

Appendix II: Promotion and Tenure Reviews

1. General Characteristics of Ranks

These characteristics serve as a general guideline to determine the appropriate level of performance for a given rank for purposes of initial appointment, annual review and promotion (see Appendix I and *Personnel Document*, Sec. 2).

A. Characteristics of Instructor

- Beginner, little experience
- Developing identity, role and specialization
- Demonstrates basic skills
- Works within unit on well-defined, short-term, supervised activity
- Contributes to planning and management within unit
- Participates, to limited degree, in larger organizational activities
- Exerts some influence and impact on larger organization
- Initiates activity in professional organizations and activities
- Establishing record of publication and presentation

B. Characteristics of Assistant Professor

- Some experience
- Shows growth and achievement in specialty
- Demonstrates broader skills
- Works with limited supervision within area of specialization doing complex, yet defined tasks
- Exerts greater influence and impact within unit and library
- Involved in university-wide committees or activities
- Contributes to professional organizations and activities
- Establishing record of publication and presentation

C. Characteristics of Associate Professor

- Experienced
- Competent specialist
- Demonstrates breadth and depth of skills
- Works with minimal supervision within area of specialization in unit and in library at large
- Plans and manages within unit and among units
- Exerts significant influence and impact within unit and parts of libraries at large
- Contributes to and leads in professional activities
- Established record of publication and presentation

D. Characteristics of Professor

- Broadly experienced
- Master specialist

- Demonstrates skills in many aspects of academic librarianship
- Works with minimal supervision in area of specialization within and beyond library
- Plans for and manages in area of responsibility
- Broad and sometimes final influence and impact
- Contributes to and leads in professional activities
- Continuing record of publication and presentation

2. Promotion to Assistant Professor

- A. For promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, the whole body of work for the time period under consideration will be assessed. See 2.3.A.2 [of the Personnel Document](#) for criteria for promotion in rank.
- B. Documentation of successful performance in the candidate's role in the operations of the Libraries will consist of annual evaluations and a summary letter, which encompasses Criteria AC, from the supervisor. Candidates will be evaluated by the Personnel Committee. Each candidate will submit electronically:
 1. Signed and approved annual workplans for the period under review
 2. Current CV
 3. Information and documentation of any accomplishments since the last annual review or personnel action, including work in progress

Commented [AW1]: Edit 41
Rationale: Clarifying what document is being referred to

3. Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

- A. For promotion and/or tenure reviews, see Sec. 2.2 and 2.3 of the *Personnel Document*.
- B. Candidates will be evaluated by the Personnel Committee and by external peer reviewers. Beginning early in the pre-tenure period the faculty member should engage in activities that will demonstrate progress toward long-term goals, emphasizing quality over quantity. The promotion/tenure dossier will include the following items, submitted in electronic format:
 1. A statement by the candidate of no more than two single-spaced pages describing the goals, focus, strategies, and coherence of [his/her/their](#) body of work. This statement is intended to provide a context for review of the file, not an argument for promotion and/or tenure.
 2. Documentation for five to eight accomplishments upon which the candidate would like the evaluation to focus. These items should represent the candidate's best efforts and should have demonstrable impact on the profession. These items and their documentation will be submitted for blind external review. The quality of the other contributions documented on annual performance summaries will be considered, but quantity of contributions should not be expected to compensate for a lack of quality or impact. These activities will be a combination of research and scholarly activity and service involvement. They may also include exceptional initiatives relating directly to the candidate's role in the operation of the Libraries.
 3. [It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide](#) [Documentation that provides](#) compelling evidence for the quality and impact of specific activities submitted to represent [his/her/their](#) body of work.

Commented [AW2]: Edit 42
Rationale: Inclusive language

Commented [AW3]: Edit 43
Rationale: Consistency with the format of other items in this list

Commented [AW4]: Edit 44
Rationale: Inclusive language

Documentation may include but should not be limited to:

- a. copies of publications
- b. editorial correspondence concerning the comments of peer reviewers and the author's response relevant editorial and/or peer review correspondence
- c. articles citing a candidate's publication
- d. speakers' notes and accompanying slides for presentations
- e. descriptions of the substance, impact, quality, and duration of a candidate's service
- f. annual reports of relevant organizations
- g. letters from others collaborating on and/or affected by an activity
- h. supervisor's documentation of exceptional performance
- i. citations accompanying awards or special recognition for service or initiatives
- j. results of focus groups or usability testing for library initiatives program evaluations, initiative assessment data, or other evidence of exceptional performance.

4. Annual workplans and annual reviews for the period under review (as stipulated in *Personnel Document 2.2, 2.3*).

5. Current CV

6. Names and addresses/contact information of at least three potential external reviewers.

C. In addition to the materials submitted by the candidate, the Personnel Committee will obtain:

1. The supervisor's evaluation for promotion and/or tenure
2. External reviewers' comments
3. A summary and recommendation concerning the promotion/tenure dossier, written by the Personnel Committee.

4. External Review Procedures

A. Tenure reviews and promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor require external review of research, and creative activity, and service activities. Expert, objective, external reviewers will be asked to evaluate the quality and impact of the contribution of the research, and creativity, and service of the candidate for promotion. External reviewers will be identified by the Personnel Committee based on area of expertise, rank, and, if appropriate, tenure status.

B. External reviewers shall:

1. have a rank or position at the same level or higher than the position sought by the candidate and be in a relevant professional position outside the University of Louisville. The decision on whether a reviewer is at an appropriate rank or position is determined by the ULF Personnel Committee based on the candidate's job position and rank sought, and the reviewer's job position, rank, and institution.
2. be neutral and may not be more than casual acquaintances of the candidate. Reviewers may have served on professional association committees with the candidate, but they must not have been professional collaborators (e.g., co-workers or co-authors on an article or grant).

Commented [AW5]: Edit 45

Rationale: While the Personnel Committee would not normally be concerned with editorial or peer review comments, some PC members felt we should leave room for submission of particularly positive feedback on an article to help us understand the quality of a work.

Commented [AW6]: Edit 46

Rationale: This seems to be an oddly specific item to include in an inexhaustive list of potential documentation. We broadened the language so that faculty could still provide evidence of impact and quality of work in areas other than scholarship and service.

Commented [AW7]: Edit 47

Rationale: The Personnel Committee asks for email addresses

Commented [AW8]: Edit 48

Rationale: Peer reviewers are asked to evaluate both research/creative activity and service

3. not offer a recommendation for tenure or promotion. Recommendations will not be considered if given. The opinions of the external reviewers will be given due consideration in the Personnel Committee's promotion procedure.
- C. The candidate shall submit to the ULF Personnel Committee in electronic format:
1. one copy of the candidate's CV
 2. one copy of the candidate's personal statement
 3. one copy of all materials to be reviewed.
- D. The Personnel Committee shall:
1. select and invite three reviewers. If any of those contacted are unable or unwilling to serve as reviewers, the Personnel Committee will submit more names and follow the process above until three reviewers have been found.
 2. send the following materials to the external reviewers:
 - a. a letter of instruction for the reviewer
 - b. a copy of the candidate's CV
 - c. the materials to be reviewed
 3. notify the candidate when all external reviews have been received. The candidate will have five working days to review and respond in writing to the letters. The copy of the external review letters shown to the candidate will have the reviewers' names and institutions redacted. This response will be included in the materials to be reviewed by the ULF Personnel Committee for consideration during the tenure or promotion process.
 4. provide a written analysis of the validity and significance of the reviews received.

DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY 20 FEBRUARY 2012.

**DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
28 JUNE 2012.**