I. Overview

The purpose of annual evaluation, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews is to ensure that the Digital, Access, and Technology (DATS) 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 DATS 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 DATS faculty member has different areas of responsibility, different types of scholarship emphasized, and a different investment in service and engagement. DATS faculty members’ scholarly activities generally derive from their professional practice however, with cross-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary scholarship becoming the norm, a wide range of library-related scholarship is acceptable with the fundamental expectation that the results of those activities will be shared with the profession, academic community, and beyond. The guidelines presented in this document are intended to be specific enough to be practical, yet flexible enough to promote and accommodate individual differences and interests.

This document describes the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the DATS 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 Faculty Handbook. 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). The DATS 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
   DATS faculty contribute to the teaching/librarianship, learning, and research mission
of WCU. 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 DATS faculty member assumes a professional disciplinary role within Hunter Library and has primary responsibilities associated with that role. Each DATS 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. Effectively managing personnel and other resources and/or ensuring department/unit goals are in concert with overall library and university goals.

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

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

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 DATS faculty member’s accomplishments as related to areas of responsibility.

b. Peer/Client Review from those that have worked with the faculty member that past year. (See Appendix B)
c. Evaluation of a DATS faculty member’s progress towards achieving their agreed upon yearly goals.

d. Department Head’s Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) Statement Summary Report

Using all applicable methods and sources of evidence previously listed, the department head will perform an Annual Faculty Evaluation and confer with each DATS faculty members and others to create an AFE summary report. This summary report and an agreed upon set of goals for the coming year go in the DATS 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 DATS 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 DATS faculty member’s effectiveness in teaching/librarianship. (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. Collegial

9. Applies knowledge gained through professional development opportunities

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (Faculty Handbook 4.05C)

1. Boyer Model

   WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types of creative activity described by Boyer (1990) Specific college/department perspectives on these categories, relative evaluations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described in this section. The DATS 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.

   For more details about the Boyer Model as it pertains to librarianship, see Appendix D.

2. Association of College and Research Libraries Guidelines


   Many of the roles that DATS faculty perform on a daily basis can be productive methods 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 DATS 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
  - translations
  - abstracts and reviews
  - development of information systems, computer programs, databases
  - websites (meeting the 4 criteria in the 4th paragraph of this section)
  - research aids such as indexes, thesauri, catalogs, union lists, finding aids, research guides, and bibliographies (meeting the 4
criteria in the 4th paragraph of this section)

- library and/or university white papers and reports (meeting the 4 criteria in the 4th paragraph of this section)
- scholarly professional book reviews

- Editing
  - Books
  - journals, or other learned publications

- Grants and Contracts
  - developing and submitting proposals
  - obtaining funding
  - directing research teams
  - preparing reports

3. Methods of Evaluation

The DATS department’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 the library, WCU, the Western North Carolina Library Network (WNCLN), the UNC system, the region, and the profession of librarianship.

The normal expectation for DATS faculty is an average of one “unit” of scholarship per year. Depending on the faculty member’s librarianship and/or service commitments and the nature of their scholarship activities, it is understood that scholarship may fluctuate over time with some years having no units and some having more than the average.

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 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 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 successful significant external grant proposal

- Category C — one unit
  - Presentation or address in a state-wide or regional conference
  - Successful internal grant or unsuccessful significant external grant proposal
  - 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. 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 DATS 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 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 DATS 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, NC DOCKS, 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.

d. Method of Evaluation And Sources of Evidence

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

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

3. Official documents and reports resulting from the activity;

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

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

6. Honors or awards recognizing service and;

7. 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 DATS 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 DATS 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. Peer Review

After the completion of the AFE self-assessment files, the department head shall collect feedback from the peers and clients of the faculty member being reviewed. These peers and clients can be people internal and external to the library and the university who have worked with the faculty member while carrying out their professional roles/responsibilities during the year. These peers/clients must include at least 3 members of the Library Faculty and at least one person from the DATS department.

The department head will select 3 names from the 5 names provided by the faculty member being reviewed before the AFE process begins. The department head will select an additional two names, making a total of 5 peer/client’s feedback that will be collected about the faculty member’s performance that year.

A DATS Librarian Review Instrument (Appendix B) will be sent to each of the 5 people selected and the results will be reviewed by the department head. As needed, the department head has the option of interviewing the respondents in person for clarification. The five review instruments will be kept on file.

Each respondent will have the opportunity to review and evaluate the past year’s performance of the library faculty using AFE files and their own experiences. Based on this feedback, the department head creates a “Summary of Peer Review” to be shared with the DATS faculty member before meeting with her/him to discuss the summative results.

b. Department Head’s Evaluation and AFE Conference

The department head will write an AFE summary of each faculty member’s overall performance, including the results of peer/client review evaluation and the department head’s 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 DATS 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 department head 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.

c. Evaluating the DATS Department Head

The DATS department head will submit five names to the Dean of Library Services following the same procedures outlined above.

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

All DATS 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

b. 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.

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 in a portfolio 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. Department Collegial Review Document (not used during the AFE)
b. Vita or resume (not used during the AFE)
c. AFE Statements (not used during the AFE)
d. Results of peer review of teaching effectiveness (not used during AFE)
e. Completed client assessment forms.
f. Documented outcomes of teaching/librarianship accomplishments for the most recent 12 months.
g. Documentation of scholarly activities for the most recent 12 months.
h. Documentation of service activities outcomes for the most recent 12 months.
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.

2. Composition of Review Committees

The library review committees (department and college) 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 the DATS Collegial Review Document and the review process timetable.

b. After the department review committee and department head 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 the 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 DATS 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 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 as described in the provost's guidelines 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 the appropriate appendix.

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.

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 DATS 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 DATS 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 DATS department and the library greatly values service and all DATS faculty are expected to participate in service activities. Service is expected to increase over a DATS 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 DATS 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 DATS 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

DATS department and the 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 of this document for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

4. General Comments

A DATS 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.

C. Tenure (Faculty handbook 4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A DATS 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 DATS 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 DATS department and 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, 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 DATS 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 DATS 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 the DATS 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 DATS 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 DATS department and 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, 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 DATS 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 DATS 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 for criteria and method of evaluation for entry into this rank.

3. Service

The DATS department and the library greatly values service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A DATS 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 DATS 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 a DATS 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 DATS 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 DATS department and the library greatly value service and all library faculty are expected to participate in service activities. A DATS 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.

4. General Comments

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

Evaluative Characteristics for Accomplishments

Regardless of a DATS faculty members’ individual areas of responsibility, they should 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 DATS 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.

- Collegial
  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.

- Applies knowledge gained through professional development opportunities
  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
DATS Department
Librarian Review Instrument
20__/20__ Academic Year

The following survey may be substituted for an electronic survey.

Instructions:
- If you don’t know the answer to a question, please don’t choose a rating from the scale; instead, write, “I don’t know” in the comment section.
- A rating of “Good” indicates acceptable performance.
- Ratings of “Poor” or “Very Poor” indicate unacceptable performance. Such ratings must be justified by comments or examples in order to allow the manager to identify the nature of the problem.
- A rating of “Excellent” indicates extraordinarily good performance. It must be justified by comments or examples in order to show why the performance is so substantially above “Good.”
- Ratings of “Very Poor,” “Poor” or “Excellent” that do not include comments or examples will be discarded.
- Please return this form by mail.

Name of Librarian Evaluated

1. What is your general assessment of this librarian?

   - In the area of teaching/librarianship within the last year

     A. How would you rate this faculty member’s teaching/librarianship?

        Very Poor  Poor  Good  Very Good  Excellent  No Comment  Don’t Know

     B. Please give comments or examples within the area of teaching/librarianship:

   - In the area of scholarship within the last year:

     C. How would you rate this faculty member’s scholarship?

        Very Poor  Poor  Good  Very Good  Excellent  No Comment  Don’t Know

     D. Please give comments or examples within the area of scholarship:

   - In the area of service within the last year:

     E. How would you rate this faculty member’s service activity?

        Very Poor  Poor  Good  Very Good  Excellent  No Comment  Don’t Know

     F. Please give comments or examples within the area of service:
2) For each of the evaluative characteristic below please rate and comment:

- Collaborative and cooperative within the organization
  Examples of this characteristic: 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).

  A. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

    Very Poor   Poor   Good   Very Good   Excellent   No Comment   Don’t Know

  B. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Committed to service
  Examples of this characteristic: Demonstrates a commitment to the service of all library users and colleagues and has a willingness to help others.

  C. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

    Very Poor   Poor   Good   Very Good   Excellent   No Comment   Don’t Know

  D. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Creative
  Examples of this characteristic: Demonstrates creative problem-solving and adapts well to change. Generates new ideas.

  E. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

    Very Poor   Poor   Good   Very Good   Excellent   No Comment   Don’t Know

  F. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:
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- Demonstrates leadership abilities
  Examples of this characteristic: 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.

G. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

  Very Poor  Poor  Good  Very Good  Excellent  No Comment  Don’t Know

H. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Effective communicator
  Examples of this characteristic: Communicates clearly and thoughtfully, listens actively, and adapts communication/presentation style (both written and spoken) to particular audiences and users.

I. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

  Very Poor  Poor  Good  Very Good  Excellent  No Comment  Don’t Know

J. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Forward thinking
  Examples of this characteristic: 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.

K. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

  Very Poor  Poor  Good  Very Good  Excellent  No Comment  Don’t Know

L. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:
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- Knowledgeable
Examples of this characteristic: Demonstrates knowledge in one’s area of librarianship.
Shares expertise with colleagues readily. What is your assessment of the librarian’s knowledge of her or his specialty in librarianship?

M. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

Very Poor    Poor    Good    Very Good    Excellent    No Comment
Don’t Know

N. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Collegial
Examples of this characteristic: 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.

O. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

Very Poor    Poor    Good    Very Good    Excellent    No Comment
Don’t Know

P. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Applies knowledge gained through professional development opportunities
Examples of this characteristic: 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.

Q. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

Very Poor    Poor    Good    Very Good    Excellent    No Comment
Don’t Know

R. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic?

3. Please provide any other information that might help with the evaluation of this librarian.
APPENDIX C

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 D
Boyter’s Model of Scholarship for librarians

Based on work by Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project in *A Report from the Association of College and Research Libraries Task Force on Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards* *March 1998*

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. DATS 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.

Activities embedded in the practice of librarianship itself are often capable of being transformed into scholarship as defined earlier in II.B.1. Examples of the integration of knowledge from other fields into library scholarship 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, DATS 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 DATS 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 of knowledge application that are capable of being transformed into scholarship as defined in II.B.1 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.