- Simple Example
  Candidate assesses a processed collection for preservation. The collection turns out to be in good condition, but the candidate realizes that it would be better housed in new boxes, so they assign and train a student intern to complete the work. (evidence: summary of preservation assessment; training materials)

c. Give evidence of effective, active involvement in service to the University, community, and/or profession, if the assignment involves service activities (i.e. appointments to unit, college, or university committees).

The combination of activities that illustrate effective service will vary from one successful candidate to the next. Successful service for promotion to Lecturer could be demonstrated by each of the following sets of accomplishments, assuming a 10% allocation of effort. These scenarios are meant as examples, not as prescriptive plans or checklists, and each candidate will have a different combination of activities.

- Continued service throughout the probationary period on one UL committee, a two-year term on another UL committee, service on one UL search committee, one three-year term on a university committee, and one two-year term on a statewide professional organization committee.
- Two two-year terms on UL committees, one one-year term as UL Faculty Secretary, one three-year term on a university committee, and a two-year term as a special officer in a statewide professional organization.

- One two-year term on a departmental committee, two two-year terms on UL committees, one three-year term on a university committee, a three-year term as web editor for a regional professional organization, and one four-year term on a national professional organization committee.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Candidates for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer shall:

a. Typically have a minimum of six years' experience as a Lecturer.
b. Have an established reputation in the library and on campus as an effective librarian according to criteria above, as evidenced by patron feedback and peer evaluation. The candidate should provide evidence of sustained performance and continued professional development as a Lecturer. Specifically, librarians will be evaluated on their cumulative mastery of the core and specialized criteria, as relevant, under “Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six” above. Activities marking successful librarian effectiveness will depend on a candidate's position responsibilities, and will be largely represented by projects that are closely aligned to the strategic goals of the unit, the department, the University Libraries, and the University. Complex projects typically involve collaboration, development of expertise, and substantive contribution to a layered work product. Simple projects may be done independently, use existing expertise, and be shorter in duration. They may be a single part of a larger complex project. Using the above librarian-effectiveness examples as a guide, the candidate should demonstrate completion, since last promotion, of at least 2 complex projects and 6 simple projects by the time of promotion to Senior Lecturer.
c. Additionally, candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer should also assume leadership within the unit, department, and the UL in achieving those criteria.
d. Give evidence of significant service with leadership roles to the University, community, and/or profession, if the assignment involves service activities (e.g., appointments to unit, college, or university committees).

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

The dossier shall be assembled by the candidate and shall contain the documents listed below:
1. Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate
2. Annual Data Outlines since last promotion, including activity up to the date of review (unscored)
3. Approved unit Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (part II)
4. Annual and Enhanced Performance Review evaluation letters and reports from all levels
5. Librarian Effectiveness Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
6. Service Documentation (if applicable)
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence

The faculty member is encouraged to consult with other more senior faculty to identify effective narrative styles and types of evidence for the dossier.

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

Most TTF members in Special Collections have an allocation of effort that is based exclusively on Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service (most typically, 70% Librarian Effectiveness, 20% Scholarship, and 10% Service). Evaluation of TTF shall take the faculty member’s allocation of effort into account.

Librarian Effectiveness

Effective librarianship is modeled through ongoing development of knowledge required to do one’s job effectively and mastery of professional skills that reflects evolving changes in scholarship and professional practice, as well as subject and/or collection expertise; effective service to internal and external clientele, such as patrons, donors, scholars, and vendors; and effective communication inside and outside the library.

Evaluation of librarian effectiveness will be based upon the duties outlined in the candidate’s position responsibilities and allocation of effort. Successful candidates will evidence strong librarian effectiveness from the outset and/or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, using their efforts to develop and organize collections and provide access to a wide range of information resources that directly support the University’s roles of teaching, research, and service through instruction, public service, and/or cataloging and description. Candidates should make annual progress toward successful completion of a variety of complex and simple projects as defined in the criteria and standards for promotion. Many complex projects will be divided over multiple years; for APRs, candidates should illustrate how their annual work contributes to a long-term project.

Broadly, librarians will be evaluated on:
• ongoing development of knowledge required to do their job effectively and mastery of professional skills that reflects evolving changes in scholarship and professional practice, as well as subject and/or collection expertise;
• effective service to internal and external clienteles, such as patrons, donors, scholars, and vendors; and
• effective communication inside and outside the library.

Additionally, head librarians will be evaluated on their effectiveness in leading and advocating for their units, as well as management of budgets and resources, oversight of day-to-day operations, and effective stewardship of collections.

More specifically, librarians will be evaluated on a variety of criteria, based on their specific duties.

**Core Criteria for All Librarians**

Core Criteria will be evident in all library work and will be reflected in documentation of specialized work, based on position responsibilities. These criteria are evidenced by:

• High-quality interactions with patrons who use library services, as indicated by direct user feedback, indirect measures as appropriate (transcripts, statistics, etc.), or peer evaluation.
• Output that demonstrates subject and collection expertise as well as application of contemporary library and archival practices. Such evidence might include policies, white papers, planning documents, instructional materials, correspondence, or related materials.
• Participation in library and university governance, including contributions to peer reviews and assessments, merit processes, and policy formation.
• Establishment of collaborations and partnerships with assigned departments and subject areas to facilitate student learning and collection access.
• Demonstrated support of unit’s mission and strategic initiatives.

**Specialized Criteria Based on Position Responsibilities**

Candidates will provide evidence of a selection of the following accomplishments, dependent on their role in their unit and department and their position responsibilities. Balance among specialized criteria will also be dependent on the unit’s annual strategic goals.

**Cataloging and Description**

• Production of high-quality original and copy cataloging records and/or archival finding aids that meet national standards at a pace commensurate with collection needs.
• Creation of Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) and/or Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) records that have been approved through appropriate funnel or workflow.
• Accurate and timely database maintenance for cataloging records in the integrated library system and/or consortial catalogs, including monitoring, correcting, troubleshooting, and providing quality control of records.
• Maintenance of current documentation, policies, and other materials that support the processing of materials and the training of students and peers in cataloging.
• Participation in library-wide decision-making about cataloging policy, projects, and procedures.

Outreach, Instruction, and Reference

• Contributions to unit’s efforts to improve visibility of collections through social media, web presence, face-to-face interactions, and/or other appropriate outlets.
• Effective reference service in face-to-face and virtual environments, as evidenced by peer review and patron satisfaction.
• Creation and maintenance of learning objects, such as LibGuides, modules for Canvas Commons, tutorials, etc., in keeping with instruction needs of the unit.
• Positive quantitative and qualitative course evaluations that are typically equal to or greater than the average scores for the department for which the course is taught, for all credit-bearing courses taught.
• Positive student reviews of and faculty feedback for instruction and library sessions.
• Participation on graduate thesis and dissertation committees and direction of independent study courses, practicum projects, and internships.

Digitization

• Collaboration with colleagues to identify and prioritize collections for digitization, as well as to plan and assess digitization projects.
• Evidence of adherence to digitization standards, policies, and norms within the digitization community.
• Successful publication of digitized collections.

Collection Development

• Responsible management of collection, including identifying, selecting, and acquiring of materials for the instructional and research needs of unit’s patrons, as well as the weeding or deaccessioning of materials that are out-of-scope, beyond repair, better suited at other institutions, or otherwise no longer suitable for continued preservation. This management is evidenced through reference and instruction transactions that demonstrate patron success with locating relevant materials in the collection, collection use, and collection analysis.
• Timely acknowledgement of all gifts received.
• Active solicitation of new materials in coordination with unit staff.
• Promotion and stewardship of effective relationships with appropriate donors.

Collection Processing and Organization
• Physical and intellectual organization of collections according to library and archival standards, including judicious rehousing of materials, training and evaluation of staff, students or interns who may assist in processing, and the development of processing plans, where appropriate.
• Assessment of collections for preservation or conservation treatment, including recommendations for outsourcing of such work. Appropriate reformatting (or making recommendations for reformatting) of materials for preservation and access, where necessary.
• Appropriate reformatting (or making recommendations for reformatting) of materials for preservation and access, where necessary.
• Constructive contributions to unit policies and procedures for processing and organization.

Additional Core Criteria for Head Librarians

In addition to success in Core Criteria for All Librarians and Specialized Criteria Based on Position Responsibilities above, Head Librarians should also demonstrate success in all of the following areas.

• Establishment of unit goals and objectives and long-range plans in concert with UL's strategic plan with assistance from the unit’s staff.
• Preparation and maintenance of operating budget requests for personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials.
• Preparation of reports, and other assessment and evaluations of the unit operations, programs, and services as requested.
• Completion of the unit’s portion of accreditation reports in cooperation with other library staff.
• Maintenance of the unit’s sections of library-wide policies on safety and security.
• Clear and timely communication to unit staff about larger UL developments and external constituent group activities as appropriate.
• Coordination of the processing of materials to be added to the collection, including establishment and maintenance of unit policies and standards for these activities.
• Supervision and evaluation of employees of the unit, as evidenced through the timely submission of annual reviews.
• Representation of the unit at appropriate UL meetings.
• Collaboration with others in areas of collection development, cataloging, acquisitions, systems, reference, instruction, serials, circulation, and document delivery, as appropriate.

Evidence that may be used in the TTF member's record of librarian effectiveness includes, but is not limited to:

• annual reviews from department, Chair, and Dean (required);
• documentation of projects and services (required);
• a peer-review from a department or UL colleague of at least one area of librarian effectiveness each year (required);
• philosophical statements of librarianship and pedagogy (optional);
• self-evaluation of librarian effectiveness (optional);
• unsolicited positive student/library users’ feedback; peer observations and evaluations (optional);
• examples of workflow or policy documents written in whole or in part by the candidate (optional);
• examples of work product like websites, research guides, metadata records, or finding aids edited in whole or in part by the candidate (optional);
• licensure or professional examinations, awards, and distinctions (optional); and
• unsolicited written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning performance, preparedness, and librarian effectiveness (optional).

Activities marking successful librarian effectiveness will depend on a candidate’s position responsibilities, and will be largely represented by projects that are closely aligned to the strategic goals of the unit, the department, the University Libraries, and the University. Complex projects typically involve collaboration, development of expertise, and substantive contribution to a layered work product. Simple projects may be done independently, use existing expertise, and be shorter in duration. They may be a single part of a larger complex project. By the time of the EPR, the candidate should demonstrate completion, since hire, of at least 1 complex project and 2 simple projects.

**Scholarly/Creative Work**

Initially, candidates are launching their research careers and thus during the first two Annual Performance Reviews, manuscripts under review or revision are demonstrative of research activity which signals likely research productivity (e.g., publications in peer-reviewed journals). For the Enhanced Performance Review, candidates should have at least one peer-reviewed article or its equivalent in press, if not published. Following a successful Enhanced Performance Review, successful candidates for the subsequent annual reviews will show sustained (or increased) research activity as well as research productivity, including the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles or their equivalent.

In assessing research success, the greatest weight will be given to articles published or in press since the initial hire. Journal quality is an important factor. Books and book chapters are also desirable, as are presentations at the regional, state, multi-state, and national levels. Refereed publications and presentations are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Grant activity (submission or receipt) is desirable but not necessary for a successful EPR as it is secondary to publication activity.

Evidence to support scholarly/creative activities may include the following materials:

• peer-reviewed articles;
• book chapters;
• selected non-peer-reviewed publications;
• selected presentations (slides and scripts/notes, if relevant);
• indications of the TTF member’s reputation in the discipline, as demonstrated by
  external feedback, research dossiers, honors and awards received, and
  acknowledgements and/or citations in publications; and
• information about the TTF member’s activities in the area of securing extramural
  support, such as grant applications submitted, notice of research funds awarded, and
  documentation of performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects.

Service

It is expected that the scope and level of service engaged in by successful candidates will
increase over time. During years 1 and 2 on the tenure track, candidates may only have
department-level service, but they should be seeking opportunities to serve at the college,
university, regional, state, multi-state or national levels. By year 3 (EPR), successful
candidates will have assumed service responsibilities beyond the department level.

Evidence used to represent service includes, but is not limited to:
• description of significance and scope of activities (required);
• documentation of significant contributions and achievements (required);
• documentation of leadership positions held (required if relevant);
• professional recognitions (required if relevant);
• documentation demonstrating organization of professional conferences and symposia
  (required if relevant);
• records of membership or affiliation and attendance (optional); and
• testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others (optional).

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

Annual Performance Review (APR)

Annual Performance Reviews (APR) are typically scheduled in the 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 5th years.
All candidates must submit their materials for review. APRs shall be based on the following
list of documents, all of which the candidate will submit for review:

1. Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate
2. Annual Data Outlines, including activity up to the date of review (unscored)
3. Annual review evaluation letters and reports from all levels
4. Hiring letter (if prior service credit granted)
5. Librarian Effectiveness Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
6. Scholarly/Creative Work Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
7. Service Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
Each narrative is to be no more than two pages and should (1) provide a philosophy for understanding how the materials represent the candidate’s career goals; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence that may not be included in the dossier.

Evidence should include any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. Documentary evidence should be representative rather than all-encompassing.

Enhanced Performance Review (EPR)

The Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) typically occurs during the fall semester of the candidate's third year on the tenure track. The candidate submits a dossier of materials for review. The core of the portfolio focuses on the candidate’s philosophies of and accomplishments in the areas of librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative work, and service. The dossier shall be assembled by the candidate. Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate
2. Approved unit Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (part II)
3. Annual Data Outlines, including activity up to the date of review (unscored)
4. Annual review evaluation letters and reports from all levels
5. Hiring letter (if prior service credit granted)
6. Librarian Effectiveness Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
7. Scholarly/Creative Work Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
8. Service Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence

Each narrative is to be no more than two pages and should (1) provide a philosophy for understanding how the materials represent the candidate’s career goals; (2) explain the rationale for selecting evidence of accomplishments included in the section; and (3) mention additional evidence that may not be included in the dossier.

Evidence should include any letters or other supporting materials that document the quality of professional performance. Documentary evidence should be representative rather than all-encompassing.

The faculty member is encouraged to consult with other more senior faculty to identify effective narrative styles and types of evidence for the dossier.
Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

For APRs of TTF members, tenured departmental faculty shall provide feedback to aid the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion.

The following procedure will be followed:

1. The Chair shall notify the probationer and the tenured bargaining unit faculty members of the upcoming APR and request that the candidate submit their documentation, including activity up to the date of review, to the Chair, who will distribute the dossier to the voting eligible faculty members. The candidate should also include copies of publications in progress, works published in the last year, if applicable, works currently out for review, and any evidence that they think will help peers understand their progress toward tenure and promotion in the areas of librarian effectiveness, scholarly productivity, and service.

2. For Head Librarians, the Chair will solicit annual feedback from the staff in the Librarian's unit. This feedback will be summarized, not quoted, and shared with tenured department bargaining unit faculty.

3. The Special Collections Faculty Facilitator, a tenured department faculty member at or above the rank of all candidates for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, convenes a meeting of department bargaining unit faculty eligible to participate in the APR review to discuss the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure.

4. The group of eligible department faculty submits a written evaluation of the candidate to the Department Chair, summarizing the group's feedback.

5. The Chair forwards the faculty's evaluation to the candidate and to the Dean.

6. The Chair submits an independent evaluation of the candidate to the Dean, copying the probationer.

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

1. Criteria for Tenure

Librarian Effectiveness

Candidates for tenure should have a demonstrated record of progressive librarian effectiveness throughout their probationary period. In addition to achieving success in the core criteria and specialized criteria below, to gain tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a TTF member must have a cumulative set of skills in the following areas:

- ongoing development of knowledge required to do their job effectively and mastery of professional skills that reflects evolving changes in scholarship and professional practice, as well as subject and/or collection expertise;
- effective service to internal and external clienteles, such as patrons, donors, scholars, and vendors; and
- effective communication inside and outside the library.

Additionally, head librarians will be evaluated on their effectiveness in leading and
advocating for their units, as well as management of budgets and resources, oversight of day-to-day operations, and effective stewardship of collections.

More specifically, librarians will be evaluated on a variety of criteria, based on their specific duties.

**Core Criteria for All Librarians**

Core Criteria will be evident in all library work and will be reflected in documentation of specialized work, based on position responsibilities. These criteria are evidenced by:

- High-quality interactions with patrons who use library services, as indicated by direct user feedback, indirect measures as appropriate (transcripts, statistics, etc.), or peer evaluation.
- Output that demonstrates the subject and collection expertise as well as application of contemporary library and archival practices. Such evidence might include policies, white papers, planning documents, instructional materials, correspondence, and related materials.
- Participation in library and university governance, including contributions to peer reviews and assessments, merit processes, and policy formation.
- Establishment of collaborations and partnerships with assigned departments and subject areas to facilitate student learning and collection access.
- Demonstrated support of unit’s mission and strategic initiatives.

**Specialized Criteria Based on Position Responsibilities**

Candidates will provide evidence of a selection of the following accomplishments, dependent on their role in their unit and department and their position responsibilities. Balance among specialized criteria will also be dependent on the unit’s annual strategic goals.

**Cataloging and Description**

- Production of high-quality original and copy cataloging records and/or archival finding aids that meet national standards, at a pace commensurate with collection needs.
- Creation of Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) and/or Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) records that have been approved through appropriate funnel or workflow.
- Accurate and timely database maintenance for cataloging records in the integrated library system and/or consortial catalogs, including monitoring, correcting, troubleshooting, and providing quality control of records.
- Maintenance of current documentation, policies, and other materials that support the processing of materials and the training of students in cataloging.
- Participation in library-wide decision-making about cataloging policy, projects, and procedures.
Outreach, Instruction, and Reference

- Contributions to unit’s efforts to improve visibility of collections through social media, web presence, face-to-face interactions, and/or other appropriate outlets.
- Effective reference service in face-to-face and virtual environments, as evidenced by peer review and patron satisfaction.
- Creation and maintenance of learning objects, such as LibGuides, modules for Canvas Commons, tutorials, etc., in keeping with instruction needs of the unit.
- Positive quantitative and qualitative course evaluations that are typically equal to or greater than the average scores for the department for which the course is taught, for all credit-bearing courses taught.
- Positive student reviews of and faculty feedback for instruction and library sessions.
- Participation on graduate thesis and dissertation committees and direction of independent study courses, practicum projects, and internships.

Digitization

- Collaboration with colleagues to identify and prioritize collections for digitization, as well as to plan and assess digitization projects.
- Evidence of adherence to digitization standards, policies, and norms within the digitization community.
- Successful publication of digitized collections.

Collection Development

- Responsible management of collection, including identifying, selecting, and acquiring of materials for the instructional and research needs of unit’s patrons, as well as the weeding or deaccessioning of materials that are out-of-scope, beyond repair, better suited at other institutions, or otherwise no longer suitable for continued preservation. This management is evidenced through reference and instruction transactions that demonstrate patron success with locating relevant materials in the collection, collection use, and collection analysis.
- Timely acknowledgement of all gifts received.
- Active solicitation of new materials in coordination with unit staff.
- Promotion and stewardship of effective relationships with appropriate donors.

Collection Processing and Organization

- Physical and intellectual organization of collections according to library and archival standards, including judicious rehousing of materials, training and evaluation of staff, students or interns who may assist in processing, and the development of processing plans, where appropriate.
- Assessment of collections for preservation or conservation treatment, including recommendations for outsourcing of such work. Appropriate reformatting (or making
recommendations for reformatting) of materials for preservation and access, where necessary.

- Appropriate reformatting of materials (or making recommendations for reformatting) of materials for preservation and access, where necessary.
- Constructive contributions to unit policies and procedures for processing and organization.

Additional Core Criteria for Head Librarians

In addition to success in Core Criteria for All Librarians and Specialized Criteria Based on Position Responsibilities above, Head Librarians should also demonstrate success in all of the following areas.

- Establishment of unit goals, objectives and long-range plans in concert with UL’s strategic plan with assistance from the unit’s staff.
- Preparation and maintenance of operating budget requests for personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials.
- Preparation of reports and other assessment and evaluations of the unit operations, programs, and services as requested.
- Completion of the unit’s portion of accreditation reports in cooperation with other library staff.
- Maintenance of the unit’s sections of library-wide policies on safety and security.
- Clear and timely communication to unit staff about larger UL developments and external constituent group activities as appropriate.
- Coordination of the processing of materials to be added to the collection, including establishment and maintenance of unit policies and standards for these activities.
- Supervision and evaluation of employees of the unit, as evidenced through the timely submission of annual reviews.
- Representation of the unit at appropriate UL meetings.
- Collaboration with others in areas of collection development, cataloging, acquisitions, systems, reference, instruction, serials, circulation, and document delivery, as appropriate.

Evidence that may be used in the TTF member’s record of librarian effectiveness includes, but is not limited to:

- annual reviews from department, Chair, and Dean (required);
- documentation of projects and services (required);
- a peer-review from a department or UL colleague of at least one area of librarian effectiveness each year (required);
- philosophical statements of librarianship and pedagogy (optional);
- self-evaluation of librarian effectiveness (optional);
- unsolicited positive student/library users’ feedback; peer observations and evaluations (optional);
- examples of workflow or policy documents written in whole or in part by the candidate (optional);
- examples of work product like websites, research guides, metadata records, or finding aids edited in whole or in part by the candidate (optional);
- licensure or professional examinations, awards, and distinctions (optional); and
- unsolicited written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning performance, preparedness, and librarian effectiveness (optional).

Activities marking successful librarian effectiveness will depend on a candidate’s position responsibilities, and will be largely represented by projects that are closely aligned to the strategic goals of the unit, the department, the University Libraries, and the University. Complex projects typically involve collaboration, development of expertise, and substantive contribution to a layered work product. Simple projects may be done independently, use existing expertise, and be shorter in duration. They may be a single part of a larger complex project. Using the following examples as a guide, the candidate should demonstrate completion, since hire, of at least 3 complex projects and 6 simple projects by the time of applying for tenure.

The following project descriptions and outcomes represent hypothetical activities that would, in concert with a broad selection of activities, model success in the different areas of librarian effectiveness. These examples are not exhaustive or prescriptive but illustrate activities a successful candidate might have undertaken and what evidence could be used to represent those activities in their dossier.

Cataloging and Description

- Complex Example
  After initial training in local practices related to cataloging, the candidate works independently to create original and copy catalog records for a variety of collection formats. Using this expertise, the candidate works with the head librarian to develop a multi-year project to address a backlog of 20,000 items that need cataloging. Together, and in consultation with current cataloging standards for the format, they develop a list of core fields to be addressed, consider who should be doing the work (dividing between a work force that includes student assistants, classified staff, and the faculty librarian), and outline specific goals and milestones for the project. The candidate then develops documentation for the project and trains appropriate staff. The candidate initially reviews all work of others contributing to the project and helps staff to correct work as appropriate, gradually working with each individual to catalog independently, with only occasional spot checks by the candidate. As the project progresses, the candidate revises procedures and documentation to allow for changes in best practices and to facilitate smoother flow of the work. By the conclusion of the project, all items in the backlog have been cataloged, a majority of milestones were met on schedule, and the records created meet national standards for cataloging of that particular format.
(evidence: project plan, including milestones; training documentation; sample catalog records annotated to show candidate’s input)

- **Simple Example**
The candidate has a database of digitized images with more than 14,000 entries that needs to be moved into a new system. Much of the metadata is unusable as is, so will need to be reconfigured to match current metadata standards, both at the local and national levels. The candidate first cleans up some of the metadata in Excel, then works with library IT personnel to clean up additional fields in order to prepare the metadata to be cross-walked over to the new digital platform. (evidence: samples of metadata before and after cleanup; screenshot of one or two records on display in the new platform)

**Outreach, Instruction, and Reference**

- **Complex Example**
The candidate notices that many undergraduate users in the collection’s subject area are visiting the collection for the first time in their third and fourth years and that they commonly express regret that they did not know of the library’s resources earlier in their academic careers. As a result, the candidate coordinates efforts with the appropriate teaching faculty to map the curriculum of the academic unit to existing information literacy frameworks. The candidate develops a plan to integrate library instruction into three entry-level courses and two intermediate courses, with planned individual research appointments for students in a senior capstone project. Faculty members in the liaison areas support this project and work with the librarian not only to allow for the in-class instruction but also to require for-credit assignments that serve as assessment to judge the effectiveness and timing of the instruction. The librarian uses the information gathered in assessment to restructure the instruction program further for subsequent years and also to create two new library guides to provide different facets of off-site research support for students in this discipline. (evidence: project proposal; curriculum map; instruction plan; correspondence with faculty; sample assignments; student feedback in aggregate; summation of assessment gleaned from assignment; new instruction plan; library guides)

- **Simple Example**
Candidate provides several instruction sessions each year at the request of teaching faculty members who sought short introductions to collection resources and services for their students. Student feedback is predominantly positive, and candidate uses this feedback to improve teaching further. (evidence: instruction notes/outline; student feedback; selected peer reviews)

**Digitzation**
- Complex Example
  The candidate coordinates a project to digitize a collection of 1,534 postcards documenting a more productive era from an abandoned town near the university, as a part of a larger digitized collection of resources documenting the history of Northwest Ohio. They work with the head librarian on metadata field planning, consult with the library IT department on ingestion procedures, and supervise 2 student assistants in digitizing the collection and inputting metadata. The candidate verifies the digital image files and metadata before ingestion, then double-checks the collection in the digital platform before making the collection public. They then work with the library outreach personnel to publicize the collection to researchers, who begin using the collection widely. The library’s web site use counts, as a whole, go up 15% as a result of this collection being available for use, and two classes begin using this collection for class projects, one studying early 19th century industry in Northwest Ohio and one studying short-form correspondence. (evidence: rationale for digitizing the collection and for the standards used; metadata schema/fields to use; a sample of the spreadsheet used to input metadata; rationale for hiring student assistants; process workflow from digitization of the images to making the collection public; examples of outreach strategies; snapshot of use statistics from web site)

- Simple Example
  A user identifies materials needed for digitization for research purposes. The candidate performs the digitization according to library’s digitization standards, delivers digital files, and stores the digital masters appropriately for preservation. (evidence: correspondence with patron)

Collection Development

- Complex Example
  A new donor offers a large gift of materials to the unit. The gift includes books, manuscripts, three-dimensional objects, and other materials. First, the candidate evaluates the gift and how it would fit the collection development policies. The candidate communicates with the donor and the Development Office on the terms of the gift—including exploring the possibility of the donor issuing a cash gift to offset processing costs—records the agreement using the Instrument of Gift, and makes arrangements for the delivery of the materials, followed by a letter of formal acknowledgement for the receipt of the materials. The candidate then decides how the gift will be processed and stored and eventually creates the finding aid. Following the creation and publication of the finding aid, the candidate arranges publicity for the gift to promote usage. (evidence: correspondence with donor; Instrument of Gift; finding aid; promotional materials)

- Simple Example
  The candidate reviews the department’s periodical subscription and decides
what subscriptions to maintain or cancel. (evidence: communication to patrons about potential cuts; rationale used to make decisions)

Collection Processing and Organization

- **Complex Example**
  Working with a committee that spans several departmental units, the candidate helps to select a new archival management tool, taking into account the number and complexity of finding aids available in each unit. The committee assesses and prioritizes the needs related to each collection and configures the management tool to accommodate the most pressing needs. Once the selected tool is implemented locally, the candidate conducts a pilot test by loading two finding aids from their unit’s collections and gets feedback from other unit staff and from users. Taking this feedback into account, the candidate works with the committee to make modifications to the system. (evidence: project plan indicating candidate’s contributions; screenshots of completed management system with unit’s finding aids)

- **Simple Example**
  Candidate assesses a processed collection for preservation. The collection turns out to be in good condition, but the candidate realizes that it would be better housed in new boxes, so they assign and train a student intern to complete the work. (evidence: summary of preservation assessment; training materials)

Additional Core Criteria for Head Librarians

- **Complex Example**
  The candidate identifies the need for reallocation of duties amongst staff and seeks input from a peer in another department to assess workflows. The two communicate with staff as a group, meet individually with each member, and identify areas for change or training. (evidence: documentation of information gathering; workflow overview; communication about training opportunities; staff feedback from annual review)

- **Simple Example**
  Each year, the candidate completed all annual reports, strategic plans, and budget requests accurately and completely. (evidence: annual reports; strategic plans; budget requests)

Scholarly/Creative Activities

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one’s
discipline is an essential responsibility of all TTF members. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for meaningful participation in the university learning community and the profession at large. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the department’s evaluation of TTF members who are under review for tenure and/or promotion.

Candidates should have a demonstrated record of continuous scholarly achievement throughout their probationary period. To gain tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a TTF member must author or co-author and publish or have accepted for publication at least one of the following since hire:

- Two professional articles in peer-reviewed academic journals with a national audience;
- A peer-reviewed academic book with a recognized publisher;
- A professional textbook with a recognized publisher.

In the interest of balancing their dossiers and establishing a reputation in the field, candidates must also achieve some combination of at least two of the following:

- Publish a chapter in a peer-reviewed academic book;
- Present at least twice at peer-reviewed conferences at the regional, state, multi-state, national, or international level;
- Serve as a primary writer on a major grant;
- Edit a book, journal issue, or journal;
- Or the equivalent.

The combination of activities will vary greatly from one candidate to the next. Successful scholarship for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor could be demonstrated by each of the following sets of accomplishments during the probationary period, assuming a 20% allocation of effort for scholarly/creative activities. These scenarios are meant as examples, not as prescriptive plans or checklists, and each candidate will have a different combination of activities.

- Publish two peer-reviewed academic journal articles and one book chapter; deliver two presentations at refereed conferences at the regional, state, multi-state, national or international levels;
- Publish two peer-reviewed academic journal articles; edit a journal issue; and serve as a primary author for a successful grant proposal;
- Publish a scholarly book; deliver three presentations at refereed conferences at the regional, state, multi-state, national or international levels; present a webinar distributed by a national library organization.

Service
TTF members being reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community and the profession. Professional service in organizations at the local, regional, state, multi-state, national, or international level is deemed valuable.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have a demonstrated record of continuous service represented at various levels throughout their probationary period. To gain tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a TTF member must show continuous and progressive responsibility in service. Evidence might include proof of active contributions to University Libraries and University committees and service to the profession, such as playing key roles in project work and report writing in professional organizations; membership alone does not represent sufficient service to attain tenure.

The combination of activities that illustrate effective service will vary from one successful candidate to the next. Successful service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor could be demonstrated by each of the following sets of accomplishments during the probationary period, assuming a 10% allocation of effort for service. These scenarios are meant as examples, not as prescriptive plans or checklists, and each candidate will have a different combination of activities.

- Continued service throughout the probationary period on one UL committee, a two-year term on another UL committee, service on one UL search committee, one one-year and one three-year term on a university committee, one two-year term on a statewide professional organization committee, and one two-year term on the board of directors of a multi-state professional organization.
- Two two-year terms on departmental committees, one one-year term on a UL committee, one one-year term and two three-year terms on university committees, and a three-year term as web editor for a regional professional organization.
- One two-year term on a departmental committee, one two-year term on UL committees, one one-year term as UL Faculty Secretary, one three-year term on a university committee, one four-year term as a special officer in a statewide professional organization, and two three-year terms on national professional organization committees.

2. **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 are the same as those for tenure. In rare cases, a faculty member may be hired at the Associate Professor level without tenure. Consistent with the discipline, a Bargaining Unit Faculty shall meet all
of the requirements outlined under “Criteria for Tenure” above for promotion to Associate Professor.

3. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Professors shall demonstrate continuous success in librarian effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Typically, candidates for Professor should show consistent achievement for at least 6 years at the Associate Professor rank before seeking promotion. Consistent with the discipline, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member with the rank of Professor:

A. Shall have an established reputation as an effective librarian, which should include: making continuous growth in librarianship, regularly suggesting and implementing enhancements for their own work and the work of the unit, taking an increasing role in library and university governance, and being a leader in the library. Specifically, candidates for promotion to Professor will be evaluated on the core and specialized criteria, as relevant, outlined under “Criteria for Tenure” above. Candidates should achieve a significant number of the above accomplishments and demonstrate active, sustained leadership in the Library community, and their work should reflect increasing complexity. Activities marking successful librarian effectiveness will depend on a candidate’s position responsibilities, and will be largely represented by projects that are closely aligned to the strategic goals of the unit, the department, the University Libraries, and the University. Complex projects typically involve collaboration, development of expertise, and substantive contribution to a layered work product. Simple projects may be done independently, use existing expertise, and be shorter in duration. They may be a single part of a larger complex project. Using the examples in this document as a guide, the candidate should demonstrate completion, since their last promotion, of at least 5 complex projects and 3 simple projects by the time of applying for promotion to Professor.

B. Shall have maintained a productive research record while an Associate Professor, and in the years leading up to promotion to Professor, the successful candidate will have, at the minimum, published an average of a peer-reviewed article every 3 years in journals with a national audience, authored a peer-reviewed academic book with a recognized publisher, or authored a professional textbook with a recognized publisher. In addition, a candidate should have a balanced portfolio with at least three of the following:

- Publish a chapter in a peer-reviewed academic book;
- Present at least twice at peer-reviewed conferences at the state, multi-state, national, or international level;
- Serve as a primary investigator on a major grant;
- Edit a book, journal issue, or journal;
- Or the equivalent.
Research success for promotion to Professor is indicated not solely by publications but also the broader effect of the faculty member's work on the field. External reviewers will assess the candidate's prominence in the field and the department will use these external assessments as one measure to gauge the candidate's scholarly influence.

C. Shall give evidence of significant involvement in service to the University, community, and/or profession as evidenced by continuous and progressive leadership at the state level and above as well as a positive national reputation for service in the profession. Service activities should involve leadership roles, such as committee chair on UL committees or leadership within departmental committees. Candidates should demonstrate mentoring of faculty colleagues within the department. At the university level the successful candidate must demonstrate active involvement in committees. Productive service at the state level and above is required and may be demonstrated by volunteering for committees or being elected to committee membership, serving as a special officer or elected official, serving on editorial boards, participating on grant review panels, or planning annual meetings.

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

All bargaining unit faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion shall undergo an Enhanced Performance Review (EPR). This typically occurs by the 6th year for candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; the timeline will vary for candidates applying for promotion to Professor. These reviews recommending tenure and/or promotion shall be based on a dossier documenting evidence of progress toward tenure and/or promotion with respect to stated criteria for librarian effectiveness, research and creative work, and service at the rank for which the candidate is eligible upon being granted tenure or promotion. The dossier shall be assembled by the candidate and shall contain the documents listed below:

1. Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate
2. Annual Data Outlines, including activity up to the date of review (unscored)
3. Annual and Enhanced Performance Review evaluation letters and reports from all levels (for tenure and promotion to associate professor)
4. Hiring letter (if prior service credit granted)
5. Approved unit Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (part II)
6. Librarian Effectiveness Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
7. Scholarly/Creative Work Documentation
   a. Narrative
   b. Evidence
8. External reviews for Scholarly/Creative Work (and Service, for candidates applying for full Professor)
9. Curriculum vitae for each external reviewer, if available
10. List of external reviewers and explanation of selection process
11. Letters sent to reviewers soliciting evaluations
12. Service Documentation
a. Narrative
b. Evidence

The faculty member is encouraged to consult with other more senior faculty, including their Chair to identify effective narrative styles and types of evidence for the dossier.

Approved by the Special Collections Department by electronic ballot on April 18, 2018.

Susannah Cleveland, Chair
Date

Sara Bushong, Dean, University Libraries
Date

John Fischer, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Interim
Date
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