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 Content Organization and Management (COM) faculty and, therefore, the services of COM and Hunter Library, are of the highest quality possible. To accomplish this, COM seeks to attract and retain library faculty who are knowledgeable, professional, collaborative, productive, cooperative, committed to service, and current in the discipline. A COM 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. COM faculty must demonstrate competency in librarianship and share knowledge within forums where such knowledge is subject to the scrutiny and assessment of peers. Each COM faculty member has different areas of responsibility, different types of scholarship emphasized, and a different investment in service and engagement. COM 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. The guidelines presented in this document are intended to 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 the COM Department of 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 (WCU) Faculty Handbook. This document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures; however, faculty members should be familiar with both The Code and the Faculty Handbook (particularly section 4.0). The COM department adheres to the University Standards for Collegial Review (Faculty Handbook 4.04.C). 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)
COM faculty contribute to the teaching/librarianship, learning, and research mission of WCU by facilitating access to intellectual content and information, and collaborating with others to 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 COM faculty member assumes a professional disciplinary role within Hunter Library and has primary responsibilities associated with that role. In each case, the COM faculty member is evaluated on accomplishments in his/her assigned role and areas of responsibility. The type(s) of accomplishment used in evaluating a librarian will depend on the nature of her/his role. In addition, library faculty who are liaisons to academic departments have specific responsibilities as described in Appendix A. Accomplishments of the following types are used in evaluating librarian performance:

a. Managing personnel and other resources effectively and ensuring department/unit goals are in concert with overall library and university goals.

b. Identifying and developing library collections and resources to ensure they meet the instructional, learning, and research needs of the university.

c. Acquiring, organizing, and creating means of access to intellectual content and information resources.

d. Assisting patrons in the use of library services and collections by providing direct assistance and instruction in finding, evaluating, and using information.

e. Assessing, evaluating, and continuously enhancing library operations, resources, and services; strategic and operational planning; and developing library promotional materials.

f. Applying and/or developing technology to enhance library services.

2. Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence

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

b. Peer review process within the COM department and Hunter Library.
c. Upward evaluation to solicit feedback from employees who report to a COM faculty member.

d. Optional external review to solicit feedback from appropriate university faculty, staff, and professional colleagues.

e. Evaluation of a library faculty member’s progress towards achieving their agreed upon performance goals.

f. Department Head’s Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) Statement

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. Scholarship and Creative Works (Faculty Handbook 4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types of creative activity described by Boyer (1990). Specific department perspectives on these categories, relative valuation of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples are described in this section. The COM department recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another; however, all Boyer categories are valued equally.

a. Scholarship of Discovery: original research that advance knowledge.

b. Scholarship of Integration: synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.

c. Scholarship of Application: application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.

d. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: systematic study of teaching and learning process.

"Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project," a report produced by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL, a division of the American Library Association) defines and describes the kind of scholarship performed by academic librarians. (See http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/academiclibrarianship or Appendix B.) Many of the roles that COM faculty perform on a daily basis can be productive of scholarship for the purposes of annual evaluation,
reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and merit for academic librarians. 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.

All creative activities of library faculty that result in the production of scholarship, regardless of Boyer category, are assessed against the following general criteria: (1) the scholarship is subjected to external 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.

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 ACRL. The identified reviewers are supplied the faculty member’s scholarship, the COM department’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.

2. Methods of Evaluation

COM’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 (WNCLN), the UNC system, and the profession of librarianship.

The normal expectation for scholarship within the COM department is an average of one “unit” of work per year. The Collegial Review Committees (CRC) will judge whether a unit has been attained in individual cases.

3. The Collegial Review Committees (CRC) will use the guidelines below 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 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 an article in a peer-reviewed or professional journal within the discipline of librarianship that is widely regarded as having high scholarly or professional status
  - Authorship of the first edition of a monograph 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 significant 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**
  - Presentation or address in a state-wide or regional conference
  - Awardee of a selective internal grant
  - Developer of a new Web-based application or service (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

- Category D – one-half unit

  - 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

  - Poster sessions, roundtable discussions, moderating panel discussions, or similar conference activities

  - 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.

4. General Comments

Guidelines for Scholarship

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 must 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 of this document).

Librarians usually engage in assigned professional activity 40 hours per week and work 12 month, rather than academic year, contracts. This schedule too often makes it difficult to perform and conduct extended research. The relative weights
and values suggested for different, specific forms of scholarship take this into account.

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

The library greatly values service, and all COM 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, WNCLN, the UNC system, the community, or the library or related professions.

1. Types of Service

a. Institutional service to the library, 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, 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 COM department faculty member's profession and discipline. Examples of applicable service activities include:

1. holding a leadership position in organizations related to the profession of librarianship;

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. Serving on committees of WNCLN, NC LIVE, or similar organizations;

2. interpreting technical information for a variety of audiences;

3. conducting tours of Hunter Library for outside groups;

4. writing summaries of research, policy analyses, or position papers for the general public and targeted audiences;

5. testifying before the legislature and Congressional committees;

6. editing newsletters or columns in one's field or discipline;

7. serving as an expert for the press or other media;
8. developing solutions to meet the information needs of external communities;

9. collaborating with schools, other libraries, or civic agencies to develop policies or programs that advance the library’s or university’s mission;

10. organizing and managing community conferences; and

11. advising students.

2. Method of Evaluation And Sources of Evidence

   a. Official documents and reports resulting from the activity;

   b. Documentation of the number of people served or benefited;

   c. Analysis of work accomplished, possibly to include self-appraisal of career goals, development, and achievement in service.

   d. Documentation of the activity’s visibility (e.g. newspaper clippings, program announcements, conference schedules, etc.).

   e. Evaluations and letters from receivers of service; sponsoring organizations, faculty colleagues, and other peers

   f. Honors or awards recognizing service and

   g. Election or appointment as an officer in an organization.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

   A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (Faculty Handbook 4.05)

   1. Overview

   All COM 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 COM department’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 improve 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. Sources of Review

a. AFE Self-Reports

After completion of the AFE self-report, the department head shall meet separately with each COM faculty member. At this meeting, the faculty member has the opportunity to review and evaluate the past year’s performance of other members of the COM department faculty using AFE self-reports and their own experiences. Other librarians within COM are especially qualified to comment on the performance of their departmental colleagues because they work with these librarians regularly and because they are more likely to understand the technical aspects of the work they perform.

b. Hunter Library Peer Review

After completion of the AFE self-reports, each faculty member shall choose three Hunter Library faculty members who are not members of the COM department as peer reviewers. The department head shall meet with each of the three to discuss the performance of the librarian under review in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service.

Based on the discussions with COM department members and non-COM peer reviewers, the department head creates a “Summary of Peer Review” to be shared with the library faculty member before meeting with her/him to discuss the results.

c. Upward Evaluation

The department head will meet with each staff member who reports directly to the faculty member being evaluated. These interviews will focus on the librarians’ knowledge and competence within their library specialty; their leadership of their unit; how effectively they communicate; the fair-mindedness of their management style; and their success in fostering a productive and harmonious work
environment.

To protect the confidentiality of staff members providing feedback on their supervisors, no separate record of the upward evaluation will be produced. Instead, the department head shall incorporate staff feedback into his/her own evaluation as he/she deems constructive and appropriate. Feedback from staff that appears in the department head evaluation shall not be identified with the staff member who provided it and care shall be taken to eliminate contextual information that may identify the feedback with the staff member.

d. Optional External Review

The optional External Review Instrument (Appendix C) for COM faculty members is a vehicle for gathering feedback about the faculty member from WCU faculty external to the library, WNCLN peers, colleagues within professional organizations, and from other parties who might have knowledge of the librarian's professional performance. The COM faculty should provide a copy of the form to the person from whom she/he wishes to receive an evaluation with instructions to return the form to the department head. The external reviews will not be confidential in that the librarian, peer reviewers, and members of collegial review committees will be able to see them, and this fact should be made clear to the evaluators. Any external reviews must be received and made available by the department head prior to any internal peer evaluations.

e. Department Head's Evaluation and AFE Conference

The department head will write a summary of each faculty member's overall performance, incorporating the results of COM department peer reviews, Hunter Library peer reviews, upward evaluations, the optional external review evaluation, and the department head's own evaluation. The department head'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 department head and the library faculty member will discuss the summary of peer reviews, department head's review, and progress toward accomplishment of the year's goals. The department head and the faculty member will discuss goals for the coming year.

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation
All COM 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 and activities. The AFE document includes:

a. Self-Evaluation of Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship, Service, and Professional Development (see Faculty Handbook 4.05.B.3)

b. Goal Evaluation and Goal Setting Proposal

The last section of the AFE document will include a self-evaluation of the faculty member’s progress towards goals. Future goals will be discussed with the department head and will be set before the beginning of the next academic year. Library faculty members who are department heads will propose their own goals and review them with the dean of Library Services.

c. Samples of Work/Portfolio

Representative materials resulting from faculty members’ activities within their teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service may be submitted as appendices at the end of the AFE document.

4. Guidelines for Preparation of the AFE File

Use the same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR dossier, but to a more limited degree, where deemed necessary:

a. Appendix A. Department Collegial Review Document (not used during the AFE)

b. Appendix B. Vita or resume (not used during the AFE)

c. Appendix C. AFE Statements (not used during the AFE)

d. Appendix D. Results of peer review of teaching effectiveness (not used during AFE)

e. Appendix E. Completed optional external review 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 (Faculty Handbook 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.

The library review committees (department and college) shall be constituted according to the composition directions of the Faculty Handbook.

2. 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 COM Department’s Review Document and the review process timetable.

   b. The COM department’s 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 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.

   d. After a COM 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 (Faculty Handbook 4.08)

1. Overview

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 COM departmental CRC shall serve as the post-tenure review committee.

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 the TPR dossier and the college/departmental AFE File described previously.

1. Prepare a Curriculum Vitae 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 of this document) 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 department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the library faculty member and shall meet with the member to discuss the review. The department head forwards the information to the dean for information.

d. See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.
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: (Faculty Handbook 4.05)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A COM faculty member’s teaching/librarianship equivalent (an individual's contributions as they pertain to their assigned areas of responsibility) is the most important consideration. See Section II.A. of this document for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and documentation.

2. Scholarship

A COM faculty member should have regular, ongoing, documented scholarly activity and production. See Section II.B. of this document for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units). A “unit” of scholarship generally reflects the normal annual expectation for most faculty.

3. Service

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

B. Reappointment: (Faculty Handbook 4.06)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A COM 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. See Section II.A. for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and documentation.

2. Scholarship
A COM 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. of this document for a full description of methods of evaluation and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units). A unit of scholarship generally reflects the normal annual expectation for most faculty.

3. Service

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

C. Tenure (Faculty Handbook 4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A COM 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. See Section II.A. of this document for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and documentation.

2. Scholarship

A COM 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. A "unit" of scholarship generally reflects the normal annual expectation for most faculty.

3. Service

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

4. General Comments
A COM faculty member must have a terminal degree from an ALA-accredited program (or equivalent) 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 (Faculty Handbook 4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A COM 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. Promotion to associate professor requires progressive, demonstrated excellence across all domains of evaluation: librarianship, scholarship and service. See Section II.A. of this document for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and documentation.

2. Scholarship

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

3. Service

The COM department and the library greatly value service and all COM faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A COM faculty member is expected to have participated in service activities at all levels (library, university, and external community) and will have demonstrated excellence in this domain. See Section II.C. of this document for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

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 (Faculty Handbook 4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship
A COM 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. Promotion to full professor requires progressive, demonstrated excellence in this domain of evaluation over a sustained professional career. See Section II.A. of this document for criteria and method of evaluation for entry into this rank.

2. Scholarship

A COM faculty member should have continuing and regular scholarly activity and production with documented outcomes. Normal scholarly production expectations with respect to quantity and/or quality and impact are exceeded; see Section II.B. of this document for criteria and method of evaluation for entry into this rank.

3. Service

The COM department and the library greatly value service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A COM faculty member is expected to have participated in service activities at all levels (library, university, and external community). See Section II.C. of this document for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

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 (Faculty Handbook 4.08)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A COM 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. See Section II.A. of this document for criteria and methods of evaluation for this domain.

2. Scholarship

A COM 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. See Section II.B. of this document for
criteria and methods of evaluation for this domain.

3. Service

The COM department and the library greatly value 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, university, and external community). See Section II.C. of this document for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

4. General Comments

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

Approved by:

[Signatures]

Department Head, Content Organization & Management

Date

Dean of Library Services

Date

Provost

Date
APPENDIX A

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 provide information literacy instruction 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 B

From Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project

A Report from the Association of College and Research Libraries Task Force on Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards
March 1998

Scholarship

As previously noted, a major proportion of the work done by librarians qualifies as scholarship.

Inquiry. Librarians have applied a wide range of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies in advancing the discipline's knowledge base. They engage in the scholarship of inquiry in order to apply their findings to the everyday challenges of providing library services. Especially important areas of inquiry for librarians include:

- conducting citation studies;
- analyzing how people seek and use information;
- constructing means for organizing bodies of data and information, and designing methods for precise and efficient information retrieval;
- establishing methods for evaluating the effectiveness of library services and processes;
- researching the effects of environment and library practices on the "life span" of the various information media found in libraries;
- discovering the communication modes and related factors that lead to the most effective reference interview, one that has the best chance of determining any given user's precise information needs;
- preparing analytical bibliographies;
- investigating the history of the book and recorded knowledge.

Integration. Academic librarianship has drawn upon a wide range of other disciplines for knowledge that informs and transforms library work. The considerable extent to which academic librarians 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:

- drawing upon learning theory in order to design effective instruction;
- employing communication theory to improve the reference interview and establish sound communication throughout the library organization;
- 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;
- protecting for future generations of scholars the library's collections from environmental and usage-imposed dangers by means of preservation techniques;
- assisting users by interpreting and analyzing the components of their information needs and helping construct efficient and comprehensive research strategies, which often requires a thorough knowledge of the literature of several disciplines;
- integrating administrative and management techniques into the operation of a complex service organization;
- advising fellow faculty about the constraints of copyright and the allowances for educational fair use of copyrighted materials in print and multimedia formats.

**Pedagogy of Teaching.** The scholarship of teaching involves developing, testing and improving pedagogical techniques for meeting library instruction objectives, and communicating to peers the results of testing the techniques.

**Application.** Academic librarianship applies the theory and knowledge gained through inquiry, integration, and pedagogical experimentation to meeting the research and learning needs of the academic community. By employing the results of the scholarship exemplified in the foregoing sections, academic librarians attempt to improve and refine their processes and programs. Many librarian activities typically reported in "Librarianship" sections of dossiers could equally well be described as the scholarship of application. For instance, descriptions of typical cataloger, bibliographer, and other similar librarian activities can benefit from using the ideas and language of Boyer and Rice.
APPENDIX C

Content Organization and Management Optional External Review Form

Your input is an important component of the Hunter Library’s Content Organization and Management department’s Annual Faculty Evaluations.

We appreciate your timely response to this request for your input.

Content Organization and Management External Review Form

Name:

Date:

1. In what capacity have you worked with this librarian?

2. How effective was he or she?

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

Please return this form by U.S. mail, campus mail or email to:
Kristin Calvert
Head of Content Organization and Management
Hunter Library, Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, N.C 28779
kcalvert@wcu.edu