

Librarian Assembly Constitution and Bylaws

Iowa State University Library

February 2020

Approved by the Librarian Assembly April 21, 2020

Approved by the Dean of the Library May 20, 2020

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Librarian Assembly Constitution and Bylaws

Article I. Organization

- A. Name of Organization: Librarian Assembly [hereafter referred to as Assembly]
- B. Purpose of Organization: To meet regularly to discuss librarian governance and affairs and to facilitate communication among librarians.

Article II. Membership

- A. Library staff holding an academic librarian (Librarian I-IV) or faculty appointment. All persons holding any of these appointments are eligible to vote and serve on committees. Questions regarding the eligibility of members serving on specific committees will be resolved by the Chair of the Assembly in consultation with the Dean of the Library, and in accordance with the above guidelines.

Article III. Officers

- A. Officers of the Assembly are: Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
- B. Eligibility: Officers may be any Library staff member with faculty or academic librarian appointment, or a member of the library administration with a librarian appointment.
- C. Terms:
 - 1. One (1) year beginning June 1.
 - 2. Officers may not serve more than two (2) consecutive years in the same office.
- D. Duties:
 - 1. Chair:
 - a. Serve as Chair of the Executive Committee.
 - b. Advise the Dean of the Library on librarian issues.
 - c. Conduct meetings.
 - d. Maintain list of eligible members.
 - e. Distribute Constitution/Bylaws and any other necessary information to new members.
 - f. Appoint and determine length of service of members for all ad-hoc committees, as well as when officers are unable to complete their terms, unless otherwise directed by the librarians.
 - 2. Vice Chair/Chair Elect:
 - a. Serve as a member of the Executive Committee.
 - b. Advise the Dean of the Library on librarian issues.
 - c. Assume duties of Chair if that person is absent.
 - d. Perform any other duties assigned by Chair.
 - e. Succeed the Chair at the end of one year.
 - f. If the Chair does not complete the full term the Vice Chair will complete that term and then continue as Chair for the succeeding year.
 - 3. Secretary:
 - a. Serve as a member of the Executive Committee.

- b. Advise the Dean of the Library on librarian issues.
 - c. Record minutes of monthly meetings.
 - d. Arrange for creating and distributing the minutes.
 - e. Responsible for issuing agenda at least two working days in advance of the meeting.
- E. Election of Officers: As stated in Article VI Section A.

Article IV. Meetings

- A. To be held monthly, September to May.
- B. Special meetings may be called by the Chair or by at least twenty percent (20%) of the membership of the Assembly.
- C. A quorum shall consist of the majority of the membership of the Assembly.
- D. All votes unless otherwise specified shall be decided by a majority of those voting.
- E. Any member of the Assembly may request a roll call vote, the results of which will be recorded in the minutes.
- F. Meetings of the Assembly shall be conducted informally. The authority in questions of proper procedure shall be Robert's Rules of Order.
- G. Any member of the Assembly may recommend agenda items for consideration by the Executive Committee.

Article V. Committees

- A. Executive Committee
 - 1. Membership: Composed of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
 - 2. Terms: As stated in Article III Section C.
 - 3. Duties:
 - a. Establish agenda, time and place of Assembly meetings and notify the membership of the Assembly at least two working days in advance.
 - b. Administer balloting for the Assembly proposals.
 - c. Meet at least once a month.
 - 4. Election of Members: As stated in Article VI Section A.
- B. Nominations Committee
 - 1. Membership:
 - a. The Nominations Committee consists of three members of the Assembly.
 - b. Members of the Executive Committee may not serve on the Nominations Committee.
 - 2. Terms: One (1) year beginning January 1.
 - 3. Duties: Solicit nominations and conduct elections of officers, members of standing committees (Research and Service Committee, Academic Librarian Committee), and Tenured Faculty Member for PRS Mediation Panel, unless provided for otherwise.
 - 4. Election of Members: Members are appointed by the Assembly Chair in December.
- C. Research and Service Committee
 - 1. Membership: The Committee consists of four members of the Assembly.
 - 2. Terms: Two (2) years beginning January 1, with staggered terms to ensure at least 2 members continue on each year

3. Duties:
 - a. Promote research activity.
 - b. Encourage professional service.
 4. Election of Members:
 - a. Members are elected by the members of the Assembly as stated in Article VI Section A.
 - b. A Chair is selected by the Committee each year.
- D. Academic Librarian Committee
1. Membership: The Committee consists of four elected Academic Librarians. It is desired that each Academic Librarian rank is represented (Librarian I-IV).
 - a. Terms: Two (2) year term beginning January 1, with one optional two-year (2-year) extension, with staggered terms to ensure at least 2 members continue on each year
 2. Duties:
 - a. Advocate for appropriate processes and procedures that will assist in maintaining the integrity of the professional promotion and advancement processes and procedures.
 - b. Conduct regular reviews of the current processes and procedures and make suggestions for improvement as needed.
 - c. Consult with University Human Resources regarding policies and procedures, as needed.
 - d. Solicit feedback from Academic Librarians before submitting suggestions to the Dean
 - e. Serve as "Promotion Coordinator" for eligible Academic Librarian promotions.
 3. Election of Members:
 - a. Only members of the Assembly who are non-faculty Academic Librarians are eligible to vote for this position. This election is conducted according to the provisions in VI. C. 1-8.
 - b. A Chair is selected by the Academic Librarian Committee each year.
- E. Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) Mediation Panel
1. Membership:
 - a. Tenured Faculty member selected by Faculty member involved in the disagreement.
 - b. Tenured Faculty member selected by the Associate Dean of Faculty member involved in the disagreement.
 - c. Tenured Faculty member elected by the Library Faculty.
 2. Terms: One (1) year beginning January 1.
 3. Duties: Handle disagreements relating to the Position Responsibility Statement.
 4. Election of the elected Tenured Faculty Member: Only members of the Assembly who hold faculty rank are eligible to vote for this position. This election is conducted according to the provisions in VI. A. 2-8.
- F. Ad Hoc Committees
1. May be established at the discretion of the Chair or vote of the Assembly.

Article VI. Elections

- A. Election of Officers, and Research and Service Committee Members:
 - 1. These positions are elected by the members of the Assembly.
 - 2. Nominations and the election will be handled by the Nominations Committee.
 - 3. The Nominations Committee will present its slate at the November meeting.
 - 4. Additional nominations may be offered from the floor at the November meeting.
 - 5. The election will be held the first full non-holiday week following the regular November meeting.
 - 6. The voting will stay open for seven days.
 - 7. Ballots are counted by the Nominations Committee and the results reported to the rest of the librarians by a member of the Nominations Committee.
 - 8. Ties will be resolved by a revote until a winner is determined.
- B. Election of the Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) Mediation Panel Tenured Faculty Member
 - 1. This election is conducted according to the provisions in VI. A. 2-8.
- C. Election of Academic Librarian Committee Members:
 - 1. These positions are elected by the non-faculty academic librarian members of the Assembly.
 - 2. Nominations and the election will be handled by the Nominations Committee.
 - 3. If there are committee vacancies, the Nominations Committee will present its slate at the September meeting.
 - 4. Additional nominations may be offered from the floor at the September meeting.
 - 5. The election will be held the first full non-holiday week following the regular September meeting.
 - 6. The voting will stay open for seven days.
 - 7. Ballots are counted by the Nominations Committee and the results reported to the rest of the librarians by a member of the Nominations Committee.
 - 8. Ties will be resolved by a revote until a winner is determined.

Article VII. Amendments

- A. Amendments to the Assembly Constitution and Bylaws may be proposed by petition in writing of at least twenty percent (20%) of the membership of the Assembly or by an Ad Hoc Review Committee or other committee.
- B. Proposed amendments shall be presented in writing at the regular meeting of the Assembly one meeting prior to a vote on the amendment.
- C. The Executive Committee shall distribute to each librarian a copy of proposed amendment(s) at least two (2) weeks in advance of a vote.

Approval of amendments and Constitution/Bylaws is by a two-thirds (2/3) vote (two-thirds of those members voting). Voting is by secret ballot.

Library Faculty Annual Appraisal Program

Purpose

The Iowa State University Library's appraisal program for Library faculty members is designed, at minimum, to assess individual performance annually for the past year, to establish performance objectives for the upcoming year, and provide guidance for upcoming promotion, tenure and /or post tenure reviews. It provides faculty with the opportunity to express in their words what they have accomplished during the past year, and to jointly develop individual annual workplans in support of unit and library objectives.

Methodology

The Library mandates an annual formal evaluation process (based on calendar year) for each faculty member. The process includes workplan development for the next calendar year, self assessment, and supervisory assessment. Regular dialogue of assessment and outcomes between supervisor and faculty member should be maintained throughout the year.

Process

Workplan

The annual workplan is outcomes based and used for setting individual goals for the upcoming calendar year. The employee is responsible for initiating the workplan with collaboration and approval from the supervisor and associate dean.¹ The faculty member also may request additional support to assist in the achievement of goals, improving performance, and/or make progress towards meeting promotion and/or tenure criteria.

Self Evaluation

Each faculty member is responsible for writing a self evaluation which reflects outcomes of the workplan and describes selective major accomplishments.

Supervisor Evaluation

The supervisor is responsible for writing the supervisor's evaluation. As appropriate, the supervisor is responsible for obtaining additional evaluative input to ensure the evaluation covers all aspects of the faculty member's responsibilities. The supervisor's evaluation assesses the faculty member's contributions in all areas relevant to the appointment and workplan and comments on progress towards meeting the criteria related to promotion, tenure and/or post tenure review. Supervisors will consider the length of time in the position in relation to accomplishments.

Additional Comments by Faculty Member

This is an optional part of the annual evaluation process. A faculty member may choose to make additional comments in writing to the supervisor's evaluation.

Evaluation Meeting

The evaluation meeting with the faculty member and supervisor should be used to discuss all aspects of the faculty member's performance.

Access to Evaluations and Confidentiality

Access to each evaluation is restricted to the Dean of the Library, the associate dean, the supervisor, and the faculty member. The final signed evaluation is maintained in a confidential personnel file in the Library Dean's Office.

Questions

Any questions regarding this process should be directed to Dean of the Library

¹ This policy assumes that the supervisor is not an associate dean or the Dean of the Library. If the supervisor is an associate dean, the dean assumes the role of associate dean.

*Library Faculty Council
11-13-08 Recommended*

*Dean of the Library
11-13-08 Approved*

Iowa State University Library

Faculty Promotion and Tenure

Policies and Procedures

July 2016

Approved by Library Faculty

7-14-16

Approved by Dean of Library Services

7-18-16

Iowa State University Library

Faculty Promotion and Tenure

Policies and Procedures

Table of Contents

PART I. POLICIES	1
I. General Policies on Tenure	1
A. Academic Freedom	1
B. Assessment	2
C. Eligibility for Tenure at Appointment	2
D. Probationary Service and Tenure Credit for Prior Service.....	2
II. Standards for Promotion and Tenure	2
A. Introduction	2
B. Scholarship	3
C. Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities	5
1. Extension/Professional Practice	5
2. Teaching	6
3. Research/Creative Activities	7
4. Institutional Service	8
III. Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure	9
A. Associate Professor and Tenure	9
B. Professor and Tenure.....	9
PART II. REVIEW PROCEDURES	10
I. Review Process	10
A. Promotion	10
B. Rank and Tenure Recommendations.....	10
II. Documentation for Promotion Review	10
A. Candidate Responsibilities	10
B. Candidate Updates	10
III. Review Committee	10
A. Responsibilities	10
B. Composition	11
1. Membership	11
2. Membership Exclusions	11
3. Candidate Comments on References or Review Committee Membership	11
4. Conflict of Interest	11

III. Review Committee (continued)	
C. Deliberations	11
1. Process	11
2. Voting	12
3. Reconsideration of a Case	12
4. Committee Confidentiality and Review Documentation Access	12
IV. Department Chair	12
A. Notification of Review Committee Members	12
B. Department Chair Assessment	12
C. Recommendation for Promotion	13
D. Department Promotion Dossier	13
1. Department Promotion Dossier Content	13
2. Candidate’s Review for Factual Accuracy	13
E. Notification Procedure	13
V. Dean	14
A. Review and Recommendation	14
B. Candidate Notification Procedure	14
VI. University Review	14
VII. Amendments	14

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

In this document the term “department” is understood to refer to the Library as a whole. Library associate deans function as Department Chairs for their divisions in the promotion and tenure process; they are referred to elsewhere in this document as Department Chairs. In cases when the unit supervisor is not the Department Chair, the Department Chair ensures the participation of the unit supervisor in the administrative assessment and notifies the unit supervisor of all formal actions.

Part I. Policies

I. General Policies on Tenure

A. Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression and to speak or write as a public citizen without institutional discipline or restraint. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of academic duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that the individual is not speaking for the institution in matters of public interest.

Tenure is the keystone for academic freedom; it is essential for safeguarding the right of free expression and for encouraging risk-taking inquiry at the frontiers of knowledge. Both tenure and academic freedom are part of an implicit social compact, which recognizes that tenure serves important public purposes and benefits society. The public is best served when faculty are free to teach, conduct research, provide extension/professional practice services, and engage in institutional service without fear of reprisal or without compromising the pursuit of knowledge and/or the creative process.

In return, faculty have the responsibility of furthering high-quality programs of research, teaching, and extension/professional practice, and are fully accountable for their performance of these responsibilities. Additionally, a well-designed tenure system attracts capable and highly qualified individuals as faculty members, strengthens institutional stability by enhancing faculty members’ institutional loyalty, and encourages academic excellence by retaining and rewarding the most meritorious people. Tenure and promotion imply selectivity and choice; they are granted for scholarly and professional merit. The length and intensity of the review leading to the granting of tenure ensures the retention of only productive faculty; annual evaluations and post tenure reviews ensure the continuance of a commitment to excellence.

The system of academic tenure at Iowa State University emphasizes

1. Recruitment of the most highly qualified candidates available.
2. Creation of an opportunity for scholarly performance in extension/professional practice, teaching, and research/creative activity.
3. Continuing evaluation of performance based on the position responsibility statement.

4. The awarding of tenure requires an affirmative decision, based upon an explicit judgment of qualifications resulting from evaluation of the faculty member typically done during the recruitment process and based on the relevant promotion criteria.
5. The awarding of tenure assumes continuous appointment. Except for resignation, retirement, or death of the faculty member, such appointments are terminable only for adequate cause.

B. Assessment

Tenured faculty members undergo annual evaluations, post tenure reviews, and, as requested, reviews for promotion. A tenured faculty member may be dismissed only for adequate cause as defined in the *Faculty Handbook's* section "Faculty Dismissal Procedures." Denial of faculty appointment or reappointment, or removal or suspension from office, or censure, or other penalty must not be based upon any belief, expression, or conduct protected by law or by the principles of academic freedom.

Affirmative action and tenure are compatible concepts. Both seek to ensure the hiring and retention of those who are most qualified. In the appointment process, affirmative action operates to ensure that the most qualified available person is identified and is offered the opportunity to join the faculty. After the initial appointment, the affirmative action program ensures that irrelevant considerations, such as race and gender, play no role in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions.

C. Eligibility for Tenure at Appointment

In the rare circumstance when a Library Faculty appointment is made, it is made at the rank of associate professor or professor with tenure with a full-time A-base appointment. Such appointments are considered and based on administrative position responsibilities that require a faculty appointment. Tenure accompanies appointment to the rank of associate professor or professor unless a probationary period for the new appointee is clearly specified in advance, or unless it is indicated that the appointment does not carry tenure. If an appointment does not include tenure, this is clearly stated in the letter of intent with the probationary period defined.

D. Probationary Service and Tenure Credit for Prior Service

See the *Faculty Handbook* for current policies and procedures for terms of probationary service, including definition, criteria, extension and tenure credit for prior professional service.

II. Standards for Promotion and Tenure

A. Introduction

Iowa State University is a public land-grant institution where liberal and professional education is merged with basic and applied research in pursuit of advancing society's potentials and assisting in solving its problems. The university serves the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world through its interrelated programs of teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice.

Evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. For promotion, the evaluation is based on the record of the faculty member since the most recent promotion or appointment at Iowa State University. In all areas of professional activity, a faculty member is expected to uphold the values and follow the guidelines in the Statement of Professional Ethics found in "Professional Policies and Procedures."

A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the position responsibility statement (PRS), which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas:

1. Extension/Professional Practice
2. Teaching
3. Research/Creative Activities, and
4. Institutional Service.

The PRS is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance, and scope of the faculty member's scholarly achievements.

The following sections define and provide examples of scholarship and the four central areas of faculty responsibilities and activities.

B. Scholarship

All Library faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship in their teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice. Scholarship is creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the honest, forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. It builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding. Scholarship is the umbrella under which research falls, but research is just one form of scholarship. Scholarship encompasses creative activities, teaching, and extension/professional practice.

Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product. This product may take the form of a book, journal article, critical review, annotated bibliography, lecture, review of existing research on a topic, or speech synthesizing the thinking on a topic. Also falling under the umbrella of scholarship that would apply to librarians are original materials designed for use with the computer; codes and standards; and scholarly articles published in non-research based periodicals, newspapers, and other publications; etc. In short, scholarship includes materials that are generally called "intellectual property."

Scholarship generally implies that one has a solid foundation in the professional field addressed and is current with developments in that field. However, it must be noted that significant advances sometimes accrue when a scholar extends her or his scope of topics beyond those traditional to a particular discipline. The production of scholarship demonstrates that a librarian is going beyond the accomplishment of daily work in order to make a difference in the profession and/or the institution.

The following **Table 1** describes the broad continuum of scholarship. It is adapted from Conrad J. Weiser, “The Value of a University—Rethinking Scholarship,” draft version; and Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered—Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, New York, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

Table 1. The Nature of Scholarship

Character of scholarship	Audiences for scholarship	Means of communicating scholarship	Criteria for validating scholarship	Means of documenting scholarship
Develops and communicates new understanding and insights. Generates, synthesizes, interprets, critically analyzes, and communicates new knowledge, methods, understandings, technologies, materials, uses, insights, beauty and so forth.	Peers, undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral associates, users, patrons, publics, etc.	Teaching materials and methods, classes, curricula; publications, exhibits, performances, patents, copyrights, distribution of materials or programs, etc.	Originality, significance, accuracy, replicability, scope, applicability, breadth, depth and duration of influence, persistence of influence or use, adoption by peers, impact or public benefit, etc.	Present evidence that creative intellectual work was validated by peers; communicated to peers and broader audiences; recognized, accepted, cited, adopted, or used by others. In other words, that it made a difference.

Table 1 describes the parameters to be used when judging the scholarly nature of a faculty member’s achievements in all evaluation reviews.

The nature of scholarly work at a diverse university necessarily varies. In the promotion and tenure review process, however, evidence that a significant portion of a faculty member’s scholarship has been documented (i.e., communicated to and validated by peers beyond the university) is required of all.

In the library field, refereed journals and monographs are the traditional media for documenting scholarship; in some areas of librarianship, exhibitions are an additional appropriate form. Emerging technologies are creating (and will continue to create) entirely new media which may be used by librarians. Finally, scholarship may be validated and communicated through conference presentations and invited lectures.

Faculty may submit evidence of scholarship that has not been documented by peers in the discipline, even though this evidence alone would not be sufficient to justify promotion and tenure. Evidence regarding both documented and undocumented scholarship provides a holistic portrayal of the candidate’s scholarly work. For example, major in-house reports or manuals in and of themselves do not constitute scholarship. However, if these materials reveal that a librarian “communicates new understandings and insights” (Table 1) effectively to the report or manual users, or “synthesizes, interprets, and communicates new knowledge” (Table 1) for these users, this material may be submitted as supporting evidence of scholarship, even though it may not have been communicated to peers outside the university.

Scholarship often requires teamwork and other collaborative relationships, particularly because of the growth of interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. When work that is a result of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the candidate’s role in the joint effort must be provided.

In the promotion and tenure review process, the emphasis is on the critical evaluation of the scholarly nature of the candidate's achievements by professional peers, including peers external to the university. Evidence should be presented as to the impact of the scholarship in terms of its depth, duration, and/or persistence of influence or use (e.g., citations, adaptations or use by others), as well as its public and critical appreciation. Table 1 provides the framework for the evaluation.

C. Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities

In carrying out their responsibilities and activities, faculty will support the university's commitment to diversity by fostering an environment of mutual respect.

The following sections provide examples of activities that may be documented in each area of faculty responsibility as well as methods by which scholarship within these areas is communicated and evaluated. Teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice are central to the mission of Iowa State University. Institutional service is an important contribution that faculty members make to ensure effective governance at all levels of the university.

1. Extension/Professional Practice

Extension and professional practice distinguishes Iowa State as a land-grant university. While librarians do not generally engage in extension activities, their primary faculty responsibility in librarianship falls under the category of professional practice. Faculty members engage in professional practice activities by utilizing their professional expertise to disseminate information outside of the traditional classroom to help improve the knowledge and skills of their clientele (i.e., the publics they serve) or the environment in which they live and work. This work is related to the faculty member's position responsibilities.

Examples of activities that fall within extension/professional practice include:

- Organizing/leading workshops or training sessions
- Preparing informational and instructional materials
- Supervising the operation of units within the library which perform library services and functions
- Acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources
- Engaging in technology transfer
- Consulting
- Serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise
- Serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.
- Serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards
- Demonstrating leadership in professional societies or organizations; e.g., committee service, active task force participation on relevant issues, special appointments to organizations, providing comments that have an impact on issues being considered by societies and organizations, reporting for organizational newsletters.

Since extension/professional practice activities vary greatly among departments, it is the responsibility of the Library Faculty to identify faculty activities that fall under this category and the appropriate evaluation methods.

Faculty who engage in extension/professional practice are knowledgeable about current research and new developments in their discipline and demonstrate an ability to interpret and apply this knowledge to meet their clients' requirements. When appropriate, they develop and maintain professional

relationships with their clientele in order to identify and serve their needs. They display leadership and initiative, are creative in the practical application of knowledge, and demonstrate a high level of disciplinary expertise, as well as the ability to instruct, inform, and assist clients. In addition, a faculty member's professional practice reputation may be reflected by leadership in professional societies and organizations or by significant editorial-related activities.

A portfolio format is used to document faculty professional practice activities beyond what is contained in the candidate's vita. The candidate provides materials such as descriptions of appointment responsibilities in extension/professional practice, representative workshop, seminar, and training materials; book reviews; unpublished reports, studies, etc.; newsletters and brochures; peer evaluations or ratings of extension/professional practice effectiveness; and client assessments.

The effectiveness of the candidate's extension/professional practice activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in the scholarship section and in Table 1. The scholarship resulting from extension/professional practice activities is documented through means appropriate to the professional specialty, such as peer-reviewed publications, lectures, videos, software, hardware, workbooks, manuals, standards, bibliographies, book reviews, and casebooks. Evaluation of scholarship should consider breadth, depth, and duration of influence or use; public appreciation and benefit; and applicability or adoption by peers.

2. Teaching

Many Library Faculty have teaching responsibilities, and for those with teaching as a position responsibility, the quality of their teaching is an important factor in evaluating their accomplishments and performances. Teaching is a scholarly and dynamic endeavor and covers a broad range of activities. Some examples of teaching activities include:

- Working closely with a teaching faculty member in course-related instruction to integrate information literacy skills into a course. Such work may involve creating handouts to support their research, teaching one or more classes for the course, and/or consulting one-on-one with the students in the course
- Teaching sections of Library 160 and/or otherwise working closely with the Library 160 program
- Working on activities that develop online resources for courses
- Teaching courses in other academic departments
- Presenting resident credit courses, extension and international programs and courses, non-credit seminars and workshops, and continuing-education and distance-learning programs
- Serving on masters and doctoral committees

Particular expressions of effective teaching vary widely, and teachers may demonstrate their pedagogical skills in a variety of ways. Some may display their pedagogical abilities in organized lectures; others may promote collaborative learning or may improvise in the classroom in response to the dynamics of a specific group, while still others may be adept in facilitating group discussion.

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning.

Examples of activities that provide evidence of a Library Faculty member's particular commitment to effective teaching include:

- Contributions to curricular development, including collaborative courses and programs and service on curriculum committees
- Pedagogical innovation, including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment
- Documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues, and incorporation of this information into the classrooms
- Development of teaching materials
- Pedagogically oriented research
- Involvement in student research projects
- Contributions to professional societies and organizations that seek to improve teaching

A portfolio format is used to document teaching activities beyond what is contained in the candidate's vita. The candidate provides materials such as teaching philosophy, student ratings of teaching, teaching materials and forms of assessment, peer evaluations based on both classroom observations and review of teaching materials, and evidence of student learning.

The effectiveness of the candidate's teaching activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in the scholarship section and in Table 1.

The scholarship resulting from teaching is documented through such means as peer-reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, workbooks, lab manuals, invited lectures and conference papers. Evaluation of scholarship in teaching considers its originality, significance, and/or impact as evidenced by its influence, use, or adoption by peers.

While production of teaching materials and surveys of student attitudes about classes are valuable indicators of the scholarship of teaching, peer evaluation of both a faculty member's and her/his students' performances in classes and in subsequent coursework are also appropriate assessments. Such assessments of performance need not be published or disseminated to publics outside the university.

3. Research /Creative Activities

Faculty members who engage in research/creative activities are expected to make original contributions that are appropriate to their chosen area of specialization and that are respected by peers within and outside the university. Some examples of research/creative activity include:

- Conducting experimental research
- Preparing exhibitions, e.g., developing displays or exhibits relating to the impact of libraries and other information issues on society and culture, whether virtual or traditional
- Conceptualizing and theorizing in an original way
- Creating synthesis, criticism, and clarification of extant knowledge and research, e.g., preparing bibliographies, compilations, essays relating to library issues, historical studies, and analyses of library practices
- Conducting innovative collection or analysis of empirical data; e.g., surveys and time-cost studies
- Seeking and obtaining competitive grants and contracts to enhance library services or library-related research; e.g., USAIN Grant, Carver Trust Grant, Miller Faculty Fellowship

- Relating research to the solution of practical problems; e.g., utilizing a survey or interactive electronic methods to solve a practical problem within the Library or in the library field
- Demonstrating leadership in professional societies or organizations in areas relating to research

A portfolio format is used to document faculty research/creative activities beyond what is contained in the candidate's vita. The candidate provides materials such as summaries of completed, current, and future research projects; descriptions of applied use of research; summaries of grants; and exhibition catalogs.

The effectiveness of the candidate's research/creative activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in the scholarship section and in Table 1.

Scholarship is the outcome of research, when it is validated by one's professional peers. Scholarship resulting from research/creative activities is documented through means appropriate to the specialty, such as peer-reviewed publications, lectures, performances, exhibits, invited lectures, conference papers. Evaluation of scholarship considers its impact as judged by its influence, use, or adoption by peers; and its originality, richness, breadth and/or depth of expression.

4. Institutional Service

Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university at all levels by participating effectively in faculty governance and in the formulation of library, and/or university policies; or by carrying out administrative responsibilities. Therefore, to be promoted and/or tenured, faculty members are expected to have been involved in institutional service. The level and amount of service are expected to be higher for those seeking promotion to the rank of professor. However, institutional service alone shall not serve as the central basis for promotion and/or tenure.

As citizens of the university, faculty members may also make other direct and indirect contributions to the Library, college, and university communities. Service to professional organizations outside the university is considered part of professional practice, teaching or research, whether or not such service results from the faculty member's reputation.

III. Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure

Recommendations for initial appointment and promotion are based on evidence that the individual has met the qualifications for the faculty rank to which he or she is to be appointed or promoted. Assessment is based upon a review of the case as submitted by the candidate and letters of evaluation from qualified evaluators.

A. Associate Professor and Tenure

An associate professor should have a solid academic reputation and show promise of further development and productivity in his or her academic career. The candidate must demonstrate:

- Excellence in scholarship that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for national distinction
- Effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities
- Satisfactory institutional service

Furthermore, a recommendation for appointment to the rank associate professor and granting of tenure must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and has a high likelihood of sustained contributions to the field or profession and to the university.

B. Professor and Tenure

A professor should be recognized by his or her professional peers within the university, as well as nationally and/or internationally, for the quality of the contribution to his or her discipline. The candidate must demonstrate:

- National distinction in scholarship, as evident in candidate's wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the field or profession
- Effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities
- Significant institutional service

Furthermore, a recommendation for appointment to rank of professor and granting of tenure must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field or profession and to the university.

Part II. Procedures

I. Review Process

A. Promotion Review

Faculty are reviewed for promotion according to the promotion review calendar. Each year the Dean notifies the faculty of the upcoming promotion review process. Faculty eligible for promotion review must petition the Dean if they wish to be considered.

B. Rank and Tenure Recommendations During Recruitment and Hiring Process

Rank and tenure recommendations are part of the recruitment and hiring process if a tenured faculty appointment is being considered. The Dean will arrange faculty peer and administrative reviews of the candidate's credentials for recommendations as to the potential appointment. The rank criteria is based on the anticipated rank being considered for the appointment.

C. Access to Confidential Review Material

Access to review documentation, during their respective reviews, is limited to current Review Committee members eligible to conduct the review, the Department Chair, Unit Supervisor if not the Department Chair, Head of Library Human Resources (HR), and the Dean.

II. Documentation for Promotion Review

A. Candidate Responsibilities

1. Faculty members must maintain their own promotion files.
2. Each candidate must provide the following documentation for their reviews.
 - Vita
 - Position Responsibility Statement(s)
 - Faculty Portfolio (Portfolio) and Portfolio Appendix
 - Names and contact information for proposed evaluators

B. Candidate Updates

The candidate may submit significant additional information for consideration by the Review Committee during its review of the case. After this review is completed, the candidate may submit only significant changes to activities listed as "in-progress" on the Vita for consideration by the Department Chair and/or Dean, depending on the status of the review process.

III. Review Committee

A. Responsibilities

The Review Committee thoroughly evaluates all promotion cases and reports the results of its findings and its recommendation in the Review Committee Report submitted to the Department Chair. It is not an appellate committee. The Committee's evaluation of a case should not be a statement of advocacy but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance. It should summarize the primary points made by external evaluators, and should include assessments of the following:

- The candidate’s accomplishments in scholarship
- The candidate’s performance in his or her areas of responsibility
- The candidate’s prospects for future contributions to the field and the library
- The candidate’s role and contributions to the library mission

In addition to the committee’s written evaluation and its recommendations regarding promotion, the Review Committee Report includes the signed vote count and all documentation on which the review was based. The Committee should frame any negative recommendation in as constructive a manner as possible and, when appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the criteria for promotion.

B. Composition

1. Membership

The Review Committee is composed of all members of the Library Faculty holding the rank of full professor. At minimum, the Committee must consist of three eligible full professors. If the minimum size is not met, the Library Faculty will elect, for one-year term(s), as many eligible associate professor(s) as necessary to meet the minimum three-member quorum.

2. Membership Exclusions

- Faculty members under review for promotion
- Candidate’s Unit Supervisor, if not the Department Chair
- Associate deans and Library Dean
- Spouses, blood relatives, or relatives by marriage of faculty members under review for promotion.

3. Candidate Comments on References or Review Committee Membership

The candidate may forward to the Review Committee written comments regarding potential references, or potential conflicts of interest with committee members according to the Promotion Review calendar. The Committee will give the candidate's comments full consideration and place the comments with the committee review materials.

4. Conflict of Interest

Any member of the Review Committee who has a conflict of interest with respect to a candidate shall not participate in the consideration of that individual or have access to review materials. A conflict of interest may exist if the Committee member has a relationship with a candidate that would hinder an objective review of the case. The chair may, after consultation with the Committee, remove a member from consideration of a case if it is determined that a conflict of interest exists.

C. Deliberations

1. Process

The Review Committee will select its own chair, who serves as the point of contact with the Department Chair. A quorum will be a majority of members eligible to consider a case. For each case, the Committee will examine all documentation submitted by the candidate, letters of evaluation, and all other relevant information. The Committee has access to either the latest post tenure review report / administrative review report or the most recent Review Committee report that concerns the promotion being considered

– whichever report is the most recent. Requests by the committee for information are made in writing. Correspondence is sent to the Committee chair.

2. Voting

A quorum is required for voting. All voting will be by signed, written ballot. Votes will be recorded and the names of those voting will be noted in the Review Committee Report. No abstentions from those eligible to vote is allowed. An affirmative vote of the Review Committee will be more yes than no votes.

3. Reconsideration of a Case

Occasionally, the Department Chair may ask the Review Committee to reconsider a case following submittal of the Review Committee Report. This can occur in those rare situations when activities in-progress and listed on the candidate's Vita have changed significantly and hold enough importance to potentially affect the candidate's review (e.g., successful completion of a major project which was in progress during the committee review process, or acceptance of an article already submitted). The committee's reconsideration of the case will be limited to review of these identified activities and their impact on the overall case. Reconsideration can result in a new vote by the committee.

4. Committee Confidentiality and Review Documentation Access

Deliberations of the Review Committee are privileged and kept in strict confidence. Committee members eligible to conduct the review have access to the review documentation only during the committee review process. Draft reports are treated as confidential material in the creation and discard process.

IV. Department Chair

Library associate deans serve as Department Chairs for their divisions and upon request by the Dean in other promotion reviews. In a case where the associate dean is under review, the Dean will select another associate dean or, if necessary, a Library Faculty member to serve as Department Chair.

A. Notification of Review Committee Members

Based on information received from the chair of the Review Committee, the Department Chair notifies in writing each candidate, Head of Library HR, and the Dean of the Review Committee members who will conduct the promotion review.

B. Department Chair Assessment

The Department Chair is responsible for fully and independently evaluating each case according to the library criteria, and forwarding the Department Review Dossier to the Dean.

If the Unit Supervisor is not the Department Chair, the Unit Supervisor submits a Supervisor Review Letter to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair takes into consideration his or her own knowledge; all materials considered by the Review Committee; the Review Committee Report; additional administrative, supervisory, and/or peer assessment; and any new significant information that the candidate has submitted to the Department Chair. If

this new information is important enough that it could significantly change the candidate's case, the Department Chair may return the case to the Review Committee.

The Department Chair's evaluation of a case should not be a statement of advocacy but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate's record of performance. It summarizes the primary points made by evaluators, both internal and external, and should include assessments of the following:

- The candidate's accomplishments in scholarship
- The candidate's performance in his or her areas of responsibility
- The candidate's prospects for future contributions to the field and the library
- The candidate's role and contributions to the library mission

C. Recommendation for Promotion

The Department Chair prepares a Department Promotion Dossier for each person whom the Review Committee has recommended for promotion. The Department Chair may prepare a Department Promotion Dossier for a candidate whom the review committee has not recommended for promotion. A Department Promotion Dossier is completed for all promotion cases except when the recommendations of the Review Committee and Department Chair are both negative. In such cases, a statement from the Department Chair indicating the reasons for his or her recommendation is sufficient to forward to the Dean.

D. Department Promotion Dossier

The Department Chair prepares a dossier for each case, forwards it to the Dean, and informs the Review Committee of his or her recommendation.

1. The Department Promotion Dossier Content

- Candidate's Vita, PRS(s), Portfolio, and Portfolio Appendix
- Review Committee Report
- Department Chair Review Letter to the Dean
- Copies of all other reports and letters of evaluation
- Log of External Letters: Includes summary of each letter of evaluation covering both positive and negative remarks and a statement regarding the significance of the evaluators' credentials
- Other required material

2. Candidate's Review for Factual Accuracy

Before forwarding the Department Promotion Dossier, the Department Chair requests the candidate to review its factual record, which only includes the Vita, Position Responsibility Statement(s), and Portfolio. The candidate reviews the factual record and notifies the Department Chair in writing of the result of this review, and provides any recommended revisions related to factual accuracy.

E. Candidate Notification Procedure

The Department Chair informs in writing each candidate whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean, and, if so, the nature of the recommendation. The Department Chair informs in writing any candidate not recommended by either the Review Committee or the Department Chair, or both, as to the reasons for the non-recommendation. The Department Chair should frame this in as constructive a manner as possible and, when appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the criteria for promotion.

V. Dean

A. Review and Recommendation

The Dean conducts an independent review of each candidate, writes the Dean Review Letter, and forwards the required Library Promotion Dossier to the Provost.

B. Notification Procedure

The Dean informs in writing the candidate and the Department Chair of the Dean's recommendation to the Provost. If the Dean's recommendation is different from the Review Committee and/or the Department Chair, the Dean will also include a summary of his or her written reasons for the recommendation.

The Department Chair informs the Review Committee and Unit Supervisor, if there is one that participated in the review, of the Dean's decision.

VI. University Review

Review for promotion and/or tenure concludes at the university level with final approval by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

VII. Amendments

Amendments to this document may be initiated by the Review Committee, an ad hoc committee appointed by the Dean, or other Library Faculty members. Those wishing to recommend amendments should present them to the Chair of the Librarian Assembly. Amendments must maintain compatibility between library and university promotion and tenure documents.

Amendments are sent to the faculty two weeks in advance of a vote. The Librarian Assembly officers conduct the vote and count the ballots. Approval will be by a majority of those voting. Amendments approved by the Library Faculty shall be forwarded to the Dean for action.

The Dean will review the amendments and announce his/her final action to the Library Faculty. As appropriate, the Dean sends the amended document to the Provost for final approval.

Iowa State University Library

Faculty PostTenure Review

Policies and Procedures

Rev. May 2017

Approved by the Library Faculty

Approved by the Dean of Library Services

Iowa State University
Library
Faculty Post Tenure Review
Policy and Procedures
Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Review, Timelines and Exemptions	1
	A. Review Timeline	1
	B. Review Schedule	1
	C. Review Exemptions	1
III.	Review Participants	2
IV.	PTR Committee Appointment	2
	A. Appointment Requirements and Criteria	2
	B. Appointment Process	2
V.	PTR Process	3
	A. Notification	3
	B. PTR Commitment Appointment and Review Schedule	3
	C. Faculty Member PTR Documentation	3
	D. PTR Committee Preliminary PTR Report.....	3
	E. Faculty Member Review of Preliminary PTR Report	3
	F. Final PTR Committee Report.....	3
	G. AD Cover Letter	3
	H. PTR Conference	4
	I. AD Final Report	4
	J. Library Dean Actions	4
VI.	Faculty PTR Documentation	4
VII.	Performance Standards and Review Outcomes	5
	A. Performance Standards	5
	B. Review Outcomes	5
VIII.	Provision of Resources	5
IX.	Confidentiality and Dissemination of Findings	6
X.	Rights of Appeal.....	6

I. Introduction

The intent of post tenure review (PTR) is to provide tenured faculty an opportunity to make a long-term appraisal of their accomplishments outside the bounds of either the annual evaluation or formal promotion and tenure review process. This peer review process addresses the quality of the faculty member's performance in the areas consistent with the faculty member's position responsibility statement (PRS) during the period of review.

The review includes an overall recommendation of the performance (meeting expectations or below expectations) and results in acknowledgement of contributions and suggestions for future development of the faculty member. A performance with an assessment of below expectations in an area that constitutes a low percentage of the PRS does not automatically result in an overall review of below expectations.

The results of the review may require expenditure of institutional resources for professional development or a change of professional direction.

All deliberations and assessment materials generated during the PTR process are confidential.

This policy is consistent with the *Iowa State University Post Tenure Review Policy*. It also follows recommendations set forth by the American Association of University Professors for post tenure reviews.

II. Review Timelines, Schedules, and Exemptions

A. Review Timeline

Post tenure reviews occur:

- At least once every seven years
- At the faculty member's request (but at least 5 years from last review)
- During the year following two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews

B. Review Schedule

1. A PTR is scheduled by the Dean of Library Services (Dean) five to seven years after a faculty member has:
 - been hired with tenure,
 - been awarded tenure, or
 - undergone a prior post tenure review
2. The post tenure review process should take no longer than four months. It should be initiated between January 1 and August 1 and completed within the calendar year in which it began.
3. The start date will be mutually agreed upon by the PTR Committee, the Associate Dean (AD) and the faculty member being reviewed.

C. Review Exemptions

An exemption from a scheduled post tenure review is automatic if the faculty member:

- is being reviewed for a higher rank during the same year;
- is within one year of announced retirement;
- is on approved phased retirement; or
- holds the administrative position of associate dean or dean. These positions are reviewed under the administrative review process.

In rare circumstances, a faculty member may petition the Dean to postpone a scheduled post tenure review for reasons beyond those listed above (e.g., extended leave of absence or illness).

III. Review Participants

A. Library Faculty member under review

B. PTR Committee

C. AD of the faculty member under review

1. Within the post tenure review process, the AD serves as the department chair.
2. If the immediate (i.e., unit) supervisor is not the AD, the immediate supervisor is considered a review participant.
3. If the immediate supervisor is the Dean or non-faculty AD, the Dean will appoint an associate dean to serve as the AD for the PTR process.

Note: "Supervisor" is used below to refer to the immediate supervisor when not the AD.

D. Dean

IV. PTR Committee Appointment

A. Appointment Requirements and Criteria

1. A PTR Committee is established for each faculty member undergoing post tenure review. The Dean appoints each committee, which includes three tenured library faculty members with two members identified by the faculty member and one member identified by the AD.
2. Committee members are appointed based upon their relevant knowledge and/or experience in the general field and/or area of specialization of the faculty member under review.
3. ADs, the Dean, and supervisor for the faculty member are not eligible to serve on PTR Committees.
4. Appointment Goals:
 - Faculty members are, in so far as is possible, reviewed by peers of their choice
 - The composition of the PTR Committee is fair and balanced
 - The workload for faculty who are members of PTR Committees is as equitable as possible. Therefore, faculty members are normally not required to serve on more than two committees in any calendar year.

B. Appointment Process

1. Library HR maintains an annual list of eligible tenured faculty members to serve on PTR Committees. In unusual circumstances, a tenured faculty member may have his or her name removed from the list of eligible faculty members for no more than one calendar year or from a specific PTR Committee based upon conflict of interest. Also at the outset of the PTR process the faculty member under review will be given the opportunity to request that a reviewer be excused based upon a conflict of interest.
2. Then Library HR submits a specific panel of eligible tenured faculty members to the AD and faculty member. LHR creates a CyBox account for the faculty member under review.
3. From the panel, the faculty member recommends three potential committee members and the AD recommends two potential committee members.
4. The Dean, with the AD, and in consultation with the faculty member under review as necessary, appoints the PTR Committee and notifies all review participants and Library HR of the PTR committee membership; and internally posts the membership.
5. The PTR Committee selects its own chair, and the chair notifies the other review participants and Library HR.

V. PTR Process

A. Notification

Library HR notifies the faculty member, supervisor, AD, and Dean of the upcoming scheduled post tenure review.

B. PTR Committee Appointment and Review Schedule

1. The Dean formally appoints each PTR Committee and notifies the review participants.
2. The Dean informs the PTR Committee and faculty member of the AD participating in the review if the AD is not the associate dean of the faculty member.
3. The PTR Committee, the AD, and the faculty member agree on a starting date for the review. The PTR Committee Chair notifies all participants and Library HR of the start date for the review.
4. The AD determines and posts the calendar in CyBox. The calendar includes the start date for the review and the schedule for all subsequent actions.

C. Faculty Member PTR Documentation

1. The faculty member prepares and submits the required PTR documentation electronically and notifies Library HR of final submittal.
2. The faculty member's PTR documentation is maintained by Library HR for the duration of the review and is available to all review participants (PTR Committee, supervisor, AD and the Dean).
3. A confidential file for other review materials is maintained in Library HR for the duration of the review. The file is used by the PTR Committee, the supervisor, the AD, and the Dean during their respective review responsibilities.

D. Preliminary PTR Committee Report

1. The report prepared by the PTR Committee should include the following components:
 - Assessment of performance based upon the PRS
 - A performance rating ("meeting expectations," or "below expectations")
 - Recommendations
 - A signature page for the electronic signatures of the faculty member, the Unit Supervisor, the AD, and the Committee Chair
2. Delivery: The chair of the PTR committee sends the preliminary report to the faculty member and copies the rest of the PTR committee via email.

E. Faculty Member Report Review

The faculty member has five working days to comment in writing regarding any factual inaccuracies that can be documented in the PTR documentation.

F. Final PTR Committee Report

The PTR Committee may revise the report and forwards a copy of the final report to the AD and Library HR.

G. AD Cover Letter

1. The AD and supervisor prepare a cover letter to the Dean indicating agreement with the outcome of the report or a detailed explanation if there is disagreement with the report findings. The letter is considered confidential and will not be shared with the entire PTR committee, only its chair, and the faculty member.
2. The AD submits the letter and committee report to the faculty member and posts it in CyBox. Only the faculty member, the Chair of the PTR committee, the supervisor, and the Dean have access to this part of the process.

H. PTR Conference

The AD holds a PTR conference with the faculty member, supervisor, and committee chair to discuss the report and draft an action plan if needed.

1. As a result of the conference, the AD may revise the cover letter.
2. The committee report is considered final when it is electronically signed and dated by the faculty member, supervisor, AD, and committee chair. The faculty member's required signature reflects that the faculty member has participated in the conference and received the final report.
3. If the report includes a determination of "below expectations" rating for any PRS area, the AD, supervisor, faculty member, and committee chair will work to create a detailed action plan for performance improvement in the area(s) deemed "below expectation." An action plan must be signed by all parties and include at least the following four parts:
 - Justification for the plan
 - Specific timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress on the plan
 - Description of possible consequences for not meeting expectations by the time of that evaluation
 - Indication of who is responsible for assessing the faculty member's performance in accomplishing the action plan (the AD)

I. AD Final Report

By posting the documents in CyBox, the AD forwards to the Dean the final signed committee report with any action plan, and the cover letter if it has been revised after the PTR conference.

J. Dean's Actions

The Dean will take the following actions regarding the post tenure review:

- Review the final AD Final Report and recommendations submitted for consistency and thoroughness.
- Provide feedback to the AD if there are areas that need improvement regarding thoroughness or consistency of the PTR processes or reports.

VI. Faculty PTR Documentation

The faculty member is responsible for electronically submitting the following required PTR documentation:

- Current Vita, updated for the period of review
- Position Responsibility Statement(s) operative during the period of review
- Personal Statement

For complete guidelines, see *ISU Library. Faculty Post Tenure Review - Documentation and Submission Guidelines*

The PTR documentation is intended to cover the most significant materials in support of the review, and provide the faculty member with the opportunity to provide a full understanding and self-appraisal of his or her accomplishments for Scholarship, Research/Creative Activities, Professional Practice, Teaching, and Institutional Service.

Previous reports and AD cover letters are not included in the PTR documentation, nor are they made available to the PTR committee. Additional documentation may be requested if needed.

VII. Performance Standards and Review Outcomes

A. Performance Standards

1. The performance standard that results in a “meeting expectations” post tenure recommendation is whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence, the duties described in his or her PRS(s).
2. A faculty member whose professional competence has been rigorously established by the awarding of tenure is at all times entitled to a presumption of competence. Post tenure review is not a reappraisal of the faculty member’s fitness under the current tenure standards, which may have changed since awarding of tenure.
3. Post tenure review is not intended as a substitute for annual reviews and promotion actions, nor is it a substitute for faculty disciplinary or dismissal procedures outlined in the Iowa State University *Faculty Handbook*.

B. Review Outcomes

1. Meeting Expectations Review

A “meeting expectations” post tenure review recommendation may include suggestions for future development of the faculty member. A performance with an assessment of below expectations in an area that constitutes a low percentage of the PRS does not automatically result in an overall review of below expectations. However, if a “meeting expectations” post tenure review does include a determination of “below expectations” performance in any PRS area, then the faculty member will work with the AD, supervisor, and committee chair to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in those areas. All parties sign the action plan.

If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS Mediation in the *ISU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.4.4.

2. Below Expectations Review

A “below expectations” review includes specific recommendations for achieving an acceptable performance evaluation. The faculty member will work with the AD, supervisor, and committee chair to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in areas deemed below expectations. All parties sign the action plan.

If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS Mediation in the *ISU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.4.4.

Failure to have the performance improvement plan in place by the time of the next annual performance review may result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy (Section 7.2.2.5.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*).

VIII. Provision of Resources

Some recommendations for improvements in professional practice, teaching, research, or institutional service or in a future record of scholarship or for new professional directions may require additional resources. If so, resources should be specifically mentioned in the recommendations. If the Dean agrees with the recommended resources, there should be a good faith effort to provide these resources within a reasonable time. If the agreed upon resources are not provided, the faculty member will not be held responsible for a lack of improvement contingent on said resources during subsequent annual evaluations or the next post tenure review.

IX. Confidentiality and Dissemination of Findings

- A. Deliberations and copies of assessment materials of PTR committees are privileged and are kept in strict confidence. Draft reports and committee members' notes are treated as confidential material in the creation and discard process.
- B. During the individual review, the PTR documentation is maintained by Library HR, as well as other confidential materials, and access is limited to the PTR Committee (during its review process), the supervisor, AD, and Dean.
- C. At the conclusion of the post tenure review process, review materials are distributed as follows:
 - 1. The AD Final Report, letter of notification of the review, and letter announcing the PTR committee is kept in the individual personnel file in Library HR with access limited to the faculty member and the current supervisor, AD, and Dean
 - 2. Reports, confidential documentation, and all correspondence from the review process; the PTR Schedule; the faculty member's PTR documentation are retained in Library HR's confidential file.
 - 3. Library HR will forward the required post tenure review materials to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

X. Rights of Appeal

If the faculty member believes that he or she has been reviewed unfairly they may file an appeal using the mechanisms described in *Faculty Handbook* Section 9, Faculty Grievance Procedures.

Dean of the Library

Five-Year Administrative Review Process

The Provost is responsible for conducting five-year administrative reviews of the Dean of the Library. The purpose of the administrative review is to provide constructive and systematic internal assessment of the dean in his/her current administrative role.

The Provost's assessment will be informed primarily by the report of an Administrative Review Committee (using feedback from library faculty and staff), assessment feedback from the Library Administrative Cabinet, the academic campus leadership, and his/own assessment.

The administrative review will focus on the dean's administrative responsibilities, leadership role, and accomplishments as well as the dean's office. The review report will focus on the following key areas:

1. Library mission statement and strategic plan and its success
2. Leadership in developing, articulating and implementing improvements in library programs, facilities and collections
3. Effectiveness in budget management and in improving financial support
4. Effectiveness in attracting and retaining high-quality faculty and staff
5. Effective communication
6. Relationships with university administration and college administrators and external constituent groups
7. Overall assessment
8. Any other topic(s) requested by the Provost when the evaluation process commences.

The Library Administrative Review Committee's charge is to provide the Provost with its assessment of the Dean of the Library while taking into account Library faculty and staff feedback. To accomplish this, the review committee will use an assessment survey tool to obtain systematic feedback from faculty and staff and will cover the areas of review and include the signatures of the faculty and staff. The assessment survey designed to obtain signed feedback from library faculty and staff is expected to be available for two weeks.

1. The Library Dean Evaluation Committee

a. Charge

Provide the Provost and the Dean of the Library with its assessment report, which takes into account Library faculty and staff feedback and external academic campus leadership (e.g., college deans and academic vice presidents). To obtain faculty and staff feedback, the review committee will use an internal assessment survey tool (requiring individual identification) to obtain systematic feedback from faculty and staff. The survey will cover the areas of review. The assessment survey designed is expected to be available for two weeks.

Composition and Appointment Process

- ◆ Size: four to five members
- ◆ Composition:
 - Associate Dean (2 nominations from Dean; Provost selects 1)
 - Faculty (4 nominations from Dean; Provost selects 2)
 - Staff person (2 nominations from Dean; Provost selects 1)
 - Outside of Library (Optional) - 2 nominations from Dean; Provost selects 1

b. The Dean's Self Study

- ◆ The study should focus on library/personal accomplishments and staffing, personal leadership, and budget management as well as the function/role of the Dean's Office
- ◆ Format (determined by Dean)
- ◆ Length (brief; include Vita)
- ◆ The self study should be available to all library faculty and staff through the Library's Intranet

c. Procedures for the Review Committee

- ◆ The Dean's self study is reviewed by the Review Committee
- ◆ The Review Committee solicits internal input from library faculty and staff with the internal assessment tool, and input from external academic leadership based upon the focus of the review.
- ◆ A confidential Evaluation Committee report will reflect the committee's final assessment on the review and evaluation of the performance of the Dean and the Office of the Dean. The report will include an executive summary, a full report, and any pertinent appendix materials.
- ◆ The report is provided to the Provost and the Dean of the Library.
- ◆ A brief summary report is provided to the Library faculty and staff.

d. Provost Report

- ◆ The Provost will obtain additional assessment from the Library Administrative Cabinet
- ◆ The Provost will complete the administrative review report for the Dean of the Library and meet to discuss the Provost's final report with the Dean of the Library.
- ◆ The Provost will provide a summary report to the Library Faculty and Staff.

e. Typical Time Table

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| a. Formation of Evaluation Committee | Early February |
| b. Completion of Self-Study | End of February |
| c. Completion of Report by Evaluation Committee | Early April |
| d. Completion of Review by the Provost | Mid May |

Benjamin Allen, Provost, January 2003

Elizabeth Hoffman, Executive Vice President and Provost, October 1, 2008

University Library

Library Administrative Reviews for Associate and Assistant Deans Policy

10-6-2022

While library faculty members have routine post tenure reviews every seven years, the Dean of the Library arranges an administrative review for all associate and assistant deans every five years. Each administrative review is internal to the Library.

The purpose of the administrative review is to provide constructive and systematic internal assessment of the associate or assistant dean in their current administrative role. The Dean's assessment is informed by the report of an Administrative Review Committee and assessment feedback from the Library Administrative Cabinet. All feedback must be signed, but is held in strict confidence. In all communication with the candidate and review reports, respondents remain anonymous.

Each administrative review focuses on the associate or assistant dean's administrative responsibilities and accomplishments. The reviews will focus on the following key areas related to the administrative areas of responsibilities and the library:

1. Strategic and operational planning
2. Leadership, initiative, collaboration, follow through, problem solving, participatory decision making, and accountability
3. Development, assessment, and oversight of programs and efficient/effective use of resources
4. Faculty and staff development and mentoring
5. Professional knowledge of their areas of responsibility and library roles
6. Communication, active listening, and transparency
7. Overall assessment and impact

The Dean appoints an Administrative Review Committee (typically composed of three library employees) and selects the committee chair. The associate or assistant dean nominates 4 staff members (faculty, P&S, and/or Merit) for the Dean's appointment consideration; they may also provide justification in writing of any staff that should be excluded due to a conflict of interest.

The Administrative Review Committee's charge is to provide the Dean of the Library with its own assessment while taking into account important Library-wide faculty and staff feedback. To obtain this feedback, each review committee will use an assessment survey tool to obtain systematic and voluntary feedback from faculty, P&S, and merit staff.