

Approved by Faculty Senate December 3, 2020
Approved by Trustees January 19, 2021

Stewart Library

TENURE DOCUMENT

As adopted by the Faculty Senate November 14, 2019
Revised and approved by Library Faculty October 28, 2020

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to outline the criteria and procedures used to evaluate faculty members for tenure in the Stewart Library. The normal probationary period for faculty members in a tenure-track appointment is six years, with a formal interim review scheduled during the third year and a formal final tenure review scheduled during the sixth year. The time in rank for normal promotion from assistant to associate professor is six years. To be promoted from assistant to associate professor one must either have been granted tenure or be granted tenure at the time of promotion. A candidate who is not granted tenure cannot be advanced in rank (see PPM 8-11). Because the Library has a small number of faculty, the Library does not have a department level ranking tenure review.

Credentials/Probationary Period

Candidates for tenure must:

1. Have earned the Masters of Library Science from a program accredited by the American Library Association, or its equivalent (see PPM 8-11),
2. Hold a tenure track appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher,
3. Be in the third year of the probationary period for the interim review and in the sixth year of the probationary period for the final tenure review, and
4. Meet faculty responsibilities, ethics, and standards of professional behavior specified in PPM 9-3 through 9-8.

Based on evidence provided in the candidate's professional file, evaluators will determine whether or not the candidate has met these requirements (see PPM 8-14).

Competencies

The competencies to be considered during interim and final tenure review fall into three categories:

Category I: Teaching

Category II: Scholarship

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

Competencies in categories I, II, and III are to be rated from unsatisfactory to excellent. Each evaluator will interpret information presented in terms of the expectations of the Library, the candidate’s specific duties as outlined in their Position Description, and the candidate’s overall pattern of professional performance.

Evaluation Summary

A written evaluation summary including the rationale for the ratings in each category and a recommendation regarding tenure will be submitted to the candidate with a copy to the Dean of the Library according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13). The pattern of ratings must meet or exceed one of the channels described below for a positive tenure recommendation:

Channel	Teaching	Scholarship	Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service
A	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory
B	Good	Good	Good
C	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good
D	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory
E	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent

Ratings

Ratings for each category are to reflect the candidate’s academic career span rather than a single year’s efforts. The ratings mean that the evidence describing the quality and quantity of the candidate's professional efforts support a continuing level of performance judged by the evaluators as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent. Ratings assigned for a formal interim (3rd year) review reflect the committee’s judgment of the candidate’s progress towards tenure and should be based on reasonable expectations for a third year faculty member. The interim review is expected to be formative in nature and both the ratings and the committee commentary should provide helpful feedback to the candidate as they evaluate priorities in preparation for the final tenure review. A candidate’s recent work at other institutions, while it may be taken into consideration, is not weighted as heavily as work at Weber State University.

General criteria for ratings in all categories are:

Unsatisfactory: Candidates will be rated unsatisfactory who do not meet the minimum requirements of the satisfactory category.

Satisfactory: Candidates will be rated satisfactory if the duties described in their position description are performed in an acceptable manner. Satisfactory means adequate and should not imply undesirable or below average endeavor.

Good: Candidates will be rated good if duties described in their position description are performed consistently in a more than satisfactory manner. Good implies commendable and desirable levels of achievement. A rating of good in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels.

Excellent: Candidates will be rated excellent if duties described in the position description are performed consistently in an outstanding manner. Inasmuch as a good rating in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above satisfactory levels, a rating of excellent in any category implies a substantial degree of achievement above those considered appropriate for a good rating.

Clarifications of the criteria for certain ratings in each category are provided later in this document.

Professional File

Candidates are responsible for updating their professional files according to the dated guidelines of the review process (see PPM 8-12 and 8-13). This file should clearly document the candidate's teaching, scholarship and administrative and/or professionally related service activities. Candidates should include brief narrative summaries throughout the professional file. Candidates may create an appendix in the professional file for items that are referenced in the narrative summaries. In addition to the standard professional file documentation and the specific evidence mentioned below under each category, the candidate's professional file should include the following documents that are specific to library faculty:

1. A copy of the candidate's position description.
2. Copies of faculty activity records submitted each academic year by the candidate.
3. Copies of annual reviews by their direct supervisor (a department head or Dean of the Library, depending on their position).

Evaluators should carefully review these additional documents during the review process.

Peer Review Committee Evaluations

Candidates being formally reviewed for tenure must undergo peer review in accordance with the Library's Peer Review Policy (http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/peer_review.cfm) and

PPM 8-11. A copy of the Peer Review Committee's report will be added to the candidate's professional file before the review process begins. It is important to note that the Library Peer Review Committee gathers evidence in all three categories of formal review as defined below and not just teaching.

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 the purposes of 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 Professional 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 ENG 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. (Required)
 - b. Summaries of student course evaluations, which are administered each semester for each course taught by the candidate, including what changes were made in response to the feedback received. Include all evaluations as a supplementary file. (Required)
 - 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 innovations 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.

Clarification of Ratings for Teaching: Candidates shall be rated good (minimum rating in Channels B, D and E) in this category if they are consistently rated good by peers in instruction and good by peers in their primary area(s) of responsibility as defined in their position description. Candidates must also provide evidence of significant additional activities/accomplishments in at least one of the areas of Teaching listed above, including what changes were made in response to feedback from student evaluations.

Category II: Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as those activities that contribute to the profession and increase the candidate's effectiveness as a professor. Candidates 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, candidates must submit evidence of significant scholarship since arriving at Weber State University. 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.

Clarification of Ratings for Scholarship:

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in this category (minimum rating in channels C and E) if they demonstrate a pattern of scholarly work which includes activities from a minimum of three of the areas of scholarship listed above. To receive a rating of good for the final tenure review, a

candidate must provide evidence of at least one refereed publication and evidence of ongoing dedication to scholarly activity. In some cases, the candidate and Library can elect to substitute an equivalent activity in lieu of a refereed publication. However, in the cases of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate and Library to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to a refereed publication.

Category III: Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

Administrative 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 candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of productive service, including evidence for the quality and impact of their committee service regardless of the level of that committee, be it library, university, regional, or national. Candidates 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.

Clarification of Ratings for Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service: Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in Professionally Related Service (minimum rating in channels A and

D) if they accept and perform in a professional manner duties in at least three areas of service listed above. Candidates shall be rated good in Professionally Related Service if their contributions to and/or leadership within the Library, University, or profession is recognized as stronger than average or if their influence in the development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs, improved operations or organizational changes is recognized as considerably above average.

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in Administrative Service if they set ambitious goals, achieve some of them, and are consistently rated as satisfactory by their immediate supervisors and supervisees in stimulating a collegial and positive climate and procuring and allocating resources competently. Candidates shall be rated good in Administrative Service if they set ambitious goals and achieve most of them, and if they are consistently rated as good by their immediate supervisors and supervisees in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a collegial and positive climate and procuring and allocating resources competently.