

University of Louisville University Libraries

Faculty Personnel Document

Approved by the Board of Trustees: December 11, 2025

**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
 - 2.0 Performance Criteria
 - 2.1 Annual Review
 - 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 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. University Libraries faculty ranks are Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. These ranks apply to both term and tenure track faculty, except for Lecturer, which is used only for term faculty. The Personnel Committee makes recommendations on rank for new appointments after considering the candidate's credentials with the requirements outlined in the ULF Personnel Document 2.3.A and Appendix II.

2 FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEWS

2.0 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The following criteria are the basis of all faculty reviews in the University Libraries (See Appendix I). 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 workplan during the review period. Failure to accomplish significant activities as listed in the annual workplan(s) will be considered unsatisfactory performance.

Criteria A will be assessed in writing by the supervisor; Criteria B and C will be assessed in writing by the Personnel Committee. The assessment will include an evaluation of performance as specified in the annual workplan. The evaluation ratings are Outstanding, Commendable, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory. These terms will be applied relative to the expectations for the faculty member's rank as described in Appendix II. Unsatisfactory ratings require additional documentation from the supervisor.

A. 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.

B. 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 faculty member's provision of services. Emphasis will be placed on work that becomes part of the scholarly record.

C. 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.

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 (See Appendix I).
- C. Each faculty member creates annually a written workplan in conjunction with their 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 their supervisor, will indicate what percentage of effort that will be spent in Criteria A-C. The percentages represent an understanding of workload distribution between faculty member and supervisor.
 - 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 based on documented 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 priorities.
- E. Each faculty member will have the opportunity to present documentation of performance and effort relative to their annual workplan each year. Guidelines for documentation are in Appendix I, the ULF Personnel Document, and the ULF Personnel Committee Manual. By November 15 each year, the Personnel Committee will send instructions regarding the documentation.
- F. All salary increase decisions will be at the discretion of the Dean.
 - 1. Criterion A will be evaluated in writing by the ULF member's supervisor; Criteria B and C will be evaluated in writing by the Personnel Committee.
 - 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 merit-based salary increases will be the preceding calendar year. Prior performance in years without merit raises will be taken into account when funds become available for salary increases. When there is an increase of 3% or more in the salary pools between two or more consecutive years, the University Libraries 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.

- G. The Dean will report annually to the ULF at the May meeting 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 system used to arrive at such salary increases.
- H. The Personnel Committee will preserve annual reviews in the ULF electronic archive. Individual faculty members will be responsible for maintaining the documentary evidence supporting each annual review through the next personnel action.
- I. A positive annual review does not guarantee promotion, tenure, satisfactory periodic career review, or contract renewal.
- J. Annual Review Procedure
 1. The calendar for annual review is outlined in the *University Libraries Faculty Personnel Committee Manual*.
 2. By November 15 each year, the Dean will send an email to all ULF members announcing the date by which documentation of the year's annual performance must be received. Instructions for formatting the section that pertains to Criteria B and C will be provided to the Dean by the Personnel Committee prior to this date.
 3. Each faculty member will prepare a written annual performance summary describing and documenting all activities in Criteria A-C as outlined in the annual workplan. The format of the section of the annual performance summary covering Criterion A will be agreed upon by the ULF member and their supervisor and can take the form of a narrative or bulleted list. If the faculty member and supervisor are unable to agree, the supervisor will determine the format. Section 4.3.3 of The Redbook details how work outside the university should be accounted for in annual review materials.
 4. Each faculty member will provide their annual workplan and annual performance summary in electronic form, as well as documentation, to the supervisor, the library director, and the Personnel Committee.
 5. The supervisor will write a formal evaluation of Criterion A and the Personnel Committee will write a formal evaluation of Criteria B-C. The supervisor and Personnel Committee will work together toward consensus on an overall rating

A faculty member's annual performance will be assessed by the Personnel Committee and the faculty member's supervisor using the following scale: faculty members will only be rated for criteria in which they have work plan commitments. Definitions set forth in this section are to provide guidance to faculty members, Personnel Committee, and supervisors in making reasonable and fair assessments of achievements and performance and to encourage a common understanding of good performance rather than rigid criteria that could discourage experimentation and innovation. In effect, the definitions strive to emphasize a balance of quantitative outcomes and qualitative efforts.

Outstanding:

Performance and accomplishments throughout the rating period that far exceed the standards and expectations of the position, both in quantity and quality.

Commendable:

Performance and accomplishments throughout the rating period that consistently met the standards and expectations of the position and may exceed them occasionally.

Satisfactory:

Performance and accomplishments throughout the rating period that meet the standards and expectations of the position. Minor deviations may occur, but the overall level of performance meets all position expectations.

Needs Improvement:

Performance and accomplishments throughout the rating period were mostly met and satisfactory based on the standards and expectations of the position, but a need for further development is recognized.

Unsatisfactory:

Performance and accomplishments throughout the rating period were consistently unsatisfactory and failed to meet the standards and expectations of the position. There was failure to meet essential goals and improvement is needed in all or most aspects of the position. A plan to correct performance, with corresponding timelines, must be outlined and monitored if this rating is given.

6. The Personnel Committee will forward the finalized evaluation(s) of Criteria B-C to the supervisor, and the supervisor will forward the finalized evaluation of Criteria A to the Personnel Committee. The supervisor or the Personnel Committee may request a meeting to discuss the review and respond to questions. After consensus on an overall rating of Outstanding, Commendable, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory has been reached between the Personnel Committee and the supervisor, the Personnel Committee will share all evaluations with the faculty member. If consensus cannot be reached, the supervisor's evaluation stands for Criterion A, and the Personnel Committee's ratings stand for Criteria B and C.
7. 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 their performance evaluation so that timely adjustments may be made before the final recommendation of the dean. If agreement cannot be reached, then the faculty member may appeal as outlined in section 2.1.K of this document.
8. All faculty evaluations will be provided to the office of the Dean for use in determination of salary increases.
9. The Dean will make salary decisions and inform each faculty member in writing of their salary decision.
 - a. Only faculty whose performance is judged to be at the level of needs improvement or above in Criteria A will be eligible to receive a salary increase. Faculty who are judged to be Unsatisfactory in any criteria 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 Provost. This decision will include the

reasons for the zero salary increase and specific suggestions for improving any performance considered to be Unsatisfactory.

10. 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 unsatisfactory rating in all criteria will be terminated. See Sec. 5, Termination of Service.
- K. Annual Review Appeal Process
1. The annual review appeal process outlined in this section is conducted outside of the University's formal grievance procedure. For additional information about resolution of faculty disputes, consult Section 4.4 of the Redbook.
 2. Faculty members have the right to appeal the performance evaluation for the current review period by submitting a claim in writing to the Appeals Committee. Claims may concern Criterion A, B, C, or any combination thereof, and must be submitted within ten working days of completion of the faculty/supervisor annual review meeting. Claims must identify the specific area or areas in dispute and provide directly relevant evidence and/or facts substantiating those claims.
 3. The Appeals Committee is responsible for reviewing the faculty person's claim and may make a recommendation for revision of a faculty member's rating. The Appeals Committee will consider the faculty member's claim and report a final recommendation in writing within ten working days. During this time, the Appeals Committee may request additional evidence and/or facts from or may, if judged necessary, meet with the faculty member and/or faculty member's supervisor(s) for further clarification and discussion.
 4. When the appeal is made by a faculty member whose direct supervisor is a standing member of the Appeals Committee, the alternate member of the Personnel Committee will replace that faculty member for the duration of the appeals process through its conclusion.
 5. The Appeals Committee will report the recommendation and rationale of the committee in writing to the Dean and all parties directly involved in the appeal. The Dean will respond with a rationale to the recommendation in writing to all parties directly involved in the appeal. The Dean's decision is final within the unit.
 6. Salary decisions may be appealed in writing to the Dean within five working days of receiving the salary decision 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. All promotion and tenure reviews are conducted by a Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee of the Personnel Committee.
- B. 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.
- C. Leaves of Absence**
- One year spent on an officially approved leave of absence may be counted toward the seven

years of full-time service 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.

D. Extension of Probationary Period

See *The Redbook* Sec. 4.2.2.C.

E. 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.

F. Early Tenure

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

G. 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.A.3. 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.

H. 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 secret ballot for or against promotion and tenure for each candidate under review. The vote tally will be announced to those present at the meeting. Absentee ballots will not be

- permitted. 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 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.

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, or the community. 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 their ability to satisfy the criteria for promotion as described below. All promotion and tenure reviews are conducted by a Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee of the Personnel Committee.

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 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 workplans 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.

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 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. Any faculty member present may call for discussion of a candidate's dossier.
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 University Provost, the candidate will have the opportunity to review the recommendations and, within five working days, write a rebuttal if desired. The Dean will forward the file 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 disagrees with the unit recommendation, the Executive Vice President and University Provost will send a statement of the reasons for their 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

The purpose of Periodic Career Review (PCR) is to promote the continued professional development of the faculty.

- A. 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.
- B. All of *The Redbook* rights of due process and appeal for faculty will apply in these reviews.
- C. 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 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will notify those faculty members scheduled for review, their supervisors, and the Dean.
 3. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will 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.
- D. If the faculty member has received at least a Satisfactory rating in all annual reviews for the specified review period, the faculty member has met the University Libraries criteria. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will review the file and characterize the member's contribution as satisfactory: meeting University Libraries criteria.
- E. If the faculty member has not received at least a Satisfactory rating in all annual reviews for the specified review period, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will review the material to determine whether the faculty member's performance has merited an overall Satisfactory rating or is Unsatisfactory.
- F. Supplementary salary increases may be awarded per the *Minimum Guidelines*, Sec. V.
- G. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 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 any deficiencies that formed 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 any deficiencies 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 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the Dean, and the supervisor will assess the faculty member's progress in the completion of the professional development plan.
 - i. If satisfactory, a special career review will be conducted one year later by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee in conjunction with the Dean and the supervisor.

- ii. 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.

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 *The 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 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, the ballot can be distributed, collected, and tallied after the meeting.

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.

Approved by University Libraries Faculty: March 21, 1985

Approved by Board of Trustees: May 20, 1985

Approved by University Libraries Faculty: November 15, 1990

Approved by Board of Trustees: March 25, 1991

Amended by University Libraries Faculty: April 18, 1996

Approved by Board of Trustees: May 20, 1996

Amended by University Libraries Faculty: March 26, 1998; January 27, 1999; December 15, 1999; April 20, 2000

Approved by Board of Trustees: February 26, 2001

Amended by University Libraries Faculty: September 2001

Approved by Board of Trustees: April 22, 2002

Approved by University Libraries Faculty: September 23, 2010

Approved by Board of Trustees: November 11, 2010

Approved by University Libraries Faculty: February 20, 2012

Approved by Board of Trustees: June 28, 2012

Approved by University Libraries Faculty: June 14, 2019

Approved by Faculty Senate: June 3, 2020

Approved by Board of Trustees: October 28, 2020

Corrected version approved by Board of Trustees: April 22, 2021

Appendix I: Annual Review

See also *Personnel Document*, 2.0.

The results of annual reviews are independent from promotion and/or tenure reviews. Incentives may be given through annual reviews for work that requires both time and conscientious effort and that is essential to the governance of the Libraries faculty, consistent with the strategic plans of the university, or integral to the operation of professional organizations, but that may not reflect the kind of contributions expected for tenure. Early in the pre-tenure period the faculty member should develop a program that will demonstrate progress toward long-term goals, emphasizing quality over quantity. As part of the annual review for persons with promotions ahead of them, the Personnel Committee will highlight contributions that they believe would make worthy components of the promotion/tenure file as described in Appendix II. No decision or advice by one Personnel Committee for annual review should be considered binding on future Committees.

The criteria presented in this document should be interpreted within the framework of the peer review process. Benchmarks and lists serve as guides rather than prescriptions. They are not substitutes for judgment on the part of any reviewing body. Nor should they be viewed as a guarantee of promotion or tenure at a later date. The expectations for any particular faculty member will, in part, be determined by where they are in their professional career. In general, certain qualities and characteristics are associated with the stages of one's career (see Appendix II). Additionally, general factors are expected of all faculty members regardless of rank. These include, but are not limited to:

- effective communication skills
- professionalism, collegiality, dependability, and adaptability
- independence and responsibility
- consistency of performance and accuracy
- initiative, creativity
- quality of decision making, judgment, influence, impact, and leadership
- organizational skills, planning, supervision, and management
- ability to relate job functions to the goals of the Libraries and University
- effective response to criticism and suggestions
- professional growth and development

Criterion A: Teaching

Typically, the activities in this criterion are assigned the largest percentage of the faculty member's annual workplan. Individual workplans for faculty members vary considerably. For definition of work under this criterion, see *Personnel Document* 2.0.

Criterion B: Research or Creative Activity

For definition of work under this criterion, see *Personnel Document* 2.0.

The quality and significance of research and creative activities will be judged with respect to the individual faculty member's position and point in career, as well as the nature of the activity in question. Examples of research and creative activities include but are not limited to:

- publishing an article or chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume, or contributing an article or chapter by invitation

- serving as author or editor of a book or book chapter
- making a presentation that reflects scholarship or research at a peer-reviewed national, regional, or state conference, or making a presentation at such conferences by invitation
- presenting a poster at a national, regional, or state conference
- receiving grant funding in support of the Libraries mission and goals or to further one's expertise or performance
- moderating or participating in a panel discussion at a conference

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

For definition of work under this criterion, see *Personnel Document 2.0*. The significance, quality, and impact of specific accomplishments will be considered, as well as leadership, influence, and reputation at the state, regional, national, or international level. Beginning early in the pre-tenure period, faculty members are expected to contribute to some combination of:

- governance of the University Libraries
- work of University committees
- leadership, planning, and governance of state, regional, national, or international professional organizations

The quality and significance of service activities will be judged with respect to the individual faculty member's position and point in career, as well as the nature of the activity in question. Examples of service activities include but are not limited to:

- participating actively on library, campus, university, and faculty governance committees and bodies
- serving as an academic advisor, internship program director, or thesis/dissertation committee member
- participating actively in professional or scholarly organizations at the state, regional, national, or international levels
- holding a leadership position in a state, regional, national, or international professional organization
- organizing conferences and other meetings
- refereeing journal articles or book manuscripts
- editing or performing editorial duties for scholarly or professional publications
- serving on grant review panels or committees
- conducting a peer-sharing
- serving as a mentor in a formal capacity

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

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

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
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 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. Documentation that provides compelling evidence for the quality and impact of specific activities submitted to represent their body of work.
Documentation may include but should not be limited to:
 - a. copies of publications
 - b. 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. 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 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, creative activity, and service activities. Expert, objective, external reviewers will be asked to evaluate the quality and impact of the contribution of the research, 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).
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.**

Summary of Amendments to the ULF Personnel Document

Submitted by the University of Libraries Faculty (ULF) Personnel Committee (2023-2024)

1/24/2025

Overview

The University Libraries Faculty voted to approve revisions to the Personnel Document. There are a total of 48 edits. The changes are minor and intended to provide clarity and improve language throughout the document, especially the annual review process. The document also references ULF's move towards virtual meetings, electronic ballots, and electronic filing.

Summary of Revisions

Personnel Document

- Edit 1: Replaced “librarian/archivist” with “faculty member”
 - Rationale: “Faculty member” applies to both librarians and archivists
- Edit 2: Replaced “written” with “documented”
 - Rationale: We ask for documentation, not necessarily in the form of a written narrative.
- Edit 3: Replaced “university’s strategic plan” with “university priorities”
 - Rationale: “University’s strategic plan” is too specific. “University priorities” are more general and allow for a broader range of activities in support of priorities.
- Edit 4: Deleted “written”
 - Rationale: Unnecessary
- Edit 5: Deleted “written”
 - Rationale: Unnecessary
- Edit 6: Added “merit-based”
 - Rationale: Clarifying that we are talking only about merit-based increases here, not COLAs or other salary increases.
- Edit 7: Added “Prior performance in years without merit raises will be taken into account when funds become available for salary increases.”
 - Rationale: Per the Economic Welfare report, this language ensures that years without merit increases are still taken into account when merit increases become available.
- Edit 8: Replaced “electronically and in the Office of the Dean” with “in the ULF electronic archive”
 - Rationale: Files are now preserved in the electronic archives only.
- Edit 9: Replaced “a letter to each” with “an email to all”
 - Rationale: The Dean sends an email to the faculty listserv.
- Edit 10: Moved “Instructions for formatting the section that pertains to Criteria B and C will be provided to the Dean by the Personnel Committee prior to this date.”

- Rationale: Moved this point up from 2.1.J.3 as it makes more sense to talk about it here since the Dean sends both the date and instructions together.
- Edit 11: Deleted “By November 15 each year, written instructions for the section that pertains to Criteria B and C will be provided by the Personnel Committee.”
 - Rationale: Added language about this point to 2.1.J.2.
- Edit 12: Added “Section 4.3.3 of The Redbook details how work outside the university should be accounted for in annual review materials.”
 - Rationale: Changed this to reference the Redbook for information on accounting for work outside the university.
- Edit 13: Deleted “print and”
 - Rationale: Print is no longer accepted.
- Edit 14: Deleted “if needed”
 - Rationale: The annual review instructions detail when documentation is needed.
- Edit 15: Added “. The supervisor and Personnel Committee will work together toward consensus on an overall rating”
 - Rationale: Consensus was not originally mentioned until later in the document.
- Edit 17: Replaced “that... for the standards” with “standards and”
 - Rationale: Clearer language
- Edit 18: Replaced “supervisor” with “Personnel Committee”
 - Rationale: The Personnel Committee sends the evaluations to faculty and copies the supervisor.
- Edit 19: Deleted “The supervisor will share the final, written evaluations with the faculty member.”
 - Rationale: Same as above.
- Edit 20: Deleted “ranking and subsequent”
 - Rationale: Ranking is no longer part of the annual review process.
- Edit 21: Added “be eligible to”
 - Rationale: Takes into account that we do not receive guaranteed raises each year and mirrors the language of the following sentence.
- Edit 22: Replaced “receiving the performance evaluation letter” with “completion of the faculty/supervisor annual review meeting”
 - Rationale: The faculty member should have a chance to discuss their rating with their supervisor before deciding to appeal an evaluation. The supervisor/faculty member meeting might be scheduled for several days or longer after receiving the evaluation letter.
- Edit 23: Replaced “revise” with “make a recommendation for revision of”
 - Rationale: The final decision about revising a faculty member’s rating should fall to the Dean. K.5 says the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the Dean for a final decision.
- Edit 24: Added “service”
 - Rationale: Missing word
- Edit 25: Deleted “written”
 - Rationale: Ballots are generally electronic.

- Edit 26: Deleted “, however virtual participation in the discussion and voting will be allowed.”
 - Rationale: Most meetings are now held virtually.
- Edit 27: Deleted “, state, or nation”
 - Rationale: Faculty members are evaluated on their contributions to the library, university, profession, and community.
- Edit 28: Replaced “his or her” with “their”
 - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 29: Deleted “written”
 - Rationale: Ballots are generally electronic
- Edit 30: Deleted “, however virtual participation in the discussion and voting will be allowed.”
 - Rationale: Most meetings are now held virtually.
- Edit 31: Replaced “triptych” with “file”
 - Rationale: “File” is truer to the current system of forwarding faculty files in Folio.
- Edit 32: Replaced “his or her” with “their”
 - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 33: Replaced “has met the University Libraries criteria overall meriting a satisfactory rating or unsatisfactory” with “has merited an overall Satisfactory rating or is Unsatisfactory”
 - Rationale: There are no criteria for PCR, just an evaluation of past annual reviews to see if the faculty member has received Satisfactory or above ratings. This language leaves more room to deal with unusual situations like split ratings, where a faculty member undergoing PCR may have received a split Satisfactory/Needs Improvement rating during the period under review.
- Edit 34: Replaced “the deficiency(ies)” with “any deficiencies”
 - Rationale: Clarifying language
- Edit 35: Deleted “written”
 - Rationale: Ballots are generally electronic
- Edit 36: Replaced “a mail ballot may be used” with “the ballot can be distributed, collected, and tallied after the meeting”
 - Rationale: A “mail ballot” would generally now be an electronic ballot distributed outside of a meeting.

Appendix I

- Edit 37: Replaced “he or she is” with “they are”
 - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 28: Added “add”
 - Rationale: Consistency among structure of bullet points with Oxford comma and “and”
- Edit 39: Deleted “service to the Libraries, University or community” and “including involvement in professional organizations”

- Rationale: These bullet points are general factors expected of all faculty members; service and involvement in professional organizations are not expectations for term faculty
- Edit 40: Replaced “librarians and archivists” with “faculty members”
 - Rationale: “Faculty member” applies to librarians and archivists

Appendix II

- Edit 41: Added “of the Personnel Document”
 - Rationale: Clarifying what document is being referred to
- Edit 42: Replaced “his/her” with “their”
 - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 43: Replaced “It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide” with “Documentation that provides”
 - Rationale: Consistency with the format of the other items on this list
- Edit 44: Replaced “his/her” with “their”
 - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 45: Replaced “editorial correspondence concerning the comments of peer reviewers and the author’s response” with “relevant editorial and/or peer review correspondence”
 - 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.
- Edit 46: Replaced “results of focus groups or usability testing for library initiatives” with “program evaluations, initiative assessment data, or other evidence of exceptional performance”
 - 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.
- Edit 47: Replaced “addresses” with “contact information”
 - Rationale: The Personnel Committee asks for email addresses
- Edit 48: Deleted “and” and added “and service activities.”
 - Rationale: Peer reviewers are asked to evaluate both research/creative activity and service