Hunter Library
Digital, Access, and Technology Services (DATS) Department
Collegial Review Document
2012-2013

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

I. Overview

The purpose of annual evaluation, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews is to ensure that the library faculty and, therefore, the services of Hunter Library, are of the highest quality possible. To accomplish this, the Library seeks to attract and retain library faculty who are knowledgeable, professional, collaborative, productive, cooperative, committed to service, and current in the discipline. A 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, with the fundamental expectation that the results of those activities will be shared with the profession and the academic community. This complex blend of expectations is hard to specify and even harder to quantify. Nevertheless, it is important to provide DATS faculty members with guidelines to help them develop productive and gratifying professional careers. The guidelines should be specific enough to be practical, yet flexible enough to promote and accommodate individual difference.

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

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching/Librarianship (Faculty Handbook Sections 4.04 & 4.08)
Library faculty contribute to the teaching/librarianship, learning, and research mission of Western Carolina University by facilitating access to intellectual content and

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

1. Accomplishments in Teaching/Librarianship

   Each DATS faculty member assumes a professional disciplinary role within Hunter Library and has primary responsibilities associated with that role. In many cases, the disciplinary role is unique within the library (e.g. metadata librarian). In other instances, there may be other faculty who assume similar roles (e.g. research and instruction). In each case, the 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. Accomplishments in effectively managing personnel and other resources and/or ensuring department/unit goals are in concert with overall library and university goals.

   b. Accomplishments in acquiring, organizing, and creating means of access to intellectual content and information resources.

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

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

   e. Accomplishments in assessing, evaluating, and continuously enhancing library operations, resources, and services; strategic and tactical planning; and developing library promotional materials.

   f. Accomplishments in applying and/or developing technology to enhance library services.

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

2. Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence

a. Self-Evaluation

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

b. Peer/Client Review

Process and method of evaluation by DATS faculty members and other clients that the faculty member works with that the department head uses to create a "Summary of Peer Review" that is shared with the DATS faculty member during the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) process.c. Goal-Evaluation

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

Department Head's Annual Faculty 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.

e. Dean's Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) Acknowledgement

.The dean will receive, review and acknowledge the department head's annual AFE summary report.

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. Respectful and concerned
9. Up to date in areas of knowledge particular to responsibilities/role

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

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

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

   Responsibilities such as reference, cataloging, collection development, information literacy, information and program management, etc., are activities that can be productive of scholarship for the purposes of annual evaluation, reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and merit for academic librarians (see "Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project," a report produced by the Association of College and Research Libraries to help define and describe the kind of scholarship performed by academic librarians, at http://www.ala.org/acrl/acrlpubs/whitepapers/academiclibrarianship.cfm). It is important to recognize that the successful librarian can make significant

scholarly contributions to librarianship through a wide variety of activities and publications and that different expressions of scholarly contributions may be appropriate for librarians according to their professional specialties, academic backgrounds, and intellectual interests. Therefore, different librarians might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another; however, all Boyer categories are valued equally.

All creative activities of library faculty that result in the production of scholarship, regardless of Boyer category (Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990), are assessed against the following general criteria: (1) the scholarship is subjected to 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.

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

External peer review may be provided by a number of sources outside of the WCU community. Types of work submitted for review to these outside entities include, but are not limited to: proposals accepted for conference presentation or panel discussion; professional publications where manuscripts must undergo review before dissemination; or personal accreditations requiring the submission of a peer-reviewed portfolio. Peer review of these materials can be conducted by committees such as those established by (but not limited to) local networks such as the Western North Carolina Library Network (WNCLN), state-wide organizations like the North Carolina Library Association (NCLA) and Business Librarianship in North Carolina (BLINC), regional entities such as the Mid Atlantic Chapter of the Medical Library Association (MAC-MLA), and national professional organizations such as the American Library Association (ALA). In addition, individuals may seek peer review from colleagues in the wider library world by submitting position papers, treatises, or other researched materials to librarians and information professionals noted within the applicable field of study.

Scholarship that has no obvious external peer review structure in place undergoes peer review by a separate process. For such scholarship, the library

identifies qualified library professionals outside Hunter Library with recognized professional standing in the relevant area of scholarly activity and requests independent reviews of the quality and impact of the scholarship in question. The requested reviews are to be based on the Boyer model of scholarship (referenced above), the library's collegial review criteria, and the understanding of scholarship established by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL, a division of the American Library Association) in its *Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project,* http://www.ala.org/acrlpubs/whitepapers/academiclibrarianship.cfm. The identified reviewers are supplied the faculty member's scholarship, the library's collegial review document, and a copy of the ACRL whitepaper. When returned, the external reviewer assessments become part of the faculty member's relevant review and assessment documentation.

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

- Scholarly Writings and Presentations
    - books, monographs, textbooks, book chapters
    - articles or bibliographies relating to librarianship or other academic disciplines
    - presentations at professional meetings
    - 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

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 DATS 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 DATS 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 and 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.

2. Methods of Evaluation

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

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

a. Service, operational method, and program initiatives and enhancements that have a beneficial impact on a larger number of patrons will have greater value than those affecting fewer patrons.

b. Published scholarship is more highly valued than unpublished.

c. Work published in a peer-reviewed journal is valued more highly than work published in a journal publication that is not peer-reviewed.

d. Activity published in a discipline-recognized journal is more highly valued than work published in internal publications.

e. Presentation at a national conference is more highly valued than presentations at regional, state-wide, or local conferences.

f. Conference addresses/presentations are more highly valued than poster presentations.

g. Development of wholly new services and service aids is valued more highly than updating, revising, or adapting established services and programs.

h. Technical documents, reports, training manuals, "white papers," and other internally focused documents will be differentially evaluated based on such factors as their scope, service impact, size, etc.

i. Published books will be more highly valued than published articles, bibliographies, and book chapters.

j. External grants are more highly valued than internal grants.

k. Applying for grants, even when unsuccessful, is more highly valued than not applying for grants.

l. Scholarship based on service, operational methods, and program initiatives and enhancements will be judged differently based on the degree to which they foster and improve abilities to discover and deliver information, information sources, and information instruction, as well as on the scope of impact of the initiatives.

The Digital, Access, and Technology Department will use these general guidelines to determine "unit" totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Although what constitutes a "unit" cannot be determined with absolute certainty in advance, the following rough equivalencies should prove helpful with regard to informing the candidate, the Collegial Review Committee, and the process itself. Scholarship of especially high value (Category A) will normally equate to three units, while others will normally equate to two units (Category B), one (Category C), or one-half (Category D). It is important to understand and recognize that the following equivalencies are approximate examples and do not exhaust, or represent, all the possible ways in which units can be obtained.

- Category A – three units
    - Authorship of a librarianship-related article in a journal that is widely regarded as having high scholarly or professional status

- Authorship of the first edition of a scholarly treatise or text within the discipline

- Editorship of a book, professional journal, or peer-reviewed journal related to librarianship

- Category B – two units

  - Authorship in a peer-reviewed or professional, less than top-tier, journal

  - Presentation or address at a national or international conference

  - Authorship of a book chapter

  - Awardee of a 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

  - Proposal selected through a competitive, peer-reviewed process for inclusion in a state-wide or regional conference

  - Awardee of a selective internal grant

  - Authorship/developer of a new database reviewed by peers outside of the university

  - Creator of a new information literacy instruction module submitted to peer review venue such as Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching (*MERLOT*) or the American Library Association's Peer-Reviewed Instructional Materials Online (*PRIMO*)

  - Developer of a new Web 2.0 source/function (reviewed by peers outside of the university) that enhances university-wide discovery and delivery of information resources

  - Developer of a new operational method/process (reviewed by peers outside of the university) that significantly enhances

discovery and delivery of information resources

- Developing new research and subject research guides and then having those resources reviewed by a subject-specific entity external to WCU (see section II.B.1 for external peer review requirement and process)

- Category D – one-half unit (candidates presenting scholarship exclusively of type illustrated below should expect to provide more extensive evidence and support of its professional impact and quality)

    - Scholarly resource review or abstract in a professional source such as ChemAbstracts, Choice, Library Journal, *MERLOT*, or *PRIMO*

    - Presentation at a local conference, symposium, seminar

    - Creating research aids such as indexes, thesauri, catalogs, or finding lists reviewed external to WCU

    - Developing library and/or university publications and reports based on original research or an analysis of research conducted by others

3. General Comments

    a. Professional Development

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

    b. Guidelines

    These guidelines and examples are neither absolute, nor exhaustive, and are intended to be illustrative, serving as typical examples of scholarship within the library profession. The library recognizes that because of the varied nature of librarian roles there may be many specific scholarly activities of high quality and impact that are not included and that constitute legitimate library scholarship. It will be the responsibility of candidates to defend their activities as scholarship, especially if these activities are extraordinary in nature, form, or extent. For example, since some of the forms of scholarship

identified in Category D above may be non-traditional, candidates presenting work solely of that kind, should expect to provide more extensive support of its impact and quality. A candidate may request a prior review of proposed activities in order to get feedback. This request, review, and feedback can be part of the annual review process. In all cases presented scholarship must have undergone some appropriate form of external peer review (once again, see section II.B.1).

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

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

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

1. Types of Service

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

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

        1. providing leadership in, or making significant contributions to, library or university committees or other appointed, elected, or ad-hoc groups;

        2. developing and/or revising major policy documents;

        3. participating in faculty governance;

        4. mentoring other faculty and staff;

        5. representing the university for its advancement;

6. assisting in the development of international programs and exchanges;

7. collaborating or partnering with university units to develop programs that support library, Western North Carolina Library Network, university, or UNC system missions;

8. mentoring student groups;

9. recruiting students; and

10. working on search committees.

b. Community Engagement and Service to the Discipline of Librarianship

This type of service contributes to the function and effectiveness of the 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. interpreting technical information for a variety of audiences;

2. conducting tours of Hunter Library for outside groups;

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

4. testifying before the legislature and Congressional committees;

5. editing newsletters in one's field or discipline;

6. serving as an expert for the press or other media;

7. developing solutions to meet the information needs of external communities;

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

9. organizing and managing community conferences; and

10. advising students.

2. Method of Evaluation And Sources of Evidence

a. Documentation of Service Activity

Documentation of service activities may include the following:

1. description of service activities;

2. summary of responsibilities and activities; and

3. analysis of work accomplished.

b. Documented Service Outcomes

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

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

2. official documents and reports resulting from the activity;

3. illustrations of ways in which the service activity enhanced the library, the university, the Western North Carolina Library

Network, the UNC system, or the discipline;

4. log of activities (e.g., programs presented); and

5. documentation of the activity's visibility (e.g., newspaper clippings, etc.)

c. Judgments of Service

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

1. evaluations and letters from receivers of service;

2. evaluations from sponsoring organizations; and

3. evaluations from faculty colleagues and other peers.

d. Eminence Measures

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

1. honors or awards recognizing service and

2. election or appointment as an officer in an organization.

e. Self Reflection and Appraisal

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

1. journals and logs and

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

3. General Comments

Professional Development

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

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview

All 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 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 from the 5 names provided to them by the faculty member 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 Hunter Librarian Review Instrument (Appendix C) will be emailed 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

a. 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 in the faculty member's area of responsibilities (teaching/librarianship equivalent – section 4), scholarship activities (section 5), service (section 6), and professional development (section 7). The AFE document includes:

b. Self-Evaluation of Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship, Service, and Professional Development

c. Goal Evaluation and Goal Setting Proposal

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

and goal setting proposal.

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

d. Samples of Work/Portfolio

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

4. 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 client assessment forms.

f. Appendix F. Documented outcomes of teaching/librarianship accomplishments for the most recent 12 months.

g. Appendix G. Documentation of scholarly activities for the most recent 12 months.

h. Appendix H. Documentation of service activities outcomes for the most recent 12 months.

i. Appendix I. Optional and will include goal-setting proposal for the coming year.

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

1. Overview

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

2. Composition of Review Committees

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

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

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

a. Each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, uses the provost's detailed instructions for preparing the dossier to create a file. The candidate shall also use Hunter Library's College Review Document and the review process timetable.

b. After the department review committee's and department head's reviews, the library CRC will meet and review each group of files in timetable order by last name and make recommendations to the Dean of Library Services for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

c. After a library faculty member's reappointment file is reviewed at each level, the recommendations and votes at each level will be communicated to the candidate in a manner prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, typically within five business days.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Overview

These guidelines are based on section 4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. Post-

Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured library faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured library faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.

2. Composition of Review Committee

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

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

   a. The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR with the annual TPR schedule, which is distributed at the beginning of the academic year.

   b. The documentation prepared by the library faculty member should generally follow the structure and format of both the TPR Dossier and the college/departmental AFE File described previously.

      1. Prepare a brief (two to three page) Self-Evaluative Statement highlighting teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service achievements over the past five years since the most recent promotion or PTR.

      2. Include the AFE files prepared for each of the past four years.

      3. Prepare a single set of appendices following the labeling and structure described previously (III.A.4) for the AFE file. In this case, include the four most recent AFE Statements written by the dean and/or department head, plus any rebuttals, in Appendix C.

   c. The committee presents its written evaluation to the Dean of Library Services. The dean shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the library faculty member and shall meet with the member to discuss the review. The dean adds his or her review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forwards this material to the provost.

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

IV. The Criteria for Meeting Expectations in the Library

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

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation: (4.05)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

   A 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 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. for a full, detailed description of methods of evaluation and documentation.

4. General Comments

B. Reappointment: (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 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. for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

4. General Comments

C. Tenure (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, WNCLN, University, and external community). See Section II.C. for a detailed description of service expectations and methods of assessment/evaluation.

4. General Comments

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

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

   ADATS 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 for a full description of methods of evaluation and categories of accomplishment (with corresponding units). Normal scholarship expectations with respect to quantity (i.e., 1 unit normal annual expectation) 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, WNCLN, University, and external community) and will have demonstrated excellence in this domain. See Section II.C.

4. General Comments

   Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires sustained, progressive,

and high level attainment in each of the three evaluative domains of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service. Demonstrated excellence across all three domains is the standard.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

ADATS 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 (i.e., 1 unit normal annual expectation) 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, WNCLN, University, and external community).

4. General Comments

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

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching/Librarianship

A 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

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

3. Service

   The 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, WNCLN, University, and external community). See Section II.C.

4. General Comments

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

Approved by:

Mark A. Hoffman — Head, Digital, Access, and Technology Services — 6/30/12 — Date

Dana M. Sally — Dean of Library Services — 6/30/12 — Date

Beth Lyon Lofquist — Provost — 7-17-12 — Date

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.

- Respectful and concerned
  Shows respect, courtesy, and concern for both users and colleagues. Encourages and

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

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

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

APPENDIX B

Roles and Responsibilities of Library Department Heads

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

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

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

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

- Encourages staff participation in library activities
- Where appropriate, participates in library governance
- Where appropriate, seeks opportunities for external funding
- Shares information and ideas with the wider library community
- Participates in academic or professional associations related to department needs
- Delegates tasks and responsibilities appropriately including actively grooming staff to step into roles of greater responsibility
- Demonstrates interpersonal relations that foster a professional environment.
- Reports unsafe and hazardous conditions

- PERSONNEL
  - Coordinates and provides leadership in the recruitment, appointment, training and placement of permanent and temporary employees to ensure optimal functioning of the department
  - Orients new staff members to their responsibilities, introduces them to their peers
  - Manages interpersonal conflict and relations in a fair, equitable and professional manner
  - Provides fair assessment of each staff member's performance. Documents performance issues promptly and thoroughly so they can be handled appropriately.
  - Prepares recommendations for in-range salary increases and for staff reclassification when appropriate
  - Ensures that all personnel related monthly and annual documentation are completed correctly and meet library and university deadlines
  - Supervises and evaluates department staff providing feedback for development
  - Deals with underperformance and incompatibility according to university policy and guidelines
  - Arranges effective and equitable distribution of staff responsibilities

Appendix C

DATS Department
Librarian Review Instrument
20__/ 20 __ Academic Year

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 email.

Name of Librarian Evaluated _____

1) 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

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

D. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

DATS Department
Librarian Review Instrument for _____
20__/ 20 __ Academic Year

- 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

F. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- 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

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

J. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

DATS Department
Librarian Review Instrument for _____
20__/ 20 __ Academic Year

- 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

JL Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Knowledgeable

Examples of this characteristic: Demonstrates knowledge in one's area of librarianship. Shares expertise with colleagues readily.

M. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

N. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

- Respectful and concerned

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

P. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic:

DATS Department
Librarian Review Instrument for _____
20__/ 20 __ Academic Year

- Timely by striving to increase their knowledge

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. What is your assessment of the librarian's knowledge of her or his specialty in librarianship?

Q. How well does the librarian meet this characteristic?

Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

R. Please give comments or examples of this characteristic?

2. 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

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

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

F. Please give comments or examples within the area of service:

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