

**Hunter Library
Collegial Review Document
2010-2011**

**Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:
Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review**

I. Overview

The purpose of annual evaluation, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews is to ensure that the library faculty and, therefore, the services of Hunter Library, are of the highest quality possible. To accomplish this, the Library seeks to attract and retain library faculty who are knowledgeable, professional, collaborative, productive, cooperative, committed to service, and current in the discipline. A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration for annual evaluation, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Library faculty must demonstrate competency in librarianship and share knowledge within forums where such knowledge is subject to the scrutiny and assessment of peers. Each library faculty member has different areas of responsibility, different types of scholarship emphasized, and a different investment in service and engagement. Library faculty members' scholarly activities generally derive from their professional practice, with the fundamental expectation that the results of those activities will be shared with the profession and the academic community. This complex blend of expectations is hard to specify and even harder to quantify. Nevertheless, it is important to provide library faculty members with guidelines to help them develop productive and gratifying professional careers. The guidelines should be specific enough to be practical, yet flexible enough to promote and accommodate individual difference.

This document describes the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to Hunter Library. It is guided by The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina (UNC) and by the Western Carolina University Faculty Handbook. Included are policies issued by General Administration, the Office of the Provost, and Hunter Library. This document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to college/department-level criteria and procedures; however, faculty members should be familiar with both The Code and the Faculty Handbook (particularly section 4.0). Furthermore, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, faculty should also use the "Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier," which is a separate document developed and provided annually by the Office of the Provost.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching/Librarianship (Faculty Handbook Sections 4.04 & 4.08)

Library faculty contribute to the teaching/librarianship, learning, and research mission of Western Carolina University by facilitating access to intellectual content and

information and by teaching skills that promote discernment in the use of information. Therefore, teaching/librarianship quality and effectiveness will be evaluated by an individual's contributions as they pertain to the faculty member's assigned role and specific librarianship responsibilities within Hunter Library.

1. Accomplishments in Teaching/Librarianship

Each library faculty member assumes a professional disciplinary role within Hunter Library and has primary responsibilities associated with that role. In many cases, the disciplinary role is unique within the library (e.g. metadata librarian). In other instances, there may be other faculty who assume similar roles (e.g. research and instruction). In each case, the library faculty member is evaluated on accomplishments in his/her assigned role and areas of responsibility. The type or types of accomplishment used in evaluating a librarian will depend on the nature of her/his role. Accomplishments of the following types are used in evaluating librarian performance.

- a. Accomplishments in effectively managing personnel and other resources and/or ensuring department/unit goals are in concert with overall library and university goals.
- b. Accomplishments in acquiring, organizing, and creating means of access to intellectual content and information resources.
- c. Accomplishments in identifying and developing library collections and resources to ensure they meet the instructional, learning, and research needs of the university.
- d. Accomplishments in assisting patrons in the use of library services and collections by providing direct assistance and instruction in finding, evaluating, and using information.
- e. Accomplishments in assessing, evaluating, and continuously enhancing library operations, resources, and services; strategic and tactical planning; and developing library promotional materials.
- f. Accomplishments in applying and/or developing technology to enhance library services.

In addition, library faculty who are liaisons to academic departments have specific responsibilities as described in Appendix B. Library faculty who are department heads within the library have specific roles and responsibilities as described in Appendix C.

2. Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence

a. Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation of a library faculty member's accomplishments as related to areas of responsibility.

b. Peer Review

Process and method of evaluation by and for all library faculty members in which the dean creates a "Summary of Peer Review" that is shared with the library faculty member during the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) process.

c. Client Assessment

Process used to solicit feedback from appropriate university faculty, staff, and professional colleagues about the performance of individual library faculty members in carrying out their responsibilities.

d. Goal-Evaluation

Evaluation of a library faculty member's progress towards achieving their agreed upon goals.

e. Department Head's Annual Faculty Evaluation

The department head provides the dean a written evaluation for each direct faculty report.

f. Dean's Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) Summary Report

Using all applicable methods and sources of evidence previously listed, the dean will perform an Annual Faculty Evaluation and confer with each library faculty member to create an AFE summary report. This summary report and an agreed upon set of goals for the coming year go in the library faculty member's files.

3. General Comments

a. Professional Development

Information pertaining to an individual's professional development in relation to teaching/librarianship may be included in this area. These activities are positively valued and should be documented and described as appropriate for the specific review event.

b. Characteristics

Regardless of a library faculty member's individual role and area of responsibility, that person should have and be able to demonstrate the following characteristics in the accomplishment of individual goals and responsibilities. The following nine characteristics will be used to assess a library faculty member's teaching/librarianship effectiveness. (Further definitions of these characteristics can be found in Appendix A).

1. Knowledgeable
2. Committed to service
3. Collaborative and cooperative within the organization
4. Creative
5. Demonstrates leadership abilities
6. Effective communicator
7. Forward thinking
8. Respectful and concerned
9. Up to date in areas of knowledge particular to responsibilities/role

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes the four types of creative activity described by Boyer as legitimate forms of scholarship. Specific college/department perspectives on these categories, relative evaluations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.

Using the taxonomy of scholarship provided by Boyer, Hunter Library recognizes that while the teaching/librarianship of librarians is different from that done by most other faculty, many of the primary faculty roles of librarians, roles that they perform on a daily basis and that are appropriately found in the performance category labeled "Teaching/Librarianship" (section II. A.) are scholarly in nature and conform to one or more of the categories of discovery, integration, application, or teaching and learning.

Responsibilities such as reference, cataloging, collection development, information literacy, information and program management, etc., are activities

that can be productive of scholarship for the purposes of annual evaluation, reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and merit for academic librarians (see "Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project," a report produced by the Association of College and Research Libraries to help define and describe the kind of scholarship performed by academic librarians, at <http://www.ala.org/acrl/acrlpubs/whitepapers/academiclibrarianship.cfm>). It is important to recognize that the successful librarian can make significant scholarly contributions to librarianship through a wide variety of activities and publications and that different expressions of scholarly contributions may be appropriate for librarians according to their professional specialties, academic backgrounds, and intellectual interests. Therefore, different librarians might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another; however, all Boyer categories are valued equally.

All scholarly activities of library faculty that result in the production of scholarship, regardless of Boyer category (Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990), are assessed against the following general criteria: (1) the scholarship is subjected to peer review; (2) there is clear evidence that there are well-articulated, realistic goals for the scholarly work, and that the methods chosen for its successful completion are appropriate; (3) the scholarship results in significant and substantive outcomes beyond the scope of the activity itself; and (4) the outcomes are effectively disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community.

These four criteria assist in differentiating the scholarship inherent in the practice of academic librarianship from the mere practice itself and in differentiating the scholarship of application within librarianship from service. Peer review can include traditional, external forms such as journal reviewers, editorial boards, editors, and grant committees. But it can also include a broader community of librarians and scholars outside the library with appropriate expertise and objectivity.

External peer review may be provided by a number of sources outside of the WCU community. Types of work submitted for review to these outside entities include, but are not limited to: proposals accepted for conference presentation or panel discussion; professional publications where manuscripts must undergo review before dissemination; or personal accreditations requiring the submission of a portfolio or the completion of a course of training. Peer review of these materials can be conducted by committees such as those established by (but not limited to) local networks such as the Western North Carolina Library Network (WNCLN), state-wide organizations like the North Carolina Library Association (NCLA) and Business Librarianship in North Carolina (BLINC), regional entities such as the Mid Atlantic Chapter of the Medical Library Association (MAC-MLA), and national professional

organizations such as the American Library Association (ALA). In addition, individuals may seek peer review from colleagues in the wider library world by submitting position papers, treatises, or other researched materials to librarians and information professionals noted within the applicable field of study.

Scholarship that has no obvious external peer review structure in place undergoes peer review by a separate process. For such scholarship, the library identifies qualified library professionals outside Hunter Library with recognized professional standing in the relevant area of scholarly activity and requests independent reviews of the quality and impact of the scholarship in question. The requested reviews are to be based on the Boyer model of scholarship (referenced above), the library's collegial review criteria, and the understanding of scholarship established by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL, a division of the American Library Association) in its *Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project*, <http://www.ala.org/acrlpubs/whitepapers/academiclibrarianship.cfm>. The identified reviewers are supplied the faculty member's scholarship, the library's collegial review document, and a copy of the ACRL whitepaper. When returned, the external reviewer assessments become part of the faculty member's relevant review and assessment documentation.

Because the scope of scholarly activity within librarianship is broad, it can be exemplified in numerous tangible forms. Generally, these forms are of three broad types: scholarly presentation and writing; editing; and contract and grant preparation and management. The following list of examples within each broad type is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive, of the forms that scholarly/creative activity might take.

- Scholarly Writings and Presentations
 - books, monographs, textbooks, book chapters
 - articles or bibliographies relating to librarianship or other academic disciplines
 - presentations at professional meetings
 - other papers and reports (trade, in-house publications, and encyclopedias)
 - translations
 - abstracts and reviews

- development of information systems, computer programs, databases
 - websites
 - research aids such as indexes, thesauri, catalogs, union lists, finding aids, research guides, and bibliographies
 - library and/or university white papers and reports
 - scholarly professional book reviews
- Editing
 - Books
 - journals, or other learned publications
- Grants and Contracts
 - developing and submitting proposals
 - obtaining funding
 - managing grants
 - directing research teams
 - preparing reports
- a. Scholarship of Discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical or literary works.

The scholarship of discovery is defined as the contribution of new knowledge to the discipline of librarianship through systematic methods and the dissemination of findings. Library faculty members apply a wide range of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies in advancing the discipline's knowledge base. They engage in the scholarship of discovery by applying their findings to the everyday challenges of providing library services. Examples of important types of discovery and their outcomes for library faculty members might include:

1. establishing methods for evaluating the effectiveness of library services and processes, such as user satisfaction surveys and user/usage statistics, and producing a position paper on those methods;
 2. researching the effects of environment and library practices on the "life span" of the various information media found in libraries and crafting a presentation on these findings;
 3. analyzing how people see and use information and then presenting that information in a forum such as a conference presentation, network or state committee meeting, publication, position paper, etc.)
 4. preparing and disseminating within the library community analytical bibliographies on topics relevant to future policy-making in librarianship, historical understanding of the profession, or current issues of concern within librarianship;
 5. comparing and analyzing collection evaluation/assessment measures and preparing a report of those findings to cause policy change or provide a professional resource for librarians external to WCU;
 6. conducting citation studies and then publishing those findings in a format accessible to the wider field of librarianship and related individuals; and
 7. carrying out a detailed investigation of the history of the book, recorded knowledge, or the social impacts of information access and use and then presenting those findings.
- b. Scholarship of Integration — Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.

The scholarship of integration is viewed as making connections across disciplines, placing specialties in the larger context. This work is a natural extension of research that closely relates to or overlaps with other academic areas. Academic librarianship draws upon a wide range of other disciplines for knowledge that informs and transforms library work. The considerable extent to which academic library faculty members integrate knowledge from other fields makes for a highly interdisciplinary profession.

Examples of the integration of knowledge from other fields into the

scholarship and practice of librarianship include:

1. drawing upon learning theory in order to design effective instruction;
 2. employing communication theory to improve the reference interview and establish sound communication throughout the library organization;
 3. applying the findings of ergonomic studies to the design of space for library users and personnel that will be conducive to human work and comfort;
 4. protecting for future generations of scholars the library's collections from environmental and usage-imposed dangers by means of preservation theory and techniques;
 5. assisting users by interpreting and analyzing the components of their information needs and helping construct efficient and comprehensive research strategies, often requiring a thorough knowledge of the literature of several disciplines;
 6. integrating administrative and management techniques into the operation of a complex service organization;
 7. advising fellow faculty about the constraints of copyright and the allowances for educational fair use of copyrighted materials in print and multimedia formats; and
 8. employing behavioral and social psychology in the construction of libraries and knowledge and information management methods and systems.
- c. Scholarship of Application — Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.

The scholarship of application is defined as the application of new knowledge within the context of librarianship. By employing the results of the scholarship exemplified in previous sections, library faculty members strive to improve and refine their processes and programs. Such improvements include developing new models of practice, based on specialized research, that contribute new knowledge or question old assumptions. Many of the typical activities of reference librarians, catalogers, bibliographers, and other librarians, when fully described, fit this Boyer category.

A library faculty member applies the theory and knowledge gained through inquiry, integration, and pedagogical experimentation to meeting the research and learning needs of the academic community. Examples may include:

1. developing new or updating existing library-specific initiatives;
 2. preparing significant library or university resources; and
 3. directing special projects to enhance the library's impact and effectiveness.
- d. Scholarship of Teaching — Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

The scholarship of teaching and learning is viewed as the transformation or extension of existing knowledge through engagement in teaching and learning activities. The scholarship of teaching for librarians involves developing, testing, and improving pedagogical techniques for meeting library instruction and information literacy objectives, and communicating to peers the results of testing the techniques.

2. Methods of Evaluation

As previously indicated, library faculty make scholarly contributions to librarianship through a wide variety of creative activities, represented by an equally broad variety of scholarly productions. Regardless of the Boyer category involved or the specific form of scholarship produced (e.g. report, resource guide, website, etc.), Hunter Library's view of scholarship is based on a model of continuous growth and improvement in the library faculty member's professional role. Value is placed on a sustained scholarly focus; special emphasis is given to the quality and impact of scholarship on the mission and services of Hunter Library, WCU, the Western North Carolina Library Network, the UNC system, and the profession of librarianship.

Scholarship at Hunter Library is based on the notion of a "unit" of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. The library's Collegial Review Committee (CRC) will judge whether a unit has been attained in individual cases, and will use the following norms as general value guidelines:

- a. Service, operational method, and program initiatives and enhancements that have a beneficial impact on a larger number of

patrons will have greater value than those affecting fewer patrons.

- b. Published scholarship is more highly valued than unpublished.
- c. Work published in a peer-reviewed journal is valued more highly than work published in a journal publication that is not peer-reviewed.
- d. Activity published in a discipline-recognized journal is more highly valued than work published in internal publications.
- e. Presentation at a national conference is more highly valued than presentations at regional, state-wide, or local conferences.
- f. Conference addresses/presentations are more highly valued than poster presentations.
- g. Development of wholly new services and service aids is valued more highly than updating, revising, or adapting established services and programs.
- h. Technical documents, reports, training manuals, “white papers,” and other internally focused documents will be differentially evaluated based on such factors as their scope, service impact, size, etc.
- i. Published books will be more highly valued than published articles, bibliographies, and book chapters.
- j. External grants are more highly valued than internal grants.
- k. Applying for grants, even when unsuccessful, is more highly valued than not applying for grants.
- l. Scholarship based on service, operational methods, and program initiatives and enhancements will be judged differently based on the degree to which they foster and improve abilities to discover and deliver information, information sources, and information instruction, as well as on the scope of impact of the initiatives.

The library will use these general guidelines to determine “unit” totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Although what constitutes a “unit” cannot be determined with absolute certainty in advance, the following rough equivalencies should prove helpful with regard to informing the candidate, the Collegial Review Committee, and the process itself. Scholarship of especially high value (Category A) will normally equate to three units, while others will normally equate to two units (Category B), one (Category C), or one-half (Category D). It is important to understand and recognize that the following

equivalencies are approximate examples and do not exhaust, or represent, all the possible ways in which units can be obtained.

- Category A – three units
 - Authorship of a librarianship-related article in a journal that is widely regarded as having high scholarly or professional status
 - Authorship of the first edition of a scholarly treatise or text within the discipline
 - Editorship of a book, professional journal, or peer-reviewed journal related to librarianship
- Category B – two units
 - Authorship in a peer-reviewed or professional, less than top-tier, journal
 - Presentation or address at a national or international conference
 - Authorship of a book chapter
 - Awardee of a successful external grant proposal
 - Presenting evidence of the demonstrable quality and effect that one's original policy, practice, technological development, or library service has had outside of WCU. This evidence may come in the form of a publication or through the external peer review process established in section II.B.1 of this document.
- Category C – one unit
 - Proposal selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process for inclusion in a state-wide or regional conference
 - Awardee of a selective internal grant
 - Authorship/developer of a new database reviewed by peers outside of the university
 - Creator of a new information literacy instruction module submitted to peer review venue such as Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching (*MERLOT*) or the American Library Association's Peer-

Reviewed Instructional Materials Online (*PRIMO*)

- Developer of a new Web 2.0 source/function (reviewed by peers outside of the university) that enhances university-wide discovery and delivery of information resources
 - Developer of a new operational method/process (reviewed by peers outside of the university) that significantly enhances discovery and delivery of information resources
 - Developing new research and subject research guides and then having those resources reviewed by a subject-specific entity external to WCU (see section II.B.1 for external peer review requirement and process)
- Category D – one-half unit (candidates presenting scholarship exclusively of type illustrated below should expect to provide more extensive evidence and support of its professional impact and quality)
 - Scholarly resource review or abstract in a professional source such as ChemAbstracts, Choice, Library Journal, *MERLOT*, or *PRIMO*
 - Presentation at a local conference, symposium, seminar
 - Creating research aids such as indexes, thesauri, catalogs, or finding lists reviewed external to WCU
 - Developing library and/or university publications and reports based on original research or an analysis of research conducted by others

3. General Comments

a. Professional Development

Information pertaining to an individual's professional development activities in relation to scholarship may be included in this area. These activities are positively valued and should be documented and described as appropriate for the specific review event. All scholarly work must undergo external validation as previously described. (see II.B.1)

b. Guidelines

These guidelines and examples are neither absolute, nor exhaustive,

and are intended to be illustrative, serving as typical examples of scholarship within the library profession. The library recognizes that because of the varied nature of librarian roles there may be many specific scholarly activities of high quality and impact that are not included and that constitute legitimate library scholarship. It will be the responsibility of candidates to defend their activities as scholarship, especially if these activities are extraordinary in nature, form, or extent. For example, since some of the forms of scholarship identified in Category D above may be non-traditional, candidates presenting work solely of that kind, should expect to provide more extensive support of its impact and quality. A candidate may request a prior review of proposed activities in order to get feedback. This request, review, and feedback can be part of the annual review process. In all cases presented scholarship must have undergone some appropriate form of external peer review (once again, see section II.B.1).

The relative weights and values suggested for different, specific forms of scholarship take into account that librarians' work schedules too often make it difficult to perform and conduct extended research: they usually engage in assigned professional activity 40 hours per week and work 12-month, rather than academic year, contracts.

C. Service (4.04.C.3 and 4.05.D)

The library greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. Service is any professionally related activity that is not scholarship or teaching/librarianship that provides support and contributes to the greater good of a program area, department, college, the university, the Western North Carolina Library Network, the UNC system, the community, or the library or related professions.

1. Types of Service

- a. Institutional service to the library, the Western North Carolina Library Network, the university, and the UNC system.

This type of service embraces activities that sustain and enable these bodies to carry out their goals. Examples of applicable activities include:

1. providing leadership in, or making significant contributions to, library or university committees or other appointed, elected, or ad-hoc groups;
2. developing and/or revising major policy documents;

3. participating in faculty governance;
4. mentoring other faculty and staff;
5. representing the university for its advancement;
6. assisting in the development of international programs and exchanges;
7. collaborating or partnering with university units to develop programs that support library, Western North Carolina Library Network, university, or UNC system missions;
8. mentoring student groups;
9. recruiting students; and
10. working on search committees.

b. Community Engagement and Service to the Discipline of Librarianship

This type of service contributes to the function and effectiveness of the library faculty member's profession and discipline. Examples of applicable service activities include:

1. holding a leadership position in organizations;
2. organizing workshops for professional groups;
3. serving on accreditation bodies;
4. writing reviews of external colleagues' work in support of tenure, promotion, or professional awards or acknowledgments; and
5. participating on committees of professional organizations.

c. Service to External Communities, Unusual Time Commitments, or Exceptional Leadership

This type of service benefits external communities such as governmental agencies, industry, or the arts, or requires special expertise, unusual time commitments, exceptional leadership, etc. In these service activities, academic knowledge intersects with practical affairs and problem solving or goes beyond regular service

commitments. Examples include:

1. interpreting technical information for a variety of audiences;
2. conducting tours of Hunter Library for outside groups;
3. writing summaries of research, policy analyses, or position papers for the general public and targeted audiences;
4. testifying before the legislature and Congressional committees;
5. editing newsletters in one's field or discipline;
6. serving as an expert for the press or other media;
7. developing solutions to meet the information needs of external communities;
8. collaborating with schools, other libraries, or civic agencies to develop policies or programs that advance the library's or university's mission;
9. organizing and managing community conferences; and
10. advising students.

2. Method of Evaluation And Sources of Evidence

a. Documentation of Service Activity

Documentation of service activities may include the following:

1. description of service activities;
2. summary of responsibilities and activities; and
3. analysis of work accomplished.

b. Documented Service Outcomes

Documentation of the service outcomes may be collected in a library faculty member's portfolio and include such items as:

1. documentation of the number of people served or benefited;

2. official documents and reports resulting from the activity;
3. illustrations of ways in which the service activity enhanced the library, the university, the Western North Carolina Library Network, the UNC system, or the discipline;
4. log of activities (e.g., programs presented); and
5. documentation of the activity's visibility (e.g., newspaper clippings, etc.)

c. Judgments of Service

To help appraise the value of a service activity an evaluation may be completed. The following are examples of activity appraisal methods:

1. evaluations and letters from receivers of service;
2. evaluations from sponsoring organizations; and
3. evaluations from faculty colleagues and other peers.

d. Eminence Measures

Following are other potential measures of the impact and quality of a service activity:

1. honors or awards recognizing service and
2. election or appointment as an officer in an organization.

e. Self Reflection and Appraisal

Self reflection and appraisal are also valuable methods of evaluating a service activity. Examples of these methods include:

1. journals and logs and
2. self appraisal of career goals, development, and achievement in service.

3. General Comments

Professional Development

Information pertaining to an individual's professional development activities

in relation to service may be included in this area. These activities are positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific event.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview

All library faculty members, regardless of status, are evaluated each spring according to the currently approved plan. For those undergoing Post-Tenure Review, the AFE process is replaced by the library's post-tenure review process. The Office of the Provost determines deadlines for completion of the review process. A library faculty member's performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. The purpose of the AFE is to:

- a. communicate peers' evaluation of a faculty member's work;
- b. prompt faculty members to increase the quality of their work;
- c. promote continuing scholarship;
- d. provide an assessment tool for reappointment, tenure, or promotion decisions; and
- e. provide a basis for distribution of merit funds.

2. Composition of Review Committee

a. Peer Review

After the completion of the AFE files, the Dean of Library Services shall meet with each member of the library faculty. At this meeting, the faculty member has the opportunity to review and evaluate the past year's performance of all other members of the library faculty using AFE files and their own experiences. Based on these discussions, the dean creates a "Summary of Peer Review" to be shared with the library faculty member before meeting with her/him to discuss the summative results.

b. Client Assessments

The Client Review Evaluation Instrument (Appendix D) for library faculty members is intended to be the equivalent of a student

evaluation form used to evaluate the teaching faculty. The client review instrument is included in the AFE process only for tasks in which the individual performance of a library faculty member can be isolated and evaluated by library clients. It will be used to solicit feedback from appropriate university faculty, staff, and professional colleagues about the performance of individual library faculty members in carrying out their responsibilities. This feedback provides external assessments of faculty members' performance in all major facets of their primary responsibilities. While the number of client reviews for each library faculty member may vary, typically there shall be at least three client reviews included in each AFE file.

Each library faculty member, except those undergoing Post-Tenure Review, will submit a list of individuals capable of commenting on the faculty member's performance during the past year. This list is to be submitted to the Dean of Library Services by a date in the early spring that is keeping with the calendar schedule developed annually by the provost. The list should not include departmental liaisons, as these will be automatically included. The Dean of Library Services may solicit input from appropriate individuals not on the submitted list. Client review evaluation forms will be sent by the dean; completed forms should be returned within two weeks.

Library faculty members may distribute client review forms to be included in their AFE file at any time of the year. Library faculty members must inform the Dean of Library Services that a client has already received an evaluation form. The library's administrative office will hold completed client review forms until the creation of the AFE file, at which time all available client review forms will be added to the file. Library faculty members may look at their client review forms at any time, but may not remove forms from their files.

Copies of the completed forms will be made available to library faculty members to include in their dossier files.

c. Dean's Evaluation and AFE Conference

The dean will write an AFE summary of each faculty member's overall performance, including the results of peer review, client review evaluation and the department head's evaluation. The dean's assessment of goal accomplishment will also be included. This written summary, the AFE Statement, will be reviewed with each faculty member during the AFE conference. During the conference, the Dean and the library faculty member will also discuss the "Summary of Peer Review," client evaluation instruments, department head's review, and progress toward accomplishment of the year's goals. The dean and the

faculty member, who also will have discussed goals with their department head will also agree upon a set of goals for the coming year.

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

- a. All library faculty members will prepare an AFE file using the format of the university TPR dossier. This AFE file will cover the previous year's accomplishments in the faculty member's area of responsibilities (teaching/librarianship equivalent – section 4), scholarship activities (section 5), service (section 6), and professional development (section 7). The AFE document includes:
- b. Self-Evaluation of Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship, Service, and Professional Development
- c. Goal Evaluation and Goal Setting Proposal

The Self-Evaluative Statement area of the TPR dossier will be used in AFE files (as a subsection of Section 1) for both the goal evaluation and goal setting proposal.

Before completing the AFE document, all non-department head library faculty members will meet with their department heads to discuss progress toward achieving the year's goals and propose goals for the coming year. Library faculty members who are department heads will propose their own goals and review them with the Dean of Library Services.

- d. Samples of Work/Portfolio

Representative, tangible materials resulting from faculty members' activities within their teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service may be submitted in a portfolio (paper format where possible and electronic or other format if paper is not applicable).

4. Specific Guidelines for Preparation of the AFE File

Use the same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR Dossier, but to a more limited degree:

- a. Appendix A. (not used during the AFE)
- b. Appendix B. Current vita.

- c. Appendix C. (not used during the AFE)
- d. Appendix D. (not used during AFE)
- e. Appendix E. Completed client assessment forms.
- f. Appendix F. Documented outcomes of teaching/librarianship accomplishments for the most recent 12 months.
- g. Appendix G. Documentation of scholarly activities for the most recent 12 months.
- h. Appendix H. Documentation of service activities outcomes for the most recent 12 months.
- i. Appendix I. Optional and will include goal-setting proposal for the coming year.

B. Reappointment, Tenure, And Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)

1. Overview

The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the Dean of Library Services will confirm and/or correct this list and notify the Office of the Provost.

2. Composition of Review Committees

The library Collegial Review Committee (CRC) shall be chaired by the Dean of Library Services (non-voting) and shall be composed of up to six tenured library faculty members elected annually by the library faculty. In the event that there are six or fewer tenured library faculty, the committee shall be composed of the Dean of Library Services and tenured library faculty, providing that the resultant committee shall consist of at least three members, exclusive of the dean. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured library faculty members, the provost, in consultation with the dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three members.

Departmental review committees shall be constituted according to the composition directions of the Faculty Handbook.

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

- a. Each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, uses the provost's detailed instructions for preparing the dossier to create a file.

The candidate shall also use Hunter Library's College Review Document and the review process timetable.

- b. After the department review committee's and department head's reviews, the library CRC will meet and review each group of files in timetable order by last name and make recommendations to the Dean of Library Services for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.
- c. After a library faculty member's reappointment file is reviewed at each level, the recommendations and votes at each level will be communicated to the candidate in a manner prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, typically within five business days.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Overview

These guidelines are based on section 4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured library faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured library faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.

2. Composition of Review Committee

The library post-tenure review committee shall be comprised of all tenured library faculty, including the Dean of Library Services, who serves in a non-voting, ex-officio capacity. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured library faculty, the provost, in consultation with the dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three members.

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

- a. The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR with the annual TPR schedule, which is distributed at the beginning of the academic year.
- b. The documentation prepared by the library faculty member should generally follow the structure and format of both the TPR Dossier and the college/departmental AFE File described previously.
 1. Prepare a brief (two to three page) Self-Evaluative Statement highlighting teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service achievements over the past five years since the most recent

promotion or PTR.

2. Include the AFE files prepared for each of the past four years.
 3. Prepare a single set of appendices following the labeling and structure described previously (III.A.4) for the AFE file. In this case, include the four most recent AFE Statements written by the dean and/or department head, plus any rebuttals, in Appendix C.
- c. The committee presents its written evaluation to the Dean of Library Services. The dean shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the library faculty member and shall meet with the member to discuss the review. The dean adds his or her review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forwards this material to the provost.
 - d. See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.

Sections I, II, and III approved by:

Dana M. Sally
Dean, Library Services

July 15, 2010
Date

Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The Criteria for Meeting Expectations in the Library

The criteria specific to each form of review and each type of promotion are described in detail below.

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation: (4.05)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration. Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate the following characteristics and qualities in the accomplishment of their individual goals and responsibilities as described in Appendix A.

2. Scholarship

A library faculty member should have regular, ongoing, documented scholarly activity and production. See Section II.B for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units).

3. Service

The library greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. Service is expected to increase over a library faculty member's employment. See Section II.C. for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and documentation.

4. General Comments

B. Reappointment: (4.06)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate the criteria/characteristics in the accomplishment of their individual goals and responsibilities as described in

Appendix A.

2. Scholarship

A library faculty member should have continuing and regular scholarly activity and production with documented outcomes during the latter portion of the probationary period. See Section II.B for a full description of methods of evaluation and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units).

3. Service

The library greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. Service is expected to increase over a library faculty member's employment. See Section II.C. for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

4. General Comments

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate the criteria/characteristics in the accomplishment of their individual goals and responsibilities as described in Appendix A.

2. Scholarship

A library faculty member should have continuing and regular scholarly activity and production with documented outcomes. See Section II.B. of this document for a full description of the methods of evaluation, expectations, criteria, and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units) regarding scholarship requirements.

3. Service

The library greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A library faculty member is expected to have participated in service activities at all levels (Library, WNCLN, University, and external community). See Section II.C. for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

4. General Comments

A library faculty member must have a terminal degree from an ALA-accredited program and show evidence of achievement and promise for sustained contributions to the institution in the areas of professional competency, scholarship, and service.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate at a high level of proficiency in all criteria characteristics described in Appendix A in the accomplishment of their individual goals and responsibilities. Promotion to associate professor requires progressive, demonstrated excellence across all domains of evaluation: librarianship, scholarship and service.

2. Scholarship

A library faculty member should have continuing and regular scholarly production with documented outcomes. See Section II.B for a full description of methods of evaluation and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units). Normal scholarship expectations are typically exceeded in promotion to the associate rank.

3. Service

The library faculty greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A library faculty member is expected to have participated in service activities at all levels (Library, WNCLN, University, and external community) and will have demonstrated excellence in this domain. See Section II.C.

4. General Comments

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires sustained, progressive, and high level attainment in each of the three evaluative domains of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service. Demonstrated excellence across all three domains is the standard.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate at a superior level the criteria/characteristics in the accomplishment of their individual goals and responsibilities as described in Appendix A. Promotion to full professor requires progressive, demonstrated excellence in this domain of evaluation over a sustained professional career.

2. Scholarship

A library faculty member should have continuing and regular scholarly activity and production with documented outcomes. Normal scholarly production expectations are exceeded, see Section II.B for criteria and method of evaluation for entry into this rank.

3. Service

The library faculty greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A library faculty member is expected to have participated in service activities at all levels (Library, WNCLN, University, and external community).

4. General Comments

Promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires sustained, progressive, and superior attainment in each of the three evaluative domains of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A library faculty member's teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate satisfactory levels of performance relative to the criteria/characteristics described in Appendix A in the accomplishment of their individual goals and responsibilities.

2. Scholarship

A library faculty member should have continuing and regular scholarly activity and production with documented outcomes in his/her post-tenure period. Scholarly production should continue at the normal expectation level throughout the post-tenure period, unless in the absence of other agreements. See Section II.B for criteria and methods of evaluation for this domain.

3. Service

The library faculty greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A library faculty member is expected to have participated in service activities at all levels (Library, WNCLN, University, and external community). See Section II.C.

4. General Comments

During the post-tenure period, absent other agreements, faculty are expected to meet the performance criteria described above.

Approved by:

Dana M. Sally
Dean of Library Services

July 15, 2010
Date

[Signature]
Provost

7-15-10
Date

APPENDIX A

Evaluative Characteristics for Accomplishments

Regardless of library faculty members' individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate the following characteristics in the accomplishment of individual goals, roles and responsibilities. These evaluative characteristics will be used as a guide in formulating assessments and comments for Peer Review during the AFE and TPR process in regard to the manner in which responsibilities are executed. They may also be used as goals for a library faculty member's professional working relationships.

- Collaborative and cooperative within the organization
Works well with groups such as committees, colleagues, etc., and is an active participant. Makes connections and creates partnerships with others outside the department and the library (e.g., university faculty, the community, the library profession).
- Committed to service
Demonstrates a commitment to the service of all library users and colleagues and has a willingness to help others.
- Creative
Demonstrates creative problem-solving and adapts well to change. Generates new ideas.
- Demonstrates leadership abilities
Uses good judgment in dealing with others. Follows through on tasks and meets deadlines. Deals effectively with administrative problems. Reacts quickly and appropriately to solve problems.
- Effective communicator
Communicates clearly and thoughtfully, listens actively, and adapts communication/presentation style (both written and spoken) to particular audiences and users.
- Forward thinking
Recognizes one's role within the "bigger process of making informed decisions."
Demonstrates good planning, defines goals (based on departmental and institutional mission, strategic plan, and core values), sets priorities, establishes a focus, and periodically evaluates goals.
- Knowledgeable
Demonstrates knowledge in one's area of librarianship. Shares expertise with colleagues readily.
- Respectful and concerned
Shows respect, courtesy, and concern for both users and colleagues. Encourages and

supports others. Aware of one's own strengths and weaknesses. Faces problems with colleagues realistically.

- Timely by striving to increase their knowledge
Up-to-date with trends, developments, literature, and theories in the fields of librarianship, higher education, and, if applicable, one's area of liaison responsibility.

--as inspired by documentation from Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL), Special Libraries Association (SLA), and the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) division of the American Library Association (ALA) and previous versions of the Hunter Library TPR document.

APPENDIX B

The Role of the Liaison

The role of the liaison is to be an information resource to the assigned academic department(s); its faculty and students. This role includes selecting appropriate library materials, keeping current on departmental plans, concerns, information needs, and curricular and discipline trends. The liaison will be the department's primary point person in the library as well as the library's primary point person on matters related to that department. This role requires that the library faculty member maintain an active engagement with the academic department.

There are many ways to achieve these aims, among them are:

- Be familiar with the library's holdings that support the department's curriculum. Share information with the department and the library about the collection's strengths and weaknesses.
- Be familiar with the trends and concerns of the academic department and its programs.
- Attend departmental functions, such as symposia, colloquia, presentations, etc.
- Be familiar with the areas of specialty and the research interests of the departmental faculty.
- Be familiar with the major issues in the discipline (scan major publications, subscribe to discussion groups, etc.).
- Be familiar with the course requirements and their relationship to the library.
- Be responsible for getting the appropriate library staff involved in meeting the needs of the department (e.g. the liaison is not expected to do all the library-related work for the department). For example, the liaison may or may not be the most appropriate person to do BI for a particular course.
- Establish a rapport with members of the department
- Provide consultative services such as advising on how to incorporate information literacy assignments into classes or doing mediated searches.
- Co-publish or team teach with departmental faculty members.
- Be appropriately involved.

APPENDIX C

Roles and Responsibilities of Library Department Heads

- STRATEGIC PLANNING
 - Translates and communicates the library vision, mission, and values into department goals and objectives.
 - Develops a yearly departmental Action Plan and evaluates progress.
 - Identifies short and long term operational needs and develops appropriate options to fulfill needs in an effective manner.
 - Effectively leads department through change.

- MANAGEMENT
 - Communicates department goals to Dean of Library Services, Units Heads and the library
 - Provides data and analysis of data for statistical reporting and assessment purposes
 - Implements Action Plan
 - Chairs regular department meetings
 - Effectively uses physical space assigned to the department. Reports facilities needs and concerns of the department to the dean.
 - Effectively represents the department on library and consortia committees
 - Keeps abreast through participation on appropriate listservs and reading literature on trends and developments in libraries as it relates to the department.
 - Cooperates with and considers other departments in the accomplishment of their department responsibilities
 - Establishes and communicates policies and procedures related to their departments
 - Prepares an annual report of department activities
 - Provides appropriate information and reports requested by the Dean of Library Services and other administrative offices

- BUDGET
 - Effectively manages department budget and personnel allocations
 - Oversees expenditures and prioritizes demands on resources
 - Prepares department financial, personnel, travel, etc. requests and submits them by the deadline
 - Understands the library's overall budget and how the department resource needs relate to it
 - Effectively communicates the library's budget decisions and the rationale behind them to the department

- LEADERSHIP
 - Represents the department to all library staff
 - Recruits high-quality staff for the library
 - Initiates, encourages and provides opportunities for staff development and growth

- Encourages staff participation in library activities
 - Where appropriate, participates in library governance
 - Where appropriate, seeks opportunities for external funding
 - Shares information and ideas with the wider library community
 - Participates in academic or professional associations related to department needs
 - Delegates tasks and responsibilities appropriately including actively grooming staff to step into roles of greater responsibility
 - Demonstrates interpersonal relations that foster a professional environment.
 - Reports unsafe and hazardous conditions
- PERSONNEL
 - Coordinates and provides leadership in the recruitment, appointment, training and placement of permanent and temporary employees to ensure optimal functioning of the department
 - Orients new staff members to their responsibilities, introduces them to their peers
 - Manages interpersonal conflict and relations in a fair, equitable and professional manner
 - Provides fair assessment of each staff member's performance. Documents performance issues promptly and thoroughly so they can be handled appropriately.
 - Prepares recommendations for in-range salary increases and for staff reclassification when appropriate
 - Ensures that all personnel related monthly and annual documentation are completed correctly and meet library and university deadlines
 - Supervises and evaluates department staff providing feedback for development
 - Deals with underperformance and incompatibility according to university policy and guidelines
 - Arranges effective and equitable distribution of staff responsibilities

APPENDIX D

Client Review Evaluation Form

*Your input is an important component of the Library's Annual Faculty Evaluations.
We appreciate your timely response to this request for your input.*

Evaluation of Library Faculty Member

during the 20__ – 20__ Academic Year

1. In what capacity have you worked with this librarian (check all that apply)?

- Provided library instruction for my classes
- Assisted my department in ordering library materials
- Worked with me on a special project. Please briefly describe

_____ Other. Please briefly describe

2. How often have you worked with this librarian during the past academic year?

0 times 1 – 2 times 3 – 5 times 6 or more times

3. How well did the librarian understand your needs?

very well moderately well satisfactory poorly

4. How would you rate the effort of the librarian in attempting to meet your needs?

very good moderately good satisfactory poor

5. How effective was he or she?

very effective moderately effective satisfactory poor

Please provide any clarification or other comments you feel would be helpful in evaluating this librarian.

Signature _____ Department _____ Date _____

Please sign and return this form to the Dean of Library Services, 250 Hunter Library