

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY
PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

The University Libraries Faculty (ULF) consists of all full and part-time library faculty members. The function of the ULF is to ensure that the goals and objectives embodied in the unit's vision statement are carried out in service to the University of Louisville and the local and professional communities.

The University Libraries Faculty Personnel Document establishes the personnel policy for the ULF in accordance with The Redbook and the Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews. This document covers policies and procedures for:

- 1 Faculty Appointments and Tenure
 - 1.1 Full-time Appointments
 - 1.2 Part-time Appointments
 - 1.3 Emeritus Faculty
 - 1.4 Rank for New Appointments
- 2 Faculty Personnel Reviews
 - 2.1 Annual Reviews
 - 2.2 Tenure
 - 2.3 Promotion in Rank
 - 2.4 Periodic Career Review
- 3 Conditions of Faculty Employment
- 4 Resolution of Disagreements
- 5 Termination of Service
- 6 Procedure for Amending University Libraries Faculty Personnel Document

The ULF delegates responsibility for implementing these policies and procedures to the ULF Personnel Committee, which makes recommendations on all of the above issues to the Dean, University Libraries, hereafter referred to as the Dean. The rules for the composition and election of members of this committee are set out in the Bylaws of the University Libraries Faculty. All personnel decisions are made by and are the responsibility of the Dean.

1 FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND TENURE

1.1 FULL-TIME APPOINTMENTS

For description of full-time appointments, including non-tenurable (term), probationary and tenured see The Redbook Sec. 4.1.1.

1.2 PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS

For description of part-time appointments see The Redbook Sec. 4.1.2. For the purposes of all other personnel actions, part-time appointments are considered non-tenurable appointments.

1.3 EMERITUS FACULTY

The honorary title Professor Emeritus may be conferred upon retired faculty if requested by the ULF and the Dean, and approved by the President and Board of Trustees as stated in The Redbook Sec. 4.1.3.

1.4 RANK FOR NEW APPOINTMENTS

A librarian must have a master's degree from an American Library Association accredited library school or the equivalent professional credentials, or a graduate degree in other professional or

Comment [e1]: Overall changes to note:
1. "Supervisor" used instead of "program director" to match Redbook language
2. "Provost" changed to "Executive Vice President and University Provost" to match Redbook language
3. Deleted passages, or parts of passages, in our current document that were verbatim duplicates of Redbook and Minimum Guidelines (Faculty Appointments and Tenure, Contract Renewal, Sabbatical, Termination of Service). Referred to Redbook and Minimum Guides as much as possible. This was done 1) because redundant language was unnecessary 2) because in many instances our document was out of line with the Redbook and the Redbook always supersedes a unit document 3) so that the Personnel Document doesn't need to be altered when Redbook changes 4) to encourage readers to consult and become familiar with the Redbook and Minimum Guidelines.
4. Reorganized document and aligned numbering and section titles to match Redbook

Comment [EMS2]: Sec 1 re-ordered to match Redbook. Descriptions of appointments removed, referred to Redbook instead. Redbook 4.1.1 covers definitions of faculty and renewal of contract.

Comment [e3]: Subsumed under non-tenurable appointments, per Redbook

scholarly fields where appropriate. An archivist must have a master's degree in archives administration, history, library science, information management, business administration, or other relevant field.

2 FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEWS

A. Performance Criteria

The following criteria are the basis of all faculty reviews in the University Libraries. Effective performance in criterion A is essential for all of the reviews documented in Sec. 2. Performance requirements for criteria B-C are determined according to the type of review and the faculty member's individual workplans during the review period. Failure to accomplish significant activities as listed in the annual workplan(s) will be considered unsatisfactory performance.

Criteria A-C will be assessed in writing by the supervisor and the Personnel Committee and will include an evaluation of performance as specified in the annual workplan. The evaluation ratings are exceptional, proficient, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. These terms will be applied relative to the expectations for the faculty member's rank as described in Appendix II. Exceptional and unsatisfactory ratings require additional documentation from the supervisor.

Criterion A: Teaching

The term teaching, applies to the wide range of functions librarians and archivists perform. Activities that contribute to the operations of the University Libraries fall under this criterion. These activities include but are not limited to administration, assessment and resource planning, technical services, information delivery, information literacy, liaison activities, outreach, resource selection, and technology administration. Professional development activities are included in this criterion.

Criterion B: Research or Creative Activity

Research or creative activity focuses on the advancement of knowledge in the fields of librarianship, archival administration, information science, information technology, or other areas of scholarship as related to the faculty member's position. This activity may represent a scholarly approach to innovation, assessment, and evaluation of services, participation in scholarly discourse and reflection concerning the discipline, or scholarly work in a complementary discipline that informs or is informed by the librarian/archivist's provision of services. Emphasis will be placed on work that becomes part of the scholarly record.

Comment [EMS4]: "Research AND Creative Activity" changed to "Research OR Creative Activity" per Redbook.

Criterion C: Service to the Profession, the Unit, the University, or the Community

This criterion is defined as sharing one's professional expertise within the profession, the unit, the University, or the community in general. Examples of activities in this criterion include participating in professional and scholarly organizations, sponsoring student organizations, participating in university-wide committees and initiatives, and consulting in one's area of professional expertise.

Comment [EMS5]: "the Unit" added, "...AND the Community" changed to "...OR the Community" per Redbook

2.1 ANNUAL REVIEWS

- A. Annual reviews follow The Redbook Sec. 4.2.1 and the Minimum Guidelines.
- B. All ULF members must be reviewed in writing annually.
- C. Each faculty member creates annually a written workplan in conjunction with his or her supervisor. The workplan will support the mission and goals of the University Libraries and is the basis for all personnel reviews. (See Sec. 2.0)
 1. The annual workplan will specify the responsibilities of the faculty member for teaching, research or creative activity, and service. Each faculty member, in agreement with his or her supervisor, will indicate what percentage of effort will be spent in criteria A-C. The percentages represent an understanding of workload distribution between faculty member and supervisor.

Comment [EMS6]: Intentional deviation from Redbook order. Redbook discusses annual workplans under "Conditions of Faculty Employment" which would be our Sec. 3. Makes more sense to discuss it under 2.1 Annual Reviews.

2. Faculty permanently or temporarily appointed or reassigned to specialized roles for the purpose of meeting unit needs may develop workplans that specify activity in only one of those areas.
 3. When circumstances require changes in the annual workplan, the faculty member and supervisor must file an amended plan (including an explanation of the necessary changes) for the approval of the Dean. Faculty members may not submit revised annual workplans after November 15.
- D. The annual review measures achievement of the goals outlined in the annual workplan and is based on written evidence. Performance evaluations will be based on the individual's accomplishments and contributions in helping the University Libraries meet its goals and objectives in support of the University's strategic plan.
- E. Each faculty member will have the opportunity to present documentation of performance and effort relative to his or her annual workplan each year.
- F. Each faculty member will be informed in writing by his or her supervisor and by the Personnel Committee of the results of the performance evaluations, any recommendations for improvements, and annual ranking. Each faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond to these recommendations and his or her performance evaluation so that timely adjustments may be made before the final recommendation of the Dean.
- G. All salary increase decisions will be at the discretion of the Dean.
1. Criteria A-C will be evaluated in writing by the ULF member's supervisor in conjunction with the Personnel Committee and reported in writing.
 2. The evaluations of the supervisor and the Personnel Committee will be provided to the Dean and be the basis of salary increase decisions.
 3. The Dean may use a portion (not to exceed 5%) of the funds allocated to the unit for salary increases for a particular year to award special, one-time payments to faculty members for exceptional effort or achievement beyond that rewarded in the regular salary increase process.
 4. The standard period of performance to be covered in the review for salary increases will be the preceding calendar year. When there is an increase of 3% or more in the salary pools between two or more consecutive years, the faculty will make a recommendation to the Dean regarding distribution of salary increases taking into consideration the annual rankings achieved by the faculty member over the period.
- H. The Dean will report annually to the ULF and to the Executive Vice President and University Provost the distribution of the percentage salary increases received by all faculty members and a description of the evaluation system used to arrive at such salary increases.
- I. The Personnel Committee will preserve annual reviews electronically and in the Office of the Dean. Individual faculty members will be responsible for maintaining the documentary evidence supporting each annual review through the next personnel action.
- J. A positive annual review does not guarantee promotion, tenure, satisfactory periodic career review, or contract renewal.
- K. Annual Review Procedure
1. The calendar for annual review is outlined in the University Libraries Faculty Personnel Committee Manual.
 2. The Dean will send a letter to each ULF member announcing the date by which documentation of the year's annual performance must be received.
 3. Each faculty member will prepare an annual performance summary describing and documenting all activities in criteria A-C as outlined in the annual workplan.
 4. Each faculty member will provide his or her annual workplan and annual performance summary in print and electronic form, as well as documentation to support activities in criteria A-C, to the supervisor and the Personnel Committee. The supervisor and the Personnel Committee will separately draft comments about the faculty member's performance in criteria A-C.

5. The supervisor and the Personnel Committee will meet and
 - a. Discuss each faculty member's performance in criteria A-C in regard to how he or she met the goals listed in his or her annual workplan.
 - b. Assign an overall rating of exceptional, proficient, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. An exceptional rating will be awarded only rarely for work that truly goes above and beyond what most faculty members have accomplished in a given year. Both exceptional and unsatisfactory ratings require additional documentation. If there is disagreement about a rating between the supervisor and the Personnel Committee, an attempt to reach consensus will be made. If no consensus can be reached, the supervisor's rating stands for criterion A, and the Personnel Committee's ratings stand for criteria B and C, resulting in a split rating for the year.
 6. After the meeting, the supervisor will write a formal evaluation of criterion A and the Personnel Committee will write a brief, formal evaluation of criteria B-C. Supervisors' evaluations will be forwarded to the Personnel Committee.
 7. The Personnel Committee will forward the finalized rating and the evaluation(s) of criteria A-C to the faculty member and supervisor.
 8. The supervisor and the faculty member will meet for discussion of the evaluation of criteria A-C and, if necessary, develop recommendations for improved performance. Both the supervisor and the faculty member will sign the faculty evaluation summary and forward it back to the Personnel Committee. Each faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond to these recommendations and his or her performance evaluation so that timely adjustments may be made. If agreement cannot be reached, then the faculty member may appeal.
 9. The Personnel Committee will rank faculty members according to the ratings and divide them into four discreet groups: high, medium, low, and unsatisfactory. A rating of unsatisfactory precludes consideration for salary increase.
 10. The Personnel Committee will forward the files and the rankings to the Dean for consideration in the salary increase decisions. If a faculty member achieves an exceptional performance for the year, the Personnel Committee may recommend to the Dean that the faculty member be awarded a special, one-time payment as provided for in Sec. 2.1.G.
 11. The Dean will make salary decisions and inform each faculty member in writing of his or her salary decision.
 - a. Only faculty whose overall performance is judged to be at the level of needs improvement or above in criteria A-C will receive a salary increase. Faculty who are judged to be overall unsatisfactory will not be eligible for a salary increase.
 - b. A decision for a zero salary increase must be submitted for approval of the Executive Vice President and University Executive Vice President and University Provost. This decision will include the reasons for the zero salary increase and specific suggestions for improving any performance considered to be unsatisfactory.
 12. Probationary or term faculty receiving an overall rating of needs improvement for more than one year will be given a terminal one-year contract. Probationary or term faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating will be terminated. See Sec. 5, Termination of Service.
- L. Annual Review Appeal Process
1. The annual review appeal process is conducted outside of the University's formal grievance procedure.
 2. Faculty members have the opportunity to appeal the performance evaluation in writing to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the letter. The Dean will reconsider the performance evaluation for that faculty member and respond in writing to the faculty member's appeal within five working days. When the appeal is made by a faculty member who is evaluated by the Dean, the Dean will designate another faculty member to review and respond to the appeal within the specified time frame. The designee will be a tenured person

at or above the rank of the faculty member making the appeal, will not be a member of the Personnel Committee, and must be agreed to by the appellant.

3. Salary decisions may be appealed in writing to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the letter. The Dean will reconsider the salary decision and respond in writing to the faculty member's appeal within five working days.

2.2 TENURE REVIEWS

A. Length of Probationary Period

1. Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied toward tenure. In most cases, the tenure review will occur at the same time as the review for promotion to Associate Professor.
2. All probationary faculty who have had seven years of service counted in a tenurable faculty position, if reemployed full time, shall be granted tenure.

B. Leaves of Absence

One year spent on an officially approved leave of absence may be counted toward the seven years of full-time necessary for tenure. Any leave granted during the probationary period must carry with it a stipulation in writing as to whether the leave counts toward tenure.

C. Extension of Probationary Period

See The Redbook Sec. 4.2.2.C.

D. Pre-Tenure Review

Faculty members will undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review, typically after the third year of service in the University Libraries. If a faculty member receives three or more years of credit toward tenure when he or she is hired, the hiring process may be considered a pre-tenure review. The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to inform the faculty member about progress toward meeting the University Libraries' standards for tenure. The review will be conducted with the same level of rigor and by the same process as a tenure review; however, external reviews are not required. Faculty members undergoing a pre-tenure review will receive the results in writing. This review is advisory only and does not constitute sufficient justification for award or denial of tenure.

E. Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted as indicated in The Redbook Sec. 4.2.2.E.

F. Criteria for Tenure

1. Completion of the probationary period with successful annual or pre-tenure reviews is not sufficient grounds for tenure. Candidates must demonstrate the level of performance required for promotion to Associate Professor as described in Sec. 2.3.A3. It should be noted that tenure is a more critical action than promotion because it is evidence of the University's firm and enduring commitment to the individual.
2. Faculty members in a probationary status will be affected by any amendments to or change in the criteria for tenure subsequent to their appointment. In such cases, appropriate consideration will be given to the amount of time remaining in their probationary period when the change becomes effective.

G. Evaluation for Tenure

1. For the purposes of tenure reviews, the University Libraries are a unit without departments or divisions.
2. Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied toward tenure. Evaluation for tenure, once originated, shall proceed as indicated unless the faculty member resigns or is subject to termination.

3. The Personnel Committee will notify faculty members as they become eligible for tenure review.
4. The candidate will submit relevant material for review, as described in Appendix II. Tenure reviews will require external review. In the case of tenure with promotion only one dossier will be submitted. Procedures for external review are outlined in Appendix II.
5. The candidate will be shown any material included in the tenure dossier upon request. The candidate may rebut any material in the file within five working days of the deadline for receipt of material by the Personnel Committee.
6. After providing access to the candidate's dossier for a period of no less than ten days, the Personnel Committee will hold a meeting of tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought (excluding the Dean). At this meeting, a majority of those eligible to vote must be present, or attend virtually, and these faculty members will cast votes by written secret ballot for or against promotion for each candidate under review. The vote tally will be announced to those present at the meeting. Absentee ballots will not be permitted, however virtual participation in the discussion and voting will be allowed. Any faculty member present may call for discussion of a candidate's dossier.
7. The Personnel Committee will tally the votes, record the full vote count for each candidate under review, and incorporate this into their recommendation to the Dean. The Personnel Committee will base its recommendation on the criteria for tenure and the documentation listed in Appendix II, and may seek additional information in writing, if necessary.
8. The Personnel Committee will communicate its recommendation regarding tenure in writing to the Dean. This recommendation will be included in all higher levels of review.
9. The faculty member may add newly available material evidence for reconsideration by the previous evaluators or rebuttals before the file is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and University Executive Vice President and University Provost.
10. The recommendation of the dean shall be the unit recommendation forwarded to all higher levels of review. Thereafter the Redbook process is followed, Sec. 4.2.2.H.

Comment [e7]: Revised per ULF vote

Comment [e8]: Revised per ULF vote

Comment [EMS9]: Candidate not notified when Personnel Committee makes recommendation to Dean. Instead, candidate has option to review and rebut file after Dean makes unit recommendation but before recommendation sent to Provost. NOTE: Tracy Eells, Vice Provost for Faculty Personnel, consulted on this point, and for practices in other units, but no response at time of this writing. This recommended change may be revoked pending his response.

Comment [EMS10]: Candidate has option to rebut file after Dean makes unit recommendation but before recommendation sent to Provost.

2.3 PROMOTION IN RANK

All members of the ULF (except Lecturers) are eligible for promotion through the faculty ranks. Promotion is granted on the basis of significant contributions to the University Libraries, the University, the profession, and the community, state, or nation. Successful annual reviews are not sufficient grounds for promotion. Candidates will also be evaluated on the basis of a continuing record of achievement; contributions to the written scholarly record; evidence of professional development; and contributions to the mission and goals of the University Libraries. Neither seniority nor time in rank is to be the sole basis for promotion. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure his or her ability to satisfy the criteria for promotion as described below.

A. Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Full-Time Faculty

1. Lecturers are not eligible for promotion.
2. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor
Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor requires at least two years of experience at the rank of Instructor, one of which must be at the University of Louisville. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor is based primarily on evidence of successful performance in the faculty member's position, and with at least one accomplishment in Criterion B and Criterion C each over the review period. See Appendix II, Sec. I, for characteristics of the Assistant Professor rank.
3. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor normally requires at least four years of experience at the rank of Assistant Professor, three of which must be at the University of Louisville. Promotion at this level is based on evidence of broad proficiency in Criteria A, B, and C, so as to show continuing promise to develop the

Comment [e11]: Proposed requirements for promotion. See below.

Comment [EMS12]: Suggested requirements in B and C for promotion to Assistant Professor. Note: activity in B includes posters, presentations (state, regional, national or international) this does not require publication for this promotion. Activity in C can be service on state or regional committees, does not require national-level service or election/appointment to any professional offices or positions.

Comment [EMS13]: Suggested requirements in B and C for promotion to Associate Professor. Note that an accomplishment in B could be a poster or presentation at a state or regional meeting (ie KLA). It does NOT require publication each year, only two peer reviewed or comparable scholarly works over the entire probationary period. Note that an activity in C could be service on a committee in a state or regional organization. Does not require national service, elected or appointed offices.

faculty member's individual strengths, see Minimum Guidelines, Sec. 4.E. Such proficiency will involve successful performance in the faculty member's position and, normally, at least one accomplishment in Criterion B and one activity in Criterion C for each year since the last personnel action with a minimum of four in each criterion. The typical expectation for accomplishment in B is two scholarly articles in peer reviewed journals or works demonstrating a comparable level of scholarship and one scholarly presentation at a meeting of a professional organization. It must be evident that activity in Criterion B and C is consistent and will continue. See Appendix II, Sec. I, for characteristics of the Associate Professor rank. In the case of those achieving tenure with this promotion, the criteria for tenure must be met, as described in Sec. 2.2 and Appendix II.

4. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor normally requires a minimum of five years of experience at the rank of Associate Professor, three of which must be at the University of Louisville. Candidates for promotion to professor must be evaluated in the areas and by the distribution of effort specified in their approved annual work plans for the period under review. The typical expectation in Criterion B for promotion to Professor is at least three scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals or works demonstrating a comparable level of scholarship, and at least three scholarly presentations at meetings of professional organizations since attaining the rank of Associate Professor. In Criterion C, the typical expectation is at least one activity for each year since promotion to Associate Professor. It must be evident that activity in Criterion B and C is consistent and will continue. See Appendix II, Sec. I, for characteristics of the Professor rank.
5. Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Part-Time Faculty
 - a. It is recognized that the responsibilities of part-time faculty may differ significantly from those with full-time appointments. In a promotion consideration, there should be tangible evidence that a candidate's contributions are significant to the mission of the University Libraries.
 - b. Neither seniority nor time in rank is to be the sole basis for promotion. The criteria for promotion of part-time faculty members are the same as those for full-time as described above.

Comment [EMS14]: These requirements based on overall productivity not productivity within a certain time frame as there is no time requirement for promotion to Professor. Activity not required annually in either B or C to account for variable career emphasis if required by Dean or supervisor.

B. Evaluation for Promotion

1. For the purposes of promotion reviews, the University Libraries are a unit without departments or divisions.
2. The Personnel Committee will notify faculty members as they become eligible for promotion review.
3. The candidate will submit relevant material for review, as described in Appendix II. Promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or from Associate Professor to Professor, will require external review. Procedures for external review are outlined in Appendix II.
4. The candidate will be shown any material included in the promotion dossier upon request. The candidate may rebut any material in the file within five working days of the deadline for receipt of material by the Personnel Committee.
5. After providing access to the candidate's dossier for a period of no less than ten days, the Personnel Committee will hold a meeting of tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought (excluding the Dean). At this meeting, a majority of those eligible to vote must be present, or attend virtually, and these faculty members will cast votes by written secret ballot for or against promotion for each candidate under review. The vote tally will be announced to those present at the meeting. Absentee ballots will not be permitted, however virtual participation in the discussion and voting will be allowed. Any faculty member present may call for discussion of a candidate's dossier.

Comment [EMS15]: Method can be determined by Nominating Committee.

6. The Personnel Committee will tally the votes, record the full vote count for each candidate under review, and incorporate this into their recommendation to the Dean. The Personnel Committee will base its recommendation on the criteria for promotion and the documentation listed in Appendix II, and may seek additional information in writing, if necessary.
7. The Personnel Committee will communicate its recommendation regarding promotion in writing to the Dean. This recommendation will be included in all higher levels of review.
8. The faculty member may add newly available material evidence for reconsideration by the previous evaluators before the file is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and University Provost.
9. Based on the file compiled through this process, the Dean will make the unit recommendation. The recommendation of the Dean shall be the unit recommendation forwarded to all higher levels of review. Prior to submitting the unit recommendation to the Executive Vice President and Provost, the candidate will have the opportunity to review the recommendations and, within five days, write a rebuttal if desired. The Dean will forward the triptych to the Executive Vice President and University Provost and will notify the Personnel Committee, the supervisor, and the candidate of the unit recommendation. Thereafter the Redbook process is followed, Sec. 4.2.2.H.
10. If the Executive Vice President and University Provost disagree with the unit recommendation, the Executive Vice President and University Provost will send a statement of the reasons for his or her recommendation to the faculty member and the Dean, each of whom will have the opportunity to respond in writing prior to any recommendation to the President. The file containing all comments and recommendation will be made available to the President.
11. If the recommendation of the Executive Vice President and University Provost is negative, the candidate must be notified by certified mail. The candidate may request a hearing before the University Faculty Grievance Committee within ten working days following receipt of the certified letter.
12. The Executive Vice President and University Provost will prepare a recommendation for the President's review, and the President makes the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.
13. In any case where the initial recommendation to deny promotion is by the President, the candidate will be notified of the reason in writing by the President and may appeal to the University Faculty Grievance Committee within ten working days following the President's notice. The report of the University Faculty Grievance Committee will make a recommendation for promotion or denial of promotion to the Board of Trustees. The President and the candidate have ten working days following the report of the University Faculty Grievance Committee to submit their written responses to the report to the Board of Trustees.
14. In all cases, the Board of Trustees makes the final decision on promotion.

2.4 PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW

- A. The purpose of Periodic Career Review (PCR) is to promote the continued professional development of the faculty.
- B. Faculty members with tenure shall undergo a career review after every fifth year of service with the following exceptions:
 1. A successful promotion review will serve as a career review, and the next review will not take place until five years after the promotion review.
 2. When the review period ends in a sabbatical (or other leave) year, the career review shall be deferred until the next academic year.

3. Faculty members planning to request promotion to Professor in the next academic year may defer review for one year.
- C. All Redbook rights of due process and appeal for faculty will apply in these reviews.
- D. Procedures for Periodic Career Review
1. All periodic career reviews for faculty members with tenure shall take place in the spring semester of the academic year.
 2. The calendar for PCR is outlined in the University Libraries Faculty Personnel Committee Manual. The Personnel Committee will notify those faculty members scheduled for review, their supervisors, and the Dean.
 3. The Personnel Committee will conduct the review and base its evaluation on annual reviews and associated documentation for each of the five years being reviewed. The faculty member may add any appropriate material.
 4. The evaluation report will characterize the faculty member's overall contribution as satisfactory: meeting University Libraries criteria, or unsatisfactory: not meeting University Libraries criteria.
- E. If the faculty member has received at least a proficient rating in all annual reviews for the specified review period, the faculty member has met the University Libraries criteria. The Personnel Committee will review the file and characterize the member's contribution as satisfactory: meeting University Libraries criteria.
- F. If the faculty member has not received at least a proficient rating in all annual reviews for the specified review period, the Personnel Committee will review the material to determine whether the faculty member's performance has met the University Libraries criteria overall meriting a satisfactory rating, or is unsatisfactory.
- G. Supplementary salary increases may be awarded per the Minimum Guidelines, Sec. V.
- H. The Personnel Committee will forward its recommendations regarding PCR to the Dean. The Dean will issue the final evaluation report to the faculty member and will notify the Executive Vice President and University Provost in writing indicating satisfactory or unsatisfactory results.
1. If the conclusion of the report is that the faculty member's overall contribution has been satisfactory over the review period, the faculty member begins the five-year review cycle in the following year.
 2. If the conclusion of the report is that the faculty member's overall contribution has been unsatisfactory, the report will state the deficiency(ies) that was (were) the basis for this conclusion. Within thirty calendar days of receipt of the report, the faculty member, in consultation with the appropriate supervisor and the Dean, will prepare a career development plan to remedy the deficiency(ies) in one year unless the Dean approves a longer period.
 - a. If the faculty member completes the agreed-upon career development plan, the faculty member shall then have one year to demonstrate satisfactory performance. The faculty member will then undergo another periodic review in the following academic year.
 - b. If the faculty member fails to complete the agreed-upon career development plan, the faculty member may ask for an extension of one year, to be granted at the discretion of the Dean. After the extension, the Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the supervisor will assess the faculty member's progress in the completion of the professional development plan.
 1. If satisfactory, a special career review will be conducted one year later by the Personnel Committee in conjunction with the Dean and the supervisor.
 2. If unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, which may include proceedings for termination as described in The Redbook Article 4.5

Comment [EMS16]: Minimum Guidelines, Sec V states that faculty member will be evaluated as "satisfactory: meeting unit criteria" or "unsatisfactory: not meeting unit criteria". There is no provision for "exceptional"; therefore, the language on awarding exceptional review has been removed.

Comment [EMS17]: Reference to "exceptional" performance removed. Supplemental salary increase now follows Minimum Guidelines.

Comment [EMS18]: The only portion of the Redbook section on Conditions for Faculty Employment that applies to the ULF is 4.3.5 Sabbatical. The language was a duplication of the Redbook except the phrase "will improve the faculty member's contribution to the University Libraries mission". The Redbook simply states "the University's mission". We felt that we could omit the specific reference to the University Libraries and simply refer all of Section 3 to the Redbook since the Redbook always supersedes unit documents anyhow.

3 CONDITIONS OF FACULTY EMPLOYMENT

The conditions of faculty employment in the University Libraries follow the Redbook, Article 4.3.

4 RESOLUTION OF DISAGREEMENTS

Except for those with temporary or emeritus appointments, all ULF members may participate in the procedures described in The Redbook, Article 4.4; however, only tenured ULF members may seek election to the University Faculty Grievance Committee.

5 TERMINATION OF SERVICE

Termination of service of tenured or probationary faculty follows Redbook Article 4.5.

6 PROCEDURE FOR AMENDING UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

- A. Any voting member of the ULF may propose changes to the University Libraries Faculty Personnel Document or any of its appendices. Proposed amendments must be submitted in writing to the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee must distribute the proposed amendment to each member of the ULF at least five working days in advance of a faculty meeting.
- B. A written ballot must be distributed at the meeting. In order for the amendment to be approved, at least half of the membership must be present and the amendment must be approved by at least two-thirds of the members present. If a majority of members is not present or if the majority of the faculty members present so wish, a mail ballot may be used.
- C. Amendments to the University Libraries Faculty Personnel Document must also be approved by the Faculty Senate, the Executive Vice President and University Provost, and the Board of Trustees. Amendments to any of the appendices can be made solely with the approval of the ULF.

Comment [EMS19]: The deleted section 3.24 of the current Personnel Document, "Termination of Service" is a verbatim copy of this section of the Redbook.

DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012.

DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, 12 NOVEMBER 2010.