

Stewart Library
POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY
Approved by Faculty Senate 11//14/2020

Revised and approved by Library Faculty, 10/21/2019

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to outline the procedures and criteria used in the post-tenure review of faculty in the Stewart Library. In keeping with PPM 8-11.II, post-tenure review is **not** a re-adjudication of tenure but an assessment of a tenured faculty member's performance during the duration of their tenure.

Purpose

Tenured faculty in the Stewart Library are expected throughout their employment to remain actively involved in their profession, to continually work to improve their performance in all areas of teaching and librarianship, to engage in scholarship and to provide meaningful professional and/or administrative service. The Stewart Library recognizes that tenure is an investment in the future of both the library and Weber State University, and this post-tenure review process is intended to serve as a measure of the success of that investment.

Timing of the Post-Tenure Review Process

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years for the duration of their employment, or more often as defined later in this document under "Actions Resulting from Post-Tenure Review" or at the request of the faculty member and/or the Dean of the Library. Faculty earning tenure prior to the effective date of this policy shall have their first post-tenure review no later than five years after that date. Faculty earning tenure after the effective date of this policy will have their first post-tenure review no later than five years after earning tenure. A formal review for promotion to professor shall constitute a post-tenure review; the next post-tenure review for such faculty will occur no later than five years following this promotion review.

Post-Tenure Review File

In preparation for their post-tenure review, faculty members shall prepare a Post-Tenure Review File separate from their Professional File consisting of the following:

1. A concise narrative of their activities and accomplishments in each of the three categories listed below during the years under review.
2. A copy of their current Position Description.
3. Copies of their annual Faculty Activity Report for each of the years under review.

4. Copies of the annual reviews by their direct supervisor (a department head or Dean of the Library, depending on their position) for each of the years under review; faculty may include comments on their annual reviews if they so desire.
5. Copies of previous post-tenure review evaluation summaries, if any, from the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Dean of the Library.
6. Copies of student evaluation summaries for all courses taught during the years under review; faculty may include comments on these summaries if they so desire.
7. Copies of relevant supporting documentation, such as syllabi for new or revised courses, copies of publications or letters of acceptance, grant documents, conference presentations, letters of commendation, etc.
8. Any additional material the faculty member wishes to include in their file.

This file can be created online, using the same system in use for promotion and tenure reviews, or in print, housed in the Library Administration Office. Faculty will be able to add items to their post-tenure review file at any time prior to the date the file is due as well as remove items which they personally placed in their file. The file shall be completed and available for review by February 1 of the year of the post-tenure review. Adjustments to this deadline must be approved in advance by the Dean in consultation with the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the faculty member under review.

Post-Tenure Review Committee

In years when one or more library faculty members are scheduled to undergo post-tenure review, the Dean shall appoint a Post-Tenure Review Committee consisting of at least two tenured library faculty members in consultation with the faculty member(s) undergoing review and with the approval of the full Stewart Library faculty. This committee will review the faculty member's performance according to the competencies and criteria described below. Faculty members serving on the Stewart Library Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee or the library Peer Review Committee during the same year are also eligible to serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Competencies

The competencies to be considered during post-tenure review fall into three categories:

Category I: Teaching

Category II: Scholarship

Category III: Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Faculty undergoing post-tenure review are to be rated as either **Adequate** or **Inadequate** in each of these categories. Criteria for ratings of **Adequate** are given at the end of the detailed discussions of each category given later in this document. During the review process, tenured

faculty members undergoing post-tenure review shall be presumed to have a rating of **Adequate** in all categories; the burden shall be on the reviewers to justify the reason(s), if any, why the faculty member should not be rated as **Adequate** in any of the categories.

Evaluation Summary

A written evaluation summary including the rationale for the ratings in each category shall be submitted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee to the candidate with a copy to the Dean by February 15 of the year of the post-tenure review. The Dean will place a copy of this summary in the faculty member's Post Tenure Review File. The Dean shall submit a separate written evaluation summary to the candidate by March 1 of the year of the post-tenure review and put a copy in the faculty member's Post-Tenure Review File. Adjustments to these deadlines must be approved in advance by the Dean in consultation with the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the faculty member under review.

Actions Resulting from Post-Tenure Review

Faculty who receive a rating of **Adequate** in **all three** categories from both the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Dean will undergo another post-tenure review in five years (or less if requested by the faculty member and/or the Dean).

Faculty who receive a rating of **Inadequate** in **one or more** categories from the Dean will undergo post-tenure review in two years unless the faculty member or Dean requests an additional review at a period of less than two years. The faculty member will also meet with the Dean to find ways to improve their performance and will be provided the opportunity to improve their performance through a wide variety of faculty development activities which may include, but are not limited to, mentoring, sabbaticals, reduced work load and support of attendance at conferences. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to take advantage of these opportunities.

Faculty who receive a rating of **Inadequate** in **one or more** categories from the Dean in two consecutive post-tenure reviews will meet with the Dean to evaluate why development activities have not been successful and to address methods to resolve outstanding performance issues. This situation may also trigger reference to and subsequent action by the Dean in accordance with PPM 8-25 and PPM 9-3 through 9-17.

Alternative Procedures for Completing Post-Tenure Review

In 2014-15, WSU created a program called the Performance Compensation Plan (PCP). This plan allows tenured faculty members who have held the rank of full professor for at least five years to apply for a permanent raise. The application process requires that eligible faculty members provide a detailed report of their teaching, scholarship and service over the most recent five academic years.

Criteria for the Performance Compensation Plan mirror university requirements for promotion from associate professor to professor. The department head and dean review the application and each makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost makes the final determination of

award. Because the standard for Performance Compensation is higher than that of the post-tenure review, a faculty member who applies for the PCP shall be considered to have passed their five-year post-tenure review if the department head and the dean both make a positive recommendation to the provost. If a faculty member reports directly to the dean, they will be considered to have passed their five-year post-tenure review if the provost awards the PCP. A faculty member who applies for PCP, but does not receive positive reviews from the department chair and/or dean, will not automatically be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review. However, if the department chair and the dean agree that the faculty member meets the requirements for a successful post-tenure review according to the criteria for that process, the dean will write a letter indicating that fact, and the faculty member will be deemed to have passed a post-tenure review. If the department chair and/or dean do not support the PCP application, but the provost awards them Performance Compensation, the faculty member will be deemed to have met the post-tenure review standards.

When a faculty member is awarded Performance Compensation, the post-tenure review cycle will be reset to five academic years forward from the academic year of the PCP award. If a faculty member who seeks Performance Compensation does not receive the PCP award based on a review of the application, and not as a result of a shortage of funds for that year, and is not deemed to have satisfied post-tenure review by the department chair and dean as noted in the above paragraph, they will undergo post-tenure review at the designated time according to library post-tenure review policy. If a faculty member applies for Performance Compensation during the same academic year as a scheduled post-tenure review and does not receive the PCP award based on a review of the application, and not as a result of a shortage of funds for that year, they will be asked to submit required documentation for the post-tenure review to the appropriate reviewing party as specified in the library post-tenure review policy two weeks before the end of that academic year. This delayed post-tenure review will be completed within two weeks of the revised deadline.

Definitions of Categories and Criteria

Category I: Teaching

Librarianship is a teaching profession that provides access to information and teaches people how to find and effectively use that information. Several activities within this category may not be recognized as formal teaching, but are nevertheless integral aspects of the educational role of librarianship. For purposes of post-tenure review, teaching is divided into two areas: 1) Classroom/Online instruction, and 2) Other Instructional Activities. The specific division of duties among these areas for each library faculty member is defined in their position description, which is included in the Post-Tenure Review File and should be consulted by evaluators during the review process. Some library faculty positions involve significant administrative duties. Evaluators should take this into account when reviewing the candidate's performance in this category.

1. Classroom/Online Instruction: Library faculty may be assigned to teach one or more sections of for-credit Library Science courses during each semester of their contract. They may also be assigned to provide general instruction sessions for students in ENGL

2010, UNIV 1105 and other general courses. Evidence of performance in this area includes:

- a. A teaching portfolio, including but not limited to a statement of their teaching philosophy and a collection of sample course syllabi, assignments, exams, etc., along with comments on how these samples reflect and support their teaching philosophy.
 - b. Summaries of student course evaluations, which are administered each semester for each course taught by the candidate, along with a brief interpretation of these evaluations including comments on both positive results and areas of concern.
 - c. Participation on relevant library teams and committees.
 - d. Involvement in the evaluation and revision of existing library science courses and the design of new courses.
 - e. Delivering course-integrated subject-specific instruction sessions requested by faculty in assigned subject areas.
 - f. Delivering course-integrated general library instruction sessions requested by general education faculty.
 - g. Providing general or subject-specific library workshops and training sessions to faculty and/or community members.
 - h. Pedagogical innovation in classroom/online instruction.
2. Other Instructional Activities: Library faculty may also be assigned to provide additional services, duties, and leadership within the library. This may include providing students and other library users with reference and information services; collection management, curation, and/or preservation activities; liaison duties in specific subject areas; design, implementation, and/or management of electronic resources, tools, management systems, etc. A primary goal of these activities is to provide students and faculty with the most efficient and effective access possible to information resources necessary to support their instructional and research activities. Evidence of performance in these areas may include:
- a. Consultation with faculty in assigned subject areas regarding library resource collections in support of existing courses, new courses, new programs, accreditation, etc.
 - b. Overseeing the development and management of information resource collections in assigned subject areas.

- c. Overseeing the curation and/or preservation of library resource collections in consultation with stakeholders in support of the mission of the Library or Weber State University.
- d. Providing assistance to users through proactive, patron-oriented reference assistance or research support.
- e. Design of web-based, how-to, and other research guides in assigned subject areas, for general patron assistance, and other guides.
- f. Design, implementation, or management of the library's electronic resources or information systems.
- g. Design, implementation, or management of digital tools intended to provide new or enhance existing library services.
- h. Product research or other research undertaken in the judicious selection of materials, tools, services, resources, artifacts, or other items, for use in the library, by library patrons, as instructional materials, for library teaching, informational displays or exhibits, or for other related purposes.
- i. Involvement on relevant library teams and committees.
- j. Attendance at relevant workshops, seminars, etc.
- k. Receipt of relevant certificates, awards, etc.
- l. Other activities appropriate to this area.

Category II: Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the candidate's effectiveness as a professor. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review are responsible for providing evidence of successful scholarly activities, which may include interdisciplinary scholarship. They are not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below; however, they must submit evidence of significant scholarship during the years under review.

Evidence of performance in scholarship includes:

- a. Refereed publications.
- b. Non-refereed publications.
- c. Papers or poster sessions presented at professional conferences and workshops.

- d. Professional improvement, such as graduate education beyond the terminal degree, development of new areas of expertise, additional training in existing areas of expertise, or attendance at professional conferences and workshops.
- e. Projects such as group or individual grants and submission of reports as required.
- f. Curated exhibits, shows, or significant displays, which may or may not be refereed, juried, or judged.
- g. Other activities appropriate to this category.

Faculty members under post-tenure review shall be rated **Adequate in Scholarship** if they demonstrate a pattern of ongoing scholarly work including activities from a minimum of **three** of the performance areas listed above.

Category III: Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Administration and/or professionally related service is defined as those activities which provide professionally related value to the community, the institution or professional organizations. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under post-tenure review to provide evidence of productive service, including evidence for the quality and impact of their committee service regardless of the level of committee, be it library, university, regional, or national, during the years under review. However, they are not expected to be equally active in all areas listed below. Evidence of performance in service includes:

- a. Committee assignments at the university or library level. Leadership positions on committees are weighted more heavily than membership only.
- b. Administrative responsibilities within the Library or University above and beyond the duties described in the candidate's position description.
- c. Leadership positions and/or active participation in professional organizations and similar activities that enhance the reputation of the candidate, the Library, and/or the University.
- d. Involvement in the planning and organization of professional workshops, meetings, conferences, symposia, etc., that benefit the Library, the University, and/or the library profession.
- e. Participation in projects that benefit the Library, the University, and/or the library profession.
- f. Professionally-related community activities.
- g. Consulting or otherwise providing professional expertise.
- h. Student advisement activities or serving as an advisor to a student organization.

- i. Performance as a department head/chair or coordinator of a major library function.
- j. Other activities appropriate to this category.

Faculty members under post-tenure review shall be rated **Adequate in Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service** if they accept and perform in a professional manner duties in at least **three** areas of service listed above, including at least one committee assignment at the university or library level (see item a. above).