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James Madison University Libraries Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
1. Introduction

This document covers professional contracts, development, and performance assessment for tenure-track and non-tenure track library faculty. It serves as a guide to the individual faculty members, the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC), supervisors, the Academic Unit Heads (AUH), and the Dean of Libraries. It should be used in concert with the James Madison University Faculty Handbook. This document must be reviewed annually by the LFA Policy Committee to maintain alignment with the Faculty Handbook. In cases of discrepancy between the Faculty Handbook and this document, the Faculty Handbook must take precedence.

The components comprising each faculty member's job performance are delineated in their position description. Faculty members are expected to add to their professional qualifications through continuing education and to contribute to their professional field or area of specialization through scholarly achievement. Faculty members are also expected to engage in service and leadership activities that benefit the Libraries, the university, their profession, or the community.

1.1 Applicability

This document applies to all instructional faculty within the Libraries. Except where indicated, this document also applies to A&P faculty within the Libraries who are pursuing promotion.

1.2 Faculty Status, Positions, and Rank

Faculty status, positions, and ranks are described in section III.B. of the Faculty Handbook.
1.3 Version

The current version of the James Madison University Libraries Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (PTG) supersedes all previous versions, and its terms replace the terms contained in previous versions. The university expressly reserves the right to change policies, benefits, and procedures, and faculty members are bound by changes as they become effective. Changes to the PTG are made as needed by the LFA Policy Committee and are approved by majority vote of eligible faculty members.

1.4 Approval of New Procedures and Criteria

This document covers procedures and criteria specific to the Libraries. As per the Faculty Handbook, III.E.1.f. Approval, “Academic unit evaluation procedures and criteria must be approved by the [Libraries] faculty members, AUH, dean, and Provost. New or revised evaluation procedures and criteria may be proposed to the academic unit by individual faculty members, the [Personnel Advisory Committee], or AUH. New or revised procedures and criteria must be proposed and approved in a timely manner to allow their use by faculty completing evaluations.” See the LFA Policy Committee Procedures for the process for recommending and approving policy changes.

1.5 Contracts

For information on contracts, see Faculty Handbook Section III.D.

1.6 Word Usage

- **Academic Unit** is defined as an administrative department or its functional equivalent, as identified by the provost.
- **Academic Unit Head** is “the head of an academic department or the functional equivalent of that position,” according to Academic Affairs Policy #2 Academic Unit Heads.
- **Day** indicates a calendar day by 5 pm, unless otherwise specified. A specific date indicates that calendar date by 5 pm. If, however, a specified deadline falls on a day when the university is not scheduled to be open, or is not open for business (as in an emergency closing, a holiday, or a weekend), the deadline must be the next day the university is open for business by 5 pm.
- **Milestone evaluations** refers to promotion and tenure reviews for faculty.
- **Must** indicates a mandatory action.
- **Should** and **may** indicate discretion on the part of the actor.
- **Will** is intended to be descriptive only and does not obligate or direct any action.

All references to any entity or publication refer to those entities and publications at James Madison University unless otherwise specified.
1.7 Abbreviations and Style

This handbook is intended to conform to the stylistic conventions in use at James Madison University. After a name or title has been used the first time, it will usually be abbreviated.

Some examples are listed below:

- Academic Unit Head – AUH
- Personnel Advisory Committee – PAC
- Administrative and Professional Faculty – A&P
- Board of Visitors – BOV
- Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs – provost
- Faculty Annual Review – FAR
- Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan – FAAP
- Renewable Term Appointment – RTA
- Speaker of the Faculty Senate – Speaker

2. Evaluations

University policies and procedures regarding evaluations are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E. Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure.

2.1 Evaluation Fundamentals

2.1.1 Evaluation Bodies

As per the Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.a. AUPAC, the Libraries Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) “advises the AUH and makes recommendations on personnel matters within [the Libraries]. The [PAC] is responsible to the faculty and to the AUH for conducting its functions, and the dean must provide oversight of the work of the [PAC] to determine if it has followed appropriate procedures.” Guidelines for Libraries PAC membership, elections, and procedures are on the Libraries PAC Hub site.

2.1.2 Records

Faculty members are responsible for keeping comprehensive records of their professional activities to supply supporting documentation for all reviews.

Copies of all evaluations that are to be maintained as a matter of record must be stored in the faculty member's personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department. Faculty members may review their own personnel files (see Faculty Handbook, III.G.1. Reviewing Personnel Files).

In support of its role in evaluations, the PAC has the right to review all relevant material in the faculty member's personnel file (see Faculty Handbook, III.E.1.d. Access to Records by AUPAC).
If documents that were not submitted by the faculty member and are not contained in the faculty member’s personnel file are to be considered in an evaluation, the faculty member must promptly be given access to the documents and given an opportunity to respond to them (see Faculty Handbook, III.E.1.e. Access to Records by Faculty Member).

2.1.3 Confidentiality

All persons involved in the evaluation process must respect and maintain the strict confidentiality of all relevant documents and deliberations.

2.2 Types of Evaluations

2.2.1 Supervisor Evaluations

The Libraries has adopted an evaluation structure to match its organizational structure. All faculty evaluations are conducted by the faculty member’s supervisor. For the purposes of evaluations faculty supervisors are given AUH signatory authority, and in this document the term "supervisor" (not "AUH") is used when referring to their evaluation responsibilities.

When a faculty member supervised by the dean undergoes a milestone review, the dean may select another Libraries faculty supervisor to evaluate the materials of the faculty member, in addition to the dean and the AUPAC.

- Initial evaluation. The initial evaluation will be conducted at the beginning of the faculty member’s second full semester of employment. The initial evaluation becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.

- Faculty annual evaluations. Annual evaluations of all faculty members must be conducted after the conclusion of each academic year. Annual evaluations become a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department. The supervisor must provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by October 1. Appeals of instructional faculty FARs are referred to the PAC.

- Midpoint review. The AUPAC and supervisor must independently review the accomplishments of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period, typically during the third year of candidacy. The midpoint review becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.

- A comprehensive evaluation concerned with promotion is conducted in addition to the annual evaluation in the appropriate year. It becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.

- A comprehensive evaluation concerned with tenure is conducted in addition to the annual evaluation in the appropriate year. It becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.
2.2.2 PAC Evaluations

- Rank recommendation review. Interview candidates have the option of requesting this review before the final round of interviews. The review is given to the supervisor, AUH, and dean.
- Midpoint review. The midpoint review is advisory to the faculty member. The midpoint review letter from the PAC becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member's personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.
- A comprehensive evaluation concerned with promotion is conducted in the appropriate year. It becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member's personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.
- A comprehensive evaluation concerned with tenure is conducted in the appropriate year. It becomes a matter of record and must be stored in the faculty member's personnel file in the Libraries Human Resources Department.
- Non-renewal of contracts.
- Post-tenure review.
- Instructional Faculty Annual Review appeals.

2.3 Rank Recommendations

Before the final round of interviews, the head of the search committee will offer all candidates the option of a rank recommendation review. If a candidate then requests this review, the PAC will evaluate the cover letter and curriculum vitae of the candidate and recommend a starting rank and tenure timeline. This evaluation must be completed by the end of the finalist interviews. The PAC will send a letter with its recommendations to the supervisor, AUH, and dean.

2.4 Orientation

During the first six months of the new faculty member's employment, the PAC must hold a meeting with the faculty member to advise them on the promotion and tenure process within the Libraries. It is at this meeting that the faculty member's individual promotion and tenure calendar will be discussed.

A&P faculty members may either establish a promotion timeline in their contracts or elect to establish a promotion timeline at any time after the orientation meeting. An A&P faculty member currently pursuing promotion may at any time decline to continue on the promotion track, without consequence. The individual A&P faculty member's promotion calendar is not binding; its establishment is intended to provide guidance to the faculty member and support their consistent progress toward meeting promotion requirements.
2.5 Initial Evaluation

University policies and procedures regarding initial evaluation of instructional faculty are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E.3. Initial Evaluation.

Initial evaluations are conducted at the beginning of a faculty member's second full semester of full-time employment, and must be completed by the end of the third week of that semester (see Faculty Handbook, III.E.3.d. Deadline). For Libraries faculty members on 12-month contracts, the summer is considered equivalent to a semester.

The supervisor must schedule an initial evaluation conference with the faculty member. The supervisor may request that the faculty member provide a written self-evaluation prior to this conference.

The supervisor must complete a written initial evaluation. The supervisor must provide the written evaluation to the faculty member within 14 days of the evaluation conference. The evaluation must state whether the faculty member's overall performance has been acceptable or unacceptable. Unacceptable performance during the initial evaluation period will normally result in nonrenewal (see Faculty Handbook, III.E.3.f. Nonrenewal).

2.6 Annual Evaluations

2.6.1 Administrative and Professional Faculty

Administrative and professional faculty are evaluated according to JMU Policy 1307, Performance Evaluation of Administrative & Professional Faculty.

A&P faculty in the Libraries who are pursuing promotion should submit a summary of activities and accomplishments during the previous 12 months in the areas of job performance, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to their supervisor for review and evaluation purposes, using the approved format described in the JMU Libraries Instructions for A&P Faculty Annual Evaluations.

2.6.2 Instructional Faculty

University policies and procedures regarding annual evaluations of instructional faculty are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E.4. Annual Evaluation.

2.6.2.1 Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan

By August 31, each faculty member must submit a Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP) for the coming year (July 1 to June 30) to their supervisor, and copy their AUH. The relative weights of the three performance areas must be determined by the faculty member and their supervisor prior to the start of the academic year.
If no individual weights are negotiated, standard weights must be:

- 60% Job Performance
- 20% Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications
- 20% Professional Service

Standard weights for RTA faculty must be:

- 80% Job Performance
- 10% Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications
- 10% Professional Service

The agreement on weights may be renegotiated during the year under appropriate circumstances.

2.6.2.2 Faculty Annual Review

The Faculty Annual Review (FAR) is conducted by the faculty member’s supervisor. Annual evaluations support a variety of decisions including those affecting tenure and promotion and are integral components of PAC reviews. The FAAP and FAR processes completed by faculty and supervisors are inextricably linked to the evaluation under PAC and/or supervisors or the dean’s purview.

As per the Faculty Handbook, III.E.4. Annual Evaluation, “In each of the three performance areas, a faculty member must be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory... In addition to an evaluation in each of the three areas of performance, the faculty member’s overall performance must be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable. A factor in determining overall annual performance must be the relative weight associated with each of the areas of performance.”

The Libraries has adopted earlier deadlines for the FAR process as found in this section than are required by the University. Each faculty member must submit to their supervisor a self-evaluation summarizing activities and accomplishments in the areas of job performance, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service by July 31. The self-evaluation covers the past 12 months, from July 1 to June 30.

The supervisor’s preliminary evaluation of the faculty member is due to the faculty member for review at least one business day before the scheduled annual evaluation conference (see Faculty Handbook III.E.4.d.). The annual evaluation conference must be held before the FAR is finalized, unless both the faculty member and the supervisor agree that no conference is necessary. The supervisor will provide the faculty member with the final version of their evaluation for signing by August 31. As per the Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.f. Deadline, “Any failure to meet this deadline will extend the appeal process by the number of days the written evaluation is late.” Faculty members have a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make a written appeal of their annual evaluation to the PAC. The evaluation process is not final until any appeal has been completed. See Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.g. Appeal and III.E.4.h. Review Criteria, for more information on the appeal process.
The final, official version of the FAR, signed by the faculty member and supervisor must be filed with Libraries HR, with the AUH copied, by October 1.

2.6.3 Faculty Annual Review of Academic Unit Heads

AUHs will be evaluated annually by the dean. For more information, see Academic Affairs Policy #2: Academic Unit Heads.

2.7 Midpoint Review

The PAC and supervisor will independently provide guidance and advice to the faculty member on progress toward promotion and/or tenure at a midpoint. For a tenure-track faculty member, the midpoint review occurs at the midpoint of their probationary period (typically in the third year of employment). For a non-tenure-track faculty member (A&P, Lecturer, or RTA) seeking promotion to associate professor, the midpoint review typically occurs three years before the faculty member intends to apply for promotion.

2.7.1 Procedures

Early in the fall semester, the PAC will notify tenure-track faculty up for midpoint review and put out a call for non-tenure-track faculty intending to submit midpoint review materials. The faculty member must submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of job performance, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the supervisor and PAC by the first day of the spring semester. Materials submitted must cover the time span established in section 2.8.2 (for promotion in rank) or section 2.9.2 (for tenure) in accordance with the faculty member’s next anticipated review.

The PAC may ask for additional documentation or seek clarification on materials during the review process.

The PAC will use the submitted documentation to write a letter to the faculty member undergoing review. The supervisor will independently write a separate letter. The PAC and supervisor drafts must be made available to the faculty member by February 20.

The faculty member must be given the opportunity for separate meetings with the PAC and the supervisor to discuss the draft midpoint letters. This is not a negotiation but rather a chance to hash out questions and deal with issues that the PAC or supervisor might not know about or that a faculty member needs more opportunity to explain. A faculty member may opt out of the meeting by alerting the PAC or supervisor in writing of their wishes to accept the letter as drafted. These meetings must be completed in time for the faculty member under review to deal with any issues well in advance of the next year’s annual goal submissions.

After the meetings with the PAC and supervisor (or the faculty member decision to opt out), final copies of the PAC and supervisor letters must be provided to the faculty member under
review, the supervisor, and the dean by March 15. These documents become part of the academic unit’s record and are filed in the Libraries Human Resources department.

2.8 Promotion in Academic Rank

University policies and procedures regarding promotion of faculty are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E.6. Promotion in Academic Rank.

Faculty members who will apply for promotion must inform the PAC and their supervisor by September 1 of that year. Promotion review materials are due to the PAC and supervisor by October 1. (See Faculty Handbook, III.E.6.b.(1).) Guidelines on preparing promotion review materials are available on the Libraries PAC Hub site.

2.8.1 Compelling Case for Early Promotion

To present a compelling case for early promotion to associate professor, a faculty member of any classification must have completed at least four years as an assistant professor at JMU and be evaluated by the supervisor and PAC as “Excellent” in job performance and scholarship and at least “Satisfactory” in service. The faculty member must also be esteemed in the discipline, as attested by at least three letters of recommendation from prominent people in the discipline.

To present a compelling case for early promotion to full professor, a faculty member must have completed at least four years as an associate professor at JMU and be evaluated by the supervisor and PAC as “Excellent” in job performance, scholarship, and service. The faculty member must also be esteemed in the discipline, as attested by at least three letters of recommendation from prominent people in the discipline.

Candidates for early promotion are evaluated by the supervisor and PAC using the same standards as would apply to any other candidate.

Faculty members who wish to apply for early promotion must consult with the dean about their candidacy by March 1 of the academic year preceding their application. The dean will advise the faculty member on the efficacy of that application by April 1. The dean will choose the above-mentioned “prominent people in the discipline” from lists submitted by the faculty members and their colleagues; the dean will then solicit those recommendations. Outside reviews will be held confidential and not be shared with the faculty member. The faculty member waives the right to see the recommendations by submitting an early application.

2.8.2 Time Span of Activities Considered for Promotion Reviews

The JMU Faculty Handbook specifies the minimum time span in rank before being reviewed for promotion (III.E.6) and the length of the probationary period for tenure (III.E.7.b). This section provides guidance on how far a faculty member may look back when selecting activities and accomplishments to submit in an application for promotion.
Applications for promotion that also include an application for tenure must follow the time span guidelines for tenure in section 2.9.2.

For promotion to the rank of assistant or associate professor, the faculty member must submit for consideration activities and accomplishments from their time in the current rank, unless otherwise specified in their contract or negotiated with the dean. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to inform the PAC and supervisor of any alterations to the faculty member’s promotion time span through their submitted materials.

For promotion to professor, the faculty member must submit for consideration all relevant activities and accomplishments of their entire career, including selected work at prior institutions or in other employment classifications when applicable. Achievements from the faculty member’s time in the current rank must be given more weight by evaluators.

Works in progress but not completed during the time period under review may be submitted for consideration.

The amount of time spent in the current rank before applying for promotion must not be a factor in evaluators’ recommendations, i.e., a faculty member must be reviewed without regard for the number of years spent in a rank. For example, a faculty member applying for promotion to professor would receive the same recommendation regardless of whether their accomplishments were obtained over five years, eight years, or ten years in the rank of associate professor.

2.8.3 Standards

University policies regarding standards for promotion in academic rank are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E.6.a. Standards.

2.8.3.1 Assistant Professor

At least satisfactory ratings in all areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.

2.8.3.2 Associate Professor

An excellent rating in job performance and at least satisfactory ratings in the others are required for promotion to associate professor.

2.8.3.3 Professor

Excellent ratings in two areas (one must be job performance) and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to professor.
2.8.3.4 Senior Lecturer

An excellent rating in job performance and at least satisfactory ratings in the second and third areas are required for promotion to senior lecturer.

2.8.3.5 Principal Lecturer

Excellent ratings in job performance and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to principal lecturer.

2.9 Tenure

University policies and procedures regarding tenure are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E.7. Tenure.

As per the Faculty Handbook, III.E.7. Tenure, “Tenure does not apply to any rank of lecturer or administrative or professional positions within the university. It is a concept with application only to the instructional faculty of the university.”

As per the Faculty Handbook, III.D.4. Renewable-Term Appointments (RTA), RTAs are not candidates for tenure and cannot be awarded tenure.

Faculty members who will apply for tenure must inform the PAC and their supervisor by September 1 of that year. Tenure review materials are due to the PAC and supervisor by October 1. (See Faculty Handbook, III.E.7.f.(1).) Guidelines on preparing tenure review materials are available on the Libraries PAC Hub site.

2.9.1 Compelling Case for Early Tenure

To present a compelling case for early tenure, a faculty member must have completed at least four years as an assistant professor at JMU and be evaluated by the supervisor and PAC as “Excellent” in job performance and scholarship and at least “Satisfactory” in service. The faculty member must also be esteemed in the discipline, as attested by at least three letters of recommendation from prominent people in the discipline.

Candidates for early tenure are evaluated by the supervisor and PAC using the same standards as would apply to any other candidate.

Faculty members who wish to apply for early tenure must consult with the dean about their candidacy by March 1 of the academic year preceding their application. The dean will advise the faculty member on the efficacy of that application by April 1. The dean will choose the above-mentioned “prominent people in the discipline” from lists submitted by the faculty members and their colleagues; the dean will then solicit those recommendations. Outside reviews will be held confidential and not be shared with the faculty member. The faculty member waives the right to see the recommendations by submitting an early application.
Candidates for early tenure may withdraw their application at any point before receiving official notification of a decision. Failure to obtain tenure will result in termination of employment at the end of the probationary period.

2.9.2 Time Span of Activities Considered for Tenure Reviews

When applying for tenure, the faculty member will submit for consideration accomplishments since the start date of their tenure probationary period, or as otherwise documented in their initial employment contract. This may include scholarship and service activities that were already in progress but not yet completed on the faculty member's start date.

2.10 Post-Tenure Review

University policies and procedures regarding post-tenure review are covered in the Faculty Handbook, III.E.8. Post-Tenure Review.

2.11 Faculty Appeals

The process for appeals of annual evaluation decisions is covered in section III.E.4.g of the Faculty Handbook. In the case of an appeal, the Libraries PAC will be the review body. Appeals must be submitted in writing within seven days of receipt of the official written evaluation.

Appeals of promotion and tenure decisions are covered in III.E.6 and III.E.7 of the Faculty Handbook.

3. Criteria

3.1 Introduction

This section provides standards for Job Performance, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications (“scholarship”), and Professional Service (“service”). It applies to midpoint, promotion, and tenure evaluations for all faculty and to instructional faculty annual reviews.

The term “evaluators” in this section refers to anyone responsible for evaluating the performance of faculty members, including AUHs, supervisors, and the PAC.

All Libraries faculty members have the freedom to pursue activities that align with their professional goals and strengths. The Libraries support activities that demonstrate the values of the Libraries, the university, and the faculty member’s profession. While faculty members are expected to be active in job performance, scholarship, and service, quality of work is more important than quantity. Examples are provided and categorized for guidance and are not intended to serve as a checklist or to be an exhaustive list of all qualifying activities.

The areas of performance that must be considered in all performance evaluations are as follows:
3.2 Definition of Areas of Performance

3.2.1 Job Performance

Job performance is understood as each faculty member’s practice of their professional duties, as is appropriate for the individual faculty member’s role in the organization. The components comprising each faculty member’s job performance are delineated in their position description.

3.2.2 Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

The JMU Faculty Handbook, section III.E.2.b.(2), states that Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications “include[s], but need not be limited to, publication of scholarly works, presentations at professional conferences, achievement through performance in the arts, engaging in recognized research, obtaining research grants, continuing professional development through formal course work, publication of educational materials and consulting activities.”

Libraries faculty members are expected to develop and sustain their professional qualifications through professional development and to contribute to their professional field or area of specialization through scholarly achievement. The Libraries defines scholarly achievement as publishing or otherwise disseminating the results of research, applications of knowledge to one’s work, grants, or creative works.

Scholarly achievement may be within one’s professional field or in other academic or professional disciplines. Co-authorship and collaborative projects, both within the Libraries and with colleagues at JMU or other institutions, are encouraged. Each faculty member is responsible for developing their own scholarly agenda and may choose the most appropriate format, venue, and copyright/license for sharing their scholarly work.

The term refereed is defined in this document as published works that have gone through a content review process by an expert in the field in which they are being published. This may be done by a publication’s primary editor or other formal review process.

An event or activity must have concluded by the evaluation deadline to be considered complete. The Libraries recognizes that publication schedules are often out of the author’s control, therefore providing proof that a work is accepted for publication will count as published and thus completed. Works that are currently under review do not count as published.

Activities such as copy editing, peer-reviewing, and indexing the work of others or writing brief descriptive reviews should generally be included under the Service section. In cases where significant analysis or creativity is involved, these activities may be included in the Scholarly Achievement section with explanation.
3.2.3 Professional Service

The JMU Faculty Handbook, section III.E.2.b.(3), states that Professional Service “must include committee service and leadership at James Madison University or in professional or educational organizations, or service otherwise enhancing the profession, academic unit, college or university.” The term “committee” in this section is not limited to standing committees but includes task forces, working groups, advisory boards, and other groups of a similar nature.

Libraries faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that benefit the Libraries, the university, their profession, or the community. The faculty member must actively support the charge of the committee as a contributor or leader and document such work in their evaluation documents. For milestone evaluations, one term counts as a single service activity, regardless of the length of the term. Multiple terms on the same committee count as multiple activities.

3.3 Categorization of Activities

Activities that are part of one’s assigned duties fall under job performance. Activities that are part of one’s service on a committee fall under service unless they are part of one’s assigned duties. It is understood that this might result in the same activity being listed under different areas by different faculty members, or by the same faculty member in different years. Categorizations used in annual reviews must be upheld by evaluators at milestone evaluations.

Faculty members are encouraged to pursue activities that encompass multiple areas of performance. These activities should be clearly documented by the faculty member to indicate their relevance to different areas. For example, a conference presentation should be listed under scholarship, but if the presentation was about a job-related or service project then the project itself should be listed under job performance or service as appropriate. These lists provided are examples and must not be used as an exhaustive checklist of activities. Individuals and supervisors must agree upon categorization during the annual review process.

3.3.1 Categorization of Job Performance

The following list provides examples of job performance. Other activities not listed here may also be counted.

3.3.1.1 Examples of Job Performance Activities

- fulfilling core duties of a faculty member’s job description
- performance as documented on annual evaluations
- outcomes as a result of innovations or efficiencies in job performance
- leadership within the areas of the organization related to one’s position
- research that influences services and activities of the Libraries
3.3.2 Categorization of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications Activities

3.3.2.1 Scholarly Achievement

The following lists provide guidance on how to categorize common scholarly activities for the purpose of assigning ratings. Scholarship activities are categorized based on vetting and the time and effort involved. Category A activities must be vetted (refereed) through external review and thus also involve a significant amount of time and effort. Category B activities are unvetted activities requiring considerable time and effort. Category C activities are unvetted activities that involve a smaller investment of time and effort. Other activities not listed here may also be counted.

3.3.2.1.1 Examples of Scholarly Achievement Activities

Category A

- Authoring or co-authoring a published scholarly book
- Authoring or co-authoring a published, refereed book chapter
- Authoring or co-authoring a published, refereed article or critical review of a resource in a scholarly or professional journal
- Editing or co-editing a published scholarly book
- Contributing significantly to the content of a digital scholarship project (link to guidance document)
- Serving as principal investigator or co-investigator for a major grant award external to the university (for example, an IMLS, NIH, NSF, or Mellon Foundation grant)
- Giving a keynote or other invited presentation at a major academic or professional conference or similar event, such as ACRL, AECT, or ALA
- Curating a scholarly exhibit external to the university at a museum or other similar venue

Category B

- Giving a presentation or workshop at an academic or professional conference
- Presenting a paper at an academic or professional conference
- Giving a scholarly or professional development presentation through a professional organization
- Authoring or co-authoring standards, frameworks, best practices, or a white paper designed for wide dissemination by a professional organization
- Providing supporting contributions to the content of a digital scholarship project (link to guidance document)
- Participating in the curation of a scholarly exhibit external to the university at a museum or other similar venue
- Authoring or co-authoring a non-refereed article in a journal, magazine, or other publication
- Authoring or co-authoring an article for a scholarly reference work
• Providing consulting work within or external to the university that uses scholarly or professional expertise
• Participating in a minor grant award internal or external to the university
• Receiving an award or honor recognizing scholarly work or research or scholarship contributions to the field

Category C

• Moderating or participating in a panel presentation at an academic or professional conference
• Presenting a poster at an academic or professional conference
• Giving a lightning talk at an academic or professional conference
• Providing ancillary contributions to the content of a digital scholarship project (link to guidance document)
• Submitting an external grant application
• Publishing research/scholarly outputs, such as data sets, code or otherwise disseminating new information through publication or a repository
• Curating a scholarly exhibit internal to the university

3.3.2.2 Professional Qualifications

The following lists provide guidance on how to categorize common professional development activities for the purpose of assigning ratings. Category D activities are accredited and/or selective programs that require a significant amount of time and effort, or programs that include formal evaluation of completed coursework. Category E comprises activities that are unaccredited, unselective, and/or less of a commitment. Other activities not listed here may also be counted.

3.3.2.2.1 Examples of Professional Qualifications Activities

Category D

• Completing an application-only intensive seminar or institute
• Completing a course that involves formal evaluation of assignments in a subject that will enhance one’s professional performance
• Earning a degree or certification in any academic or professional discipline beyond what is required for one’s current position
• Participating in a formal course of study leading to a degree or certification

Category E

• Participating in a training course that awards credit based on attendance or participation
• Engaging in a workshop, seminar, webinar, conference presentation, training event, or intentionally documented self-directed development on a topic of relevance to one’s professional performance
### 3.3.3 Categorization of Service Activities

The following lists provide guidance on how to categorize common professional service activities for the purpose of assigning ratings. Service activities are categorized based on their impact and the time commitment and effort involved. Category F activities must demonstrate leadership and/or significant impact, which generally requires a significant commitment of time and effort. Category G activities are those lacking a leadership role and significant impact, or with more moderate investments of time and effort. Category H activities are minimal, one-time commitments. Other activities not listed here may also be counted.

#### 3.3.3.1 Examples of Service Activities

**Category F**

- Leading or co-leading a university committee
- Leading or co-leading a Libraries committee
- Leading or co-leading a professional organization or committee in an elected or appointed position
- Leading a search committee
- Serving on a Libraries, university, or professional committee and providing evidence of demonstrable effort and impact
- Serving as PAC Chair
- Serving on Faculty Senate
- Leading or co-leading a conference planning committee
- Organizing or co-organizing a major outreach, professional development, or mentoring program
- Contributing to the professional literature through serving as editor or co-editor of a scholarly or professional journal

**Category G**

- Serving on a university committee
- Serving on a Libraries committee
- Serving on a departmental working group or task force
- Participating on a committee at the local, state, regional, national, or international level
- Serving as a mentor through a formal arrangement, appointment, or program in the Libraries, on campus, or through a professional organization
- Contributing to the professional literature through editing columns, peer-reviewing, writing brief descriptive reviews, indexing, or annotating
- Participating in a special project outside one’s job responsibilities that benefits the Libraries, its users, or the community
- Conducting a staff seminar or other training opportunity for the Libraries, university, or community on a topic of professional relevance
- Moderating or maintaining a professional discussion forum, website, or email list
- Receiving an award recognizing service contributions
- Participating in a year-long new faculty orientation as a new faculty member
Category H

- Selecting material for a book/resource display
- Volunteering in support of student activities
- Reviewing scholarship or other award or funding applications for the university or a professional organization
- Serving as an external reviewer for promotion and/or tenure applications

3.4 Evaluation Criteria

Faculty members are rated as Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory in each performance area. Evaluators must base ratings on the documented performance of the faculty member within the context of the criteria and standards in this document, and not relative to the performance of other faculty members. For reviews that cover a multiyear period, evaluators should consider the faculty member's cumulative performance when assigning a rating. As per the Faculty Handbook (III.E.6. and III.E.7.e.), the "pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered" when reviewing a faculty member for promotion or tenure, but evaluators "should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations". Evaluators should take into account changes in role, reporting line, and policy that occurred during the faculty member's career. The following criteria are based on a 60/20/20 distribution. Because faculty members can adjust those weights in their FAAP and FAR, evaluators will make commensurate adjustments when applying these criteria in annual evaluations. Faculty are expected to meet the criteria listed below for milestone evaluations regardless of yearly weights. It is up to the individual faculty member to document their contribution to any activity and its impact, significance, and any notable innovations.

3.4.1 Annual Evaluation Criteria

3.4.1.1 Job Performance Criteria

To earn a rating of at least Satisfactory in the area of Job Performance, the faculty member must fulfill the core duties of their job description.

To earn a rating of Excellent in the area of Job Performance, the faculty member must

1) fulfill the core duties of their job description
2) AND demonstrate progress toward additional aspects of job performance such as:
   - taking on new or expanded responsibilities
   - implementing and/or sustaining new or revised services or workflows
   - coordinating services or workflows
   - increasing effectiveness and/or efficiencies of services offered
   - managing projects
   - receiving awards or significant recognition from colleagues and/or constituents related to job performance
   - implementing services, contributing to initiatives, or making new job-related contributions that demonstrate Libraries’ and university values
A rating of Unsatisfactory is assigned when the faculty member does not meet the requirements for a Satisfactory rating or fails to document their individual contributions.

3.4.1.2 Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications Criteria

To earn a rating of Satisfactory in the area of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, the faculty member must satisfy one of the following:

- complete at least one scholarly product from Category C AND complete at least three professional development activities from Category E
- OR provide evidence of engaging in work on a scholarly product from Category A or B (e.g., conducting background research, collecting data for a study, drafting an article) AND complete a minimum of five professional development activities from Category E
- OR complete a minimum of ten professional development activities from Category E.

To earn a rating of Excellent in the area of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, the faculty member must satisfy one of the following:

- complete a minimum of one scholarly product from Category A
- OR complete a minimum of one scholarly product from Category B AND complete a minimum of five professional development activities from Category E
- OR complete a minimum of two scholarly products from Category C AND complete a minimum of five professional development activities from Category E
- OR complete a minimum of one professional development activity from Category D.

A rating of Unsatisfactory is assigned when the faculty member does not meet all the requirements for a Satisfactory rating or fails to document their individual contributions.

3.4.1.3 Professional Service Criteria

To earn a rating of Satisfactory in the area of Professional Service, the faculty member must satisfy one of the following:

- make documented contributions in at least one service activity from Category F
- OR make documented contributions in at least two service activities from Category G
- OR make documented contributions in at least one service activity from Category G AND at least three service activities from Category H
- OR participate in a year-long new faculty orientation as a new faculty member.

To earn a rating of Excellent in the area of Professional Service, the faculty member must satisfy one of the following:

- make documented contributions in a minimum of two service activities from Category F
- OR make documented contributions in a minimum of one service activity from Category F AND in two or more service activities from Category G
- OR make documented contributions in five or more service activities from Category G.
A rating of Unsatisfactory is assigned when the faculty member does not meet all the requirements for a Satisfactory rating or fails to document their individual contributions.

### 3.4.2 Promotion and Tenure Criteria

These criteria are applied to the entire time period under consideration, not a single year.

#### 3.4.2.1 Job Performance Criteria

To earn a rating of at least Satisfactory in the area of Job Performance, the faculty member must fulfill the core duties of their job description.

To earn a rating of Excellent in the area of Job Performance, the faculty member must

1) fulfill the core duties of their job description
2) AND demonstrate additional aspects of job performance such as:
   - taking on new or expanded responsibilities
   - implementing and/or sustaining new or revised services or workflows
   - coordinating services or workflows
   - increasing effectiveness and/or efficiencies of services offered
   - managing projects
   - receiving awards or significant recognition from colleagues and/or constituents related to job performance
   - implementing services, contributing to initiatives, or making new job-related contributions that demonstrate Libraries’ and university values

A rating of Unsatisfactory is assigned when the faculty member does not meet the requirements for a Satisfactory rating or fails to document their individual contributions.

#### 3.4.2.2 Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications Criteria

To earn a rating of Satisfactory in the area of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, the faculty member must

1) complete a minimum of two scholarly products from Category A
2) AND satisfy one of the following:
   - complete a minimum of two scholarly products from Category B
   - complete a minimum of one scholarly product from Category B AND complete a minimum of three scholarly products from Category C
3) AND satisfy one of the following:
   - complete a minimum of one professional development activity from Category D
   - provide evidence of yearly engagement in professional development activities from Category E.
To earn a rating of Excellent in the area of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, the faculty member must

1. complete a minimum of two scholarly products from Category A
2. AND satisfy two of the following:
   - complete one additional scholarly product from Category A
   - complete a minimum of five scholarly products from Category B
   - complete a minimum of three scholarly products from Category B AND complete a minimum of six scholarly products from Category C
3. AND satisfy one of the following:
   - complete a minimum of one professional development activity from Category D
   - provide evidence of yearly engagement in professional development activities from Category E.

A rating of Unsatisfactory is assigned when the faculty member does not meet all the requirements for a Satisfactory rating or fails to document their individual contributions.

### 3.4.2.3 Professional Service Criteria

To earn a rating of Satisfactory in the area of Professional Service, the faculty member must

1. make documented contributions in at least one service activity from Category F
2. AND satisfy one of the following:
   - make documented contributions in at least two service activities from Category G
   - make documented contributions in at least one service activity from Category G AND at least three service activities from Category H.

To earn a rating of Excellent in the area of Professional Service, the faculty member must

1. make documented contributions in a minimum of two service activities from Category F
2. AND satisfy one of the following:
   - make documented contributions in a minimum of six service activities from Category G
   - make documented contributions to four service activities from Category G AND at least four service activities from Category H.
