University Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

# Libraries Faculty Handbook

# Table of Contents

# Section 1: Evaluation for Compensation

## Part 1: Annual Salary Distribution

### Process for evaluating librarianship

At the time of the annual evaluation, the first level evaluator and faculty member should create goals for the coming year. Individual faculty members should write a first draft of their goals and schedule a meeting with their first level evaluator to discuss their goals and, through a process of negotiation, ensure that they are in concert with department goals.

The goals will be documented in the faculty member's University Professional Plan, or on the second page of the Annual Evaluation document, at the time of evaluation or no later than Feb. 28 of each year. The faculty member and evaluators' Faculty Rights and Due Process Protections shall be maintained throughout this process. If an agreement on goals cannot be reached, the faculty member's second-level evaluator should be consulted.

Goals can be added or modified during the year, as appropriate, and first-level evaluators are encouraged to meet with their faculty members at least once during the year to discuss progress on goals. Associate Deans are encouraged to review the librarianship goals of faculty in their divisions in order to ensure consistency of expectations between departments. Directors are responsible for ensuring appropriate goals are set within their departments.

At the time of the annual evaluation, the first-level evaluator meets with the faculty member to discuss the faculty member's accomplishments and areas for improvement, including a review of the faculty member's annual goals. The first-level evaluator makes the final decision on what score is recommended to the Dean.

Merit Review and Salary Committee (MRSC) will review the longitudinal distribution of scores and report their findings to the faculty and the deans, and recommend procedural changes as needed. MRSC will review and assess the evaluation process every 5 years.

### Appeals of Scores

Faculty may appeal their evaluation scores to the Appeals Committee. Prior to submitting a formal appeal, faculty may request reconsideration of their librarianship scores to their first level evaluators. Faculty may request reconsideration of their service or research scores to the MRSC.

### Calculation of Scores

Annual Evaluation Scores are determined by a faculty member's workload distribution. For example, a faculty member with a 40% librarianship /40% research /20% service distribution (the standard for tenure track faculty), with scores of 4/4/2 would receive a score of 3.6 out of 5.

## Distribution of Libraries Salary Pool

The Merit Review and Salary Committee (MRSC) proposes to the Deans a specific distribution of part of the salary pool that may be reserved for equity or other adjustments. Remaining salary pool is distributed proportionately according to merit and workload distributions.
The MRSC recommends to the Dean the level of salary increases to be used in a given year, considering:

- The aggregate merit of all faculty members
- The size of the Libraries' merit increase pool for the year
- Promotions in rank among Libraries faculty
- Any individual instructions received from the campus or the Dean
- The need for equity adjustments

The Dean makes a final decision about merit distribution, and informs the Provost of their recommendations for salary increase. The Dean informs the faculty of merit distribution.

# Part 2: Evaluation

## How Do I Classify This Work?

A general rule for determining where to classify one's work is to consider the origin of the assignment.

- If one is elected to, or assigned, the work by the Libraries' faculty, that work is service.
- If one is assigned the work by one's director/evaluator or the Libraries' administration, that work is librarianship.
- Service that is expected of your job (e.g. Tenure Committee, state/regional collaborative committees, search committees, Council of Associate Deans, etc.) is usually still considered service.
- For further clarification on whether work is service or librarianship please see the librarianship and service criteria in Section 3 Part 2 of this handbook.
-

## Librarianship

Librarians specialize in diverse areas of the field. Consequently, portfolios vary widely. Activities encompassed in the term "Practice of Librarianship" are described in Section 3, Part 2.

### Factors for Evaluating Librarianship

The performance of librarianship is evaluated by the first- level evaluator., who has the best operational knowledge of the librarianship duties regardless of their rank or classification. The first-level evaluator is identified for the specific job at the time of evaluation based on the Libraries organizational chart. The evaluator should consider performance based on the candidate's current position description and the annual goals, as well as support of University, Campus, and Libraries mission and goals, when writing an evaluation.

### Scores

- **5 = Outstanding:** Far exceeds performance expectations on a consistent and uniform basis. Work is of exceptional quality in all essential areas of responsibility. In addition, makes an exceptional or unique contribution in achievement of unit, department, and University objectives.
- **4 = Exceeding expectations:** Always achieves performance expectations and frequently exceeds them. Demonstrates performance of a very high level of quality in all areas of responsibility.
- **3 = Meeting expectations:** Consistently fulfills performance expectations and periodically may exceed them.
- **2 = Below expectations:** Performs below expectations in one or two of the significant/essential position requirements and improvement is needed in these areas.
- **1 = Fails to meet expectations:** Performs below expectations in more than two of the significant/essential position requirements and improvement is needed in most aspects of position.

## Research

### Factors for Evaluating Scholarly and Creative Work

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to detail all Scholarly and Creative Work on the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) and curriculum vitae. The Merit Review and Salary Committee is guided by the following general considerations as it assesses a record of scholarly and creative work for annual compensation purposes or career merit. The considerations are applied to all scholarly outputs, regardless of format, provided that they are related to the field. Note that the list is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. Other factors may be considered as appropriate.

### Factors to be considered for <u>all</u> works

- Purpose or nature of the work (e.g., report of research results, essay, report of conference meeting, publicity, etc.)
- Audience (e.g., scholarly, popular)
- Nature of publishing or sponsoring body (e.g., scholarly press, popular press, professional organization, institutional, etc.)
- Nature of the review process (e.g., peer-review/refereed, editorial review, adoption/endorsement by an organization)
- Nature and scope of the engagement (e.g. conference size/impact, keynote, invited, competitively selected, etc.)
-

### Factors to be considered for <u>particular</u> works

- **Books:** Credit for book-length scholarly monographs is given over a two year period. In the year a scholarly book is published, the faculty member receives a 5 in research. The year after the book is published, the faculty member receives credit equivalent to a peer reviewed journal article. In the year that a scholarly book translation or edited book is

published, the faculty member receives a 5 in research. The faculty member does not receive credit in subsequent years after the book is published.

- **Research in Progress:** Research in Progress must eventually lead to a public presentation, publication, performance, exhibit, etc. "In Progress" denotes research for which significant work is underway, for example: research instrument design, data analysis, draft writing, etc. It also denotes research which has been submitted or is at some stage of review/revision, but is not yet scheduled for publication.
- **Research in Press:** Research which has been accepted and is scheduled for publication can be described as in "In Press."
- **Awards and Prizes:** Awards are evaluated in the categories for which they are given. The amount of credit given for an award depends on the level of the award (i.e. local, state, national) and why it is awarded. Receipt of an award does not automatically result in the highest rating for the category.
- **Grants:** Writing and submitting a grant is considered research. The execution and outputs of the grants are evaluated separately as either Scholarly and Creative Work, Librarianship, or Service, depending on the nature of the grant. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide grant specifics, including grant size, funding source, significance, and the extent of their involvement in grant activities.
- **Digital scholarship:** Appropriate credit is given based on the nature and scope of the project, the extent of the individual's involvement, demonstrated impact, and other relevant details, such as evaluative reviews during a grant writing process or forms of post-publication peer review.

### Scores for Tenure Track

- **5 = Outstanding:** 2 refereed publications OR publication of a scholarly monograph; significant grants; OR meets the guidelines for [4] and at least one more activity from, but not limited to, the following: additional scholarly and creative work that, together, far exceed expectations
- **4 = Exceeding expectations:** A refereed publication; OR Meets the guidelines for [3] and at least one more activity from, but not limited to, the following: refereed conference proceedings; significant presentations; grants funded; or published annotated bibliographies
- **3 = Meeting expectations:** Meets the guidelines for [2] and at least one more activity from, but not limited to, the following: non-refereed articles, book chapters, or conference proceedings; scholarly presentations; grant proposals submitted; significant book or resource reviews; digital scholarship; works in press (with citation) or published bibliographies
- **2 = Below expectations:** Displays evidence of activity (reported on FRPA). May include one of the following: book reviews; scholarly presentations at the local or libraries level; or research in progress
- **1 = Fails to meet expectations:** No evidence of activity (nothing reported on FRPA)

### Scores for Teaching Professor Track

- **5 = Outstanding:** A refereed publication; OR meets the guidelines for [4] and one or more activity from, but not limited to, the following: presentation(s) at the national level; non-peer reviewed publication(s); or grant(s).
- **4 = Exceeding expectations:** National presentation OR a non-refereed publication OR white paper, OR a combination of three or more of the following: presentation(s) at the local, campus, system, state or regional level, work(s) in press (with citation), book review(s), or grant(s).
- **3 = Meeting expectations:** Two of the following: a presentation at the local, campus, system, state, or regional level; a book review; or research in progress.
- **2 = Below expectations:** Displays evidence of activity (reported on FRPA). May include one of the following: a book review; scholarly presentation at the local or libraries level; or research in progress.
- **1 = Fails to meet expectations:** No evidence of activity (nothing reported on FRPA).

## Leadership & Service

### Factors for Evaluating Leadership & Service

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to detail all Service and Outreach activities on the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) and curriculum vitae. The Merit Review and Salary Committee is guided by the following general considerations as it assesses a record of service for annual compensation purposes or for career merit. Note that the list is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. Other factors may be considered as appropriate.

- Commitment of service requirement (e.g. amount of time required, difficulty of work)
- Impact of the activity (e.g., setting standards or best practices, organizational policy and governance, fostering retention & success via mentoring, whether formal or informal, etc.)
- Purpose of parent body (e.g., institutional, professional, disciplinary)
- Role in service (e.g., appointed, elected, chair, ex officio)

### Scores

- **5 = Outstanding:** Evidence of high importance, high commitment, OR impactful leadership for service activity.
- **4 = Exceeding expectations:** Evidence of significant responsibility on at least one, OR contribution to several, service commitments.
- **3 = Meeting expectations:** Evidence of active participation in more than one service commitment.
- **2 = Below expectations:** Membership on, or low contribution to, a single service commitment; community service related to the profession
- **1 = Fails to meet expectations:** No evidence of activity

# Part 3: Salary Equity Process

All campus academic units are mandated to have in place a faculty Salary Equity Evaluation System, in accordance with campus[1] and Regent[2] policies. As these policies state, requests for equity begin at the unit level and must be based on comparable faculty members' years since terminal degree, salaries, and career merit. In accordance with campus policy, the Libraries define career merit in terms of performance in librarianship, scholarly and creative work, and service since terminal degree. Comparisons between three colleagues and the faculty member requesting equity forms the basis of the request. On an annual basis, the faculty will be provided with salaries and years since terminal degree for all faculty members to identify potential equity issues based on comparisons with three colleagues of comparable career merit. MRSC evaluates these requests and makes recommendations for salary adjustments to the Dean. Faculty members can appeal the decisions of either MRSC or the dean to the campus (Faculty Affairs Policy on Salary Equity[3]). On an annual basis, MRSC also proactively reviews salaries for merit inequities and makes recommendations for salary adjustments directly to the Dean.

# Part 4: Workload Distribution

## Standard Workloads

Standard workload is broken down by librarianship, scholarly and creative work, and service and is weighted according to a ratio of 40-40-20 for faculty with tenure stream appointments, and 70-10-20 for faculty with non-tenure stream appointments. The standard workload for part time and temporary faculty, including grant funded faculty, is 100% librarianship.

## Differentiated Workload Policy

Individual professional and scholarly responsibilities may require the Libraries faculty to engage in activities demanding an unusual time commitment. Such activities may be associated with individual faculty needs for career development, tenure and promotion; with goals and objectives of the Libraries or of the University; or with responsibilities to the discipline of librarianship. All of these circumstances are recognized by the University Libraries as legitimate reasons to consider a differentiated annual workload for an individual faculty member.

## Associate or Full Teaching Professor's Differentiated Workload

In accordance with section 4.c of the Titles, Roles, Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Teaching and Librarian Positions[4], Associate or Full Teaching Professors who have completed six years (twelve semesters) in rank at 100% appointment as either an instructor promoted to senior instructor or as a senior/principal instructor are eligible to

[1] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/salary_equity_policy_revision_2015_final.pdf

[2] https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/11

[3] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/faculty-career-milestones/evaluation-and-compensation/salary-and-equity

[4] https://www.colorado.edu/academicaffairs/titles-roles-appointment-evaluation-and-promotion-non-tenure-track-faculty-teaching-and-librarian

apply for a teaching professor differentiated workload. Faculty with part time appointments of at least 50% are eligible for this benefit on a pro-rated basis. The differentiated workload provides time for focused work related to librarianship, scholarly and creative work, or leadership and service. The Teaching Professor will engage in focused project work that benefits the Libraries or the University. Examples include special projects, professional development, updating or acquiring new skills, planning or developing new initiatives, or research projects related to the practice of librarianship.

## One-Semester Release from Librarianship

Tenure-stream faculty are eligible to request up to 4.5 months release from Librarianship to be taken prior to applying for promotion and tenure. During this time, faculty continue to perform Scholarly and Creative Work and Leadership and Service duties. See the Tenure Committee Procedures for more information.

## Sabbatical

Per APS 1024 Tenured faculty are eligible to apply for a 6 month (full salary) or 12 month (half salary) sabbatical after six years of service to the university. Eligible faculty members may apply for subsequent sabbaticals after at least six years of additional service to the university. See the Tenure Committee Procedures for more information.

## Faculty Research Time

In consultation with their first-level evaluators, faculty set an annual, agreed-upon schedule for research time, consistent with their classification:

- Tenure-track faculty with 40/40/20 workloads are provided 48 days per year for research.
- Non-tenure track faculty (Assistant Teaching Professors/Associate Teaching Professors/Teaching Professors) with 70/10/20 workloads are provided 12 days per year for research.
- Tenure-track, non-tenure track, and tenured faculty with differentiated workloads will receive time for research at percentage equivalent to their appointment. Tenured faculty who have chosen phased retirement, or are working at 50% time or less as defined by University policy, will receive time for research at a percentage equivalent to their appointment.

The faculty member's regular research schedule is recorded in the Faculty Research Time Contract and reviewed and signed on an annual basis by both the faculty member and their first-level evaluator. The contract may also be revised as often as needed by the faculty member, in consultation with their evaluator. Research days are expected to be used annually and are not bankable from year to year.

It is understood that faculty research may require additional time that extends beyond these policies. Faculty may be able to engage in additional research time, so long as it is determined in consultation with their first-level evaluator and recorded in the Faculty Research Time Contract. This additional research time is not a release from librarianship; faculty must continue their librarianship duties concurrently. In cases where the faculty member requires additional research time in lieu of librarianship that is not research leave or sabbatical leave, the faculty member is encouraged to consider a differentiated workload. Additional research time may only be taken in lieu of librarianship with the approval of both the faculty member's first-level and second-level evaluators and should be considered a very rare practice; in general, prolonged research time is reserved for research leave or sabbatical leave.

It is the responsibility of the first-level evaluator to support and enable the faculty member's research leave, consistent with these policies and the faculty member's classification.

### Faculty Service Time

In other departments faculty who serve on VCAC or ARPAC are given course releases and exceptions from all other service activities. Since multiple course loads and any kind of releases are uncommon in the Libraries, faculty who serve on these committees should be permitted to use the differentiated workload to adjust their workloads to ensure that their valuable multi-year service on these committees does not harm their annual scores overall. Their workflow distribution ranges may become 10%–40% librarianship, 10–40% research, and 20-70% service for the entire evaluative year, in consultation with their supervisor and approval of their reporting line and the dean. Additionally members of these committees may work with the dean to adjust their research workload downward for an additional year after rotating off of the committees, to allow time for their research trajectory to recover.

## Part 5: Annual Evaluation Process for Libraries Faculty Members with Special Cases

This document provides instructions for applying the annual evaluation process for Libraries faculty members who have worked less than 12 months within a given calendar year.

### Newly Hired Faculty

A faculty member who has worked at least 1 month in the calendar year in which she/he began employment will undergo the normal faculty evaluation process for that year. In such cases, neither supervisors nor the MRSC are to take into account the length of a faculty member's employment in determining merit scores.

A faculty member who has worked less than one month will not participate in the annual evaluation process and will not receive a dollar amount increase but is still required to submit all other required documentation associated with the annual evaluation process.

## Leaves

### Sabbatical

It is recommended that faculty members' workload distributions are adjusted depending on the individual's circumstances when taking a sabbatical.

When a faculty member takes a six-month sabbatical within a single evaluative year, their workload distribution ranges may become 15%–35% librarianship, 45–75% research, and 5–25% service for the entire evaluative year, in consultation with their supervisor and approval of the Deans.

When a faculty member takes a 12-month sabbatical within a single evaluative year, the workload distribution ranges may become 0–20% librarianship, 60–100% research, and 0–20% service, in consultation with their supervisor and approval of the deans.

When a faculty member takes a sabbatical spanning across two calendar years, in a year where 4 months or more are taken as sabbatical, the following workload distribution is recommended:

- 15–35% librarianship
- 45–75% research
- 5–25% service

In a year where less than 4 months are taken as sabbatical, the following workload distribution is recommended:

- 25–45% librarianship
- 35–65% research
- 5–25% service

Workload distribution forms should be completed by the faculty member by the annual due date for forms.

### All Other Leave

All faculty members will undergo the normal evaluation process regardless of the amount of leave taken in a given evaluation year. When a faculty member takes cumulative leave of 3 months (65 work days/520 hrs) or more within a single evaluative year, the faculty member may request to receive the average of their merit scores during the previous six years, or since the start of employment in the Libraries (if fewer than six years). In this case, the faculty member should inform the Faculty Support Project Manager that they wish to receive averaged scores before the deadline for appeals of annual evaluations. Neither supervisors nor the MRSC are to take into account the length of the leave or the administrative impact of the leave in determining merit scores.

Faculty and supervisors are also encouraged to consider whether a differentiated workload may be appropriate during a year in which a faculty member takes significant cumulative leave, and/or during the year following.

# Section 2: Emeritus/a Status

Emeritus/a status "is awarded those faculty, in the ranks of full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Assistant Teaching Professor, upon retirement, who are nominated by their department for this distinction and whose nomination is supported through the usual personnel review process." (Board of Regents Policy 5: Faculty Titles) Minimum requirements to be considered for emeritus status within the Libraries are:

- Holding the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor or above
- Full time appointment, or part time phased retirement appointment for at least 5 years
- Performance at an overall level of at least "meeting expectations" for the past 5 years, or 80 percent of the total years of service.
- Other issues may be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

## Emeritus Status Procedures within the Libraries

Retiring faculty notifies Dean of desire for emeritus/a status at least 30 days before intended retirement date. Administrative Services verifies eligibility. Dean determines whether to request emeritus status. Dean presents names of faculty to be considered for emeritus status and requests a vote. Based upon a successful vote, Dean prepares letter of recommendation for Faculty Affairs. Final decision regarding granting of emeritus/a status is made by the Chancellor. Upon approval, the action is listed on the Regents' monthly Delegated Personnel Action Report.

# Section 3: Appointment; Reappointment and Promotion of Teaching Professors; Comprehensive Review, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review of Tenure-track Faculty

Libraries faculty follow the procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review established for University of Colorado faculty by the Office of Faculty Affairs and regental policy.

- See Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion[5] by the Office of Policy and Efficiency.
- See Tenure and Promotion Appeals[6] by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

## Part 1: Appointment and Reappointment

### Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor

- See Non Tenure-Track Faculty[7] by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- See Reappointment of Instructor Rank Faculty[8]

**Assistant Teaching Professor:** Assistant Teaching Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to the field and should be otherwise well-qualified to practice librarianship.

**Associate Teaching Professor:** The rank of Associate Teaching Professor is awarded to Assistant Teaching Professors who have demonstrated a high level of performance in the practice of librarianship, usually after a period of not less than seven years in rank as an Assistant Teaching Professor or equivalent professional experience.

**Teaching Professor:** The rank of Teaching Professor is awarded to Associate Teaching Professors who have been exemplary librarians and members of the university community, after a minimum of three years at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or equivalent professional experience.

[5] https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022
[6] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/relevant-policies-and-procedures/tenure
[7] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/faculty-career-milestones/recruitment-and-hiring/non-tenure-track-faculty
[8] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-instructor-rank-faculty

## Tenure Track Faculty: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

### Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor

- See Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty[9] by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- See Hire with Credit toward the Tenure Probationary Period, below.

## Hire with Credit toward the Tenure Probationary Period

- Adjustments to the Tenure Clock[10] (see Shortening the Probationary Period)
- Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion/APS 1022[11]
- Regent Laws, Article 5[12] (see 5.B.4.D.3, regarding the tenure probationary period)

Candidates employed previously in a tenure-track position are eligible to request consideration for hire with one, two, or three years of credit toward the tenure probationary period. See Adjustments to the Tenure Clock:

"Shortening the Probationary Period: At the time of initial appointment, the dean has authority to credit 1, 2, or 3 years towards a tenure decision to incoming faculty with previous tenure-track faculty experience of a comparable nature at another institution. Regent's Rules do not allow more than 3 years credit to be granted. Granting years of credit towards tenure must be defined in the letter of offer. Junior faculty should be conservative in requesting or accepting credit towards tenure, as the decision to shorten one's probationary period becomes a binding decision on the part of both the University and the faculty member. In extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member who has already begun an appointment may, with the approval of the chair and/or dean, petition the provost to grant years towards tenure at a later date."

The Senior Associate Dean will inform all tenure-track faculty search finalists that campus policy permits both hire with credit and early tenure applications, and that a candidate may request consideration for hire with one, two, or three years of credit, during their hiring negotiation.
Upon receiving a candidate's request for hire with credit, the Senior Associate Dean will inform the candidate that they may elect to submit a revised version of their curriculum vitae. This allows the candidate to submit a curriculum vitae that documents their complete record and that will be used to consider their request for hire with credit. In deciding whether to

[9] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/faculty-career-milestones/recruitment-and-hiring/tenure-track-and-tenured-faculty

[10] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/adjustments-tenure-clock

[11] https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022

[12] https://www.cu.edu/regents/law/5

grant years of credit and how many, the Senior Associate Dean will consult with the relevant department director, search committee chair, and make a recommendation to the Dean.

In case of hire with credit toward the tenure probationary period, the letter of offer must state the year(s) of credit awarded and indicate the timeline for the individual's mandatory, fourth-year comprehensive review, as stipulated by the campus Adjustments to the Tenure Clock policy[13].

### How to Request a Retention Offer

Any faculty members may negotiate a retention offer with the Dean of Libraries at any time. Retention requests may stem from receipt of an offer from another institution, or may be preemptive, which would not necessitate such an offer. Prior to making an offer to the candidate, the Dean may consult with the Merit Review Salary Committee. The Dean reviews supporting information and makes a recommendation to the Provost. Retention offers may require a commitment to remain at CU Boulder for some period of time. There is no guarantee of a retention offer if requested and there is no penalty for making a request.

For more information see the Faculty Affairs documents on retention[14] and the MRSC Committee Procedures.

## Part 2: Criteria for Evaluating Libraries Faculty for Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure

- See CU System APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion
- See Regent Policy 5.D: Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion.

General criteria for evaluating Libraries faculty for reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review are (1) the practice of librarianship, which is considered the equivalent of teaching in other campus departments, (2) scholarly and creative work, and (3) service, which includes service to the Libraries, the campus, and the profession. The most critical factors in reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, and tenure cases are the quality and impact of a candidate's work. The Libraries faculty value excellence in the practice of librarianship informed by active scholarship. Given that a rating of 'excellent' in leadership and service is neither required nor sufficient for promotion or reappointment, candidates are encouraged to focus on achieving a rating of 'excellent' in librarianship or in scholarly and creative work.

[13] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/adjustments-tenure-clock

[14] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/a-z#O

Criteria are reviewed and updated regularly, on a cycle tied to the seven-year Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) review. The Faculty Governance Committee will appoint a group of pre-tenured, tenure, and teaching professor rank faculty to conduct the review.

## Practice of Librarianship

We evaluate the practice of librarianship based on the following three criteria:

- Performance of Core Responsibilities
- Trajectory and Growth
- Impact

## Performance of Core Responsibilities

Library faculty dossiers must include all position descriptions and revisions during the time period under review. The position description documents the major duties and core responsibilities of the position, and it may be updated over time to reflect changes to core responsibilities.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of a high level of achievement in professional performance, defined as successfully carrying out the faculty member's responsibilities as specified in their position description(s) for the time under consideration.
- **Excellent:** Beyond the level of achievement required for meritorious, with evidence of consistently outstanding performance in the area(s) of core responsibilities at a rigorous and challenging level; demonstrated, significant impact on the development, management, and/or implementation of high quality collections or services.

## Trajectory and Growth

At the time of review, candidates must demonstrate continued development and professional growth in their appointed position(s).

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of continued growth and the development of expertise in the knowledge and skills required for their position(s). The candidate must demonstrate that they will continue to develop in their appointed position.
- **Excellent:** Beyond the level of achievement required for meritorious, with evidence that the faculty member is greatly accomplished in their area of expertise, has continued to develop their knowledge and skills, and/or has expanded their areas of expertise to other relevant domain areas.

## Impact

The work of library faculty can have an impact in a wide range of areas depending on their job duties. The categories outlined below (in alphabetical order) provide potential areas in which candidates can demonstrate impact:

- Collaboration
- Fostering inclusion
- Impact on research and learning
- Influence on the practice of librarianship
- Innovation

- Leadership and management

Not all of these categories will apply to every candidate, dependent on the individual's librarianship duties. Candidates are not expected to demonstrate achievement in all of the areas.

### Collaboration

Librarianship is a collaborative effort that requires building relationships, maintaining projects, and mutual support of colleagues both inside and outside of the University Libraries.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of success in building and maintaining essential relationships; demonstrated contributions toward projects, and in support of colleagues, through the candidate's collaborative work.
- **Excellent:** Evidence of success in building and maintaining especially productive collaborations, including key support roles in the success and/or longevity of existing projects or relationships, or those leading to new initiatives or projects.

### Fostering Inclusion

Librarianship, as a profession, values intellectual freedom, equity, inclusion, and diversity. Library faculty affirm inclusive excellence and diversity[15] to be vitally integral to the practice of librarianship, and actively support the values outlined in the CU Libraries' Commitment to Diversity and Inclusive Excellence statement[16]; by the American Library Association[17]; the Association of College and Research Libraries[18]; and the University of Colorado Boulder[19].

- **Meritorious:** Demonstrated contributions to activities creating, supporting or promoting inclusion, equity, and intellectual freedom initiatives. Incorporates these values in their practice of librarianship.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and widely significant contributions to activities creating, supporting or promoting inclusion, equity, and/or intellectual freedom; evidence of significant outcomes and impact in promoting an inclusive environment through incorporating these values in their practice of librarianship.

### Impact on Research and Learning

Library faculty can have a large impact on research and learning practices, often achieved by either partnering directly with researchers and teaching faculty or by developing collections or building and maintaining tools, systems, services, policies, or communities of practice.

- **Meritorious:** Demonstrated contributions to supporting, enhancing, or promoting research and learning.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and widely significant contributions in this area. Beyond the level of achievement for meritorious, excellence may be demonstrated by broad

[15] As defined by the CU Boulder IDEA Plan, p. 5

[16] https://www.colorado.edu/libraries/about/commitment-diversity-and-inclusive-excellence

[17] http://www.ala.org/advocacy/diversity

[18] http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/diversity

[19] https://www.colorado.edu/odece/diversity-plan/campus-definition-inclusive-excellence

influence on the research and learning practices of the CU community, significant impact on a more focused constituency, or special recognition for contributions promoting research and learning.

### Influence on the Practice of Librarianship

Library faculty work within an international community of library and information professionals that shares and establishes best practices, standards, and guidelines. CU Boulder library faculty are often leaders in their field whose practice and accomplishments can have substantial influence on how libraries and librarians approach their work.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of consistent and sustained adoption, support, and advocacy for best practices, standards, guidelines and similar within their practice of librarianship.
- **Excellent:** Beyond the level of achievement for meritorious, excellence may be demonstrated by instrumental contributions in the development of standards or practices, such as those produced by recognized bodies at the national or international level; the creation of widely adopted, acclaimed, or influential best practices, standards, guidelines, instructional or procedural materials, and similar; or the creation or development of particularly impactful workflows, activities or documentation that materially changed the organizational culture and/or the practice of librarianship within the Libraries, campus, or more broadly.

### Innovation

Innovation within the Libraries is experimenting with new ideas, pedagogy, techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures, services, workflows, or physical environments.

- **Meritorious:** Demonstrated contributions in experimentation with and assessment of new ideas, techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures; Ongoing support of practices considered innovative or new.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and widely significant contributions in experimentation with and assessment of new ideas, techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures; creating, designing, facilitating, or leading programs to encourage innovation and experimentation; introducing new best practices around communicating innovation and new ideas.

### Leadership and Management

Library faculty may participate in high-level decision-making and strategic planning within or beyond their unit; influence the activities of individuals and groups and manage human, material, or financial resources to support, advance, or achieve the Libraries' or campus' strategic mission and goals; and/or provide effective leadership and management for activities that support, advance, or achieve unit, departmental, or Libraries strategic initiatives.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of active participation in high-level decision-making and strategic planning within or beyond their unit, and/or providing effective leadership or management for activities that support, advance, or achieve Libraries or campus strategic initiatives.

- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and exemplary leadership or management of initiatives or activities that support, advance, or achieve Libraries or campus strategic initiatives, and/or especially significant or influential contributions to strategic planning initiatives.

## Multiple Measures of Librarianship

Dossiers for all candidates for reappointment, comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion must include at least three "multiple measures" by which the practice of teaching/librarianship is evaluated, some of which are solicited by the Primary Unit and some of which are supplied by the candidate.

Multiple measures included in the dossier must contain at least one measure beyond the letters described below.

### Terminology: Evaluator, Supervisor

The concept of a faculty member's work being supervised by another is unfamiliar to most teaching faculty. Therefore, to the extent possible, those who prepare such evaluations are encouraged to refer to these letters as from "Internal evaluators."

### Letters solicited by the Primary Unit

- **Measure: Libraries' evaluator letters:** For each candidate, two letters are solicited from internal Libraries' evaluators. These letters should focus on the candidate's practice of librarianship. However, evaluators may also choose to comment on the candidate's scholarly/creative activity and leadership and service. These letters should be solicited from qualified individuals familiar with the candidate's operational role and librarianship duties in the Libraries, and at least one should be from someone who is a current member of the Primary Unit that will review the candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Candidates for review may suggest the names of library employees who can serve as evaluators.[20] The primary unit (PU) will determine which Libraries employees to ask to provide these two evaluations, considering the candidate's specific organizational responsibilities and role in the libraries and the candidate's suggestions of qualified evaluators. These evaluations are the equivalent of what teaching faculty might regard as a multi-year teaching evaluation.

  If the PU cannot find at least one internal evaluator who is at a rank above the candidate's, the PU may request an evaluative letter from an evaluator outside of the Libraries (from the campus, but not outside the university), who knows the work of the candidate and is qualified to judge the candidate, and who is above the candidate's rank. If no one at a higher rank can provide an evaluative letter, only in those rare cases may a candidate's dossier include two evaluative letters from evaluators who are at or below the rank of the candidate.

[20] Library employees refer to faculty and staff who are supervising faculty.

- **Measure: Libraries or Campus colleague letters:** Candidates for review may suggest the names of faculty colleagues within or outside the libraries who can provide an informed evaluation of some aspect of their work that may be otherwise insufficiently covered in the dossier. In general, no more than one such letter from libraries or campus colleagues is solicited for reappointment or comprehensive review dossiers, and no more than three are solicited for review for tenure or for promotion dossiers. Working from the names supplied, the Primary Unit solicits such evaluations as it believes will be useful for the review.

### Evaluation of instructional activities gathered by the Primary Unit

- **Measure: Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs):** All FCQs received during the period under review must be included in the candidate's dossier. Faculty who teach credit courses outside LIBR and DHUM must provide FCQs to the Faculty Support Project Manager.

- **Measure: Teaching Evaluations:** All pre-tenure faculty who teach (including credit-course teaching) as part of their core responsibilities are evaluated by the Tenure Committee Teaching Evaluation subcommittee. At least one evaluation should be conducted annually. The review dossier includes all evaluations received during the period under review.
- Teaching professors and tenured faculty who teach (including credit-course teaching) are encouraged to request a teaching evaluation by contacting the subcommittee. The review dossier includes all evaluations received during the period under review.

- **Measure: Solicited Student Letters:** Some candidates may serve as academic advisors, mentors, supervisors or classroom instructors. Candidates may suggest the names of students from whom to solicit letters. Working from the names supplied, the Primary Unit solicits such evaluations as it believes will be useful for the review process. Unless the list of names is extensive, the Committee usually solicits letters from all those named. Solicited student letters are confidential, and the names of students who provided letters may not be shared with the candidate.

### Evidence of librarianship activities supplied by the candidate

- **Measure: Candidate-Solicited Letters:** Candidates may solicit letters and e-mails from students, colleagues, patrons, etc. These letters and e-mails should be addressed to the candidate, who is responsible for holding them on file pending a review, and forwarding them for the dossier at the appropriate time.

- **Measure: Librarianship Portfolio:** Candidates may submit a portfolio comprised of documentation to support their librarianship statement, illustrating their accomplishments and responsibilities. Candidates are advised to be highly-selective and concise, including only evidence that best demonstrates the impact of librarianship activities. Portfolios may include, but are not limited to:
- Documentation and/or examples demonstrating the impact or context of librarianship activities, including but not limited to:
  - Accomplishments resulting from participation or leadership in task forces or other groups at the unit/department, Libraries, or campus level.

- Advocacy toward, or the development of, collections, programs, and services that are inclusive of the needs of all persons in the community, and promoting open access to information for all users.
- Awards and honors, including university, college, or professional society awards, prizes, selection for memberships in honorary societies, or honorary titles.
- Contributions toward creating and maintaining a workplace climate that demonstrates commitment to inclusion, including but not limited to the development of instructional methods, resources or partnerships that are reflective of the broad diversity of the community.
- The design and/or implementation of user research methods, user experience design methods and/or activities.
- The development of improvements, new ideas, innovative techniques, alternative approaches to, or iterative assessment of, library procedures, organizational methods, and materials.
- Serving as a thesis or dissertation advisor, or as a member of a thesis committee.
- Work on standards adopted by national or international bodies.

- Evidence of using professional experience, research, and creativity to solve problems, improve services, and innovate.
- Examples of new partnerships created and maintained; policies, procedures, workflows, or systems implemented or improved; outreach, events, or exhibits organized; teaching or instructional materials created (e.g., syllabi, lesson plans, classroom activities, or guides).
- Quantitative and/or qualitative measurements demonstrating excellence and impact of librarianship activities, including but not limited to:
  - Published reviews or descriptions of programs, projects, presentations, services rendered, etc. “Published” in this sense means written and distributed in a public venue, including in newspapers, newsletters, journals, websites, electronic discussion lists, etc.
  - Statistical data demonstrating impact of librarianship activities.
  - User research and/or feedback demonstrating impact of librarianship activities.
  - Other evidence of engagement with activities supporting research, teaching, and learning (e.g. research consultations).
  - Widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials.

## Scholarly and Creative Work

As researcher-practitioners, the nature and subject of candidates’ scholarly and creative work frequently aligns with and/or complements their practice of librarianship. Scholarly output, in all its forms, is assessed based on its quality and impact. Creativity and originality are also highly regarded. As an applied field, impact may be demonstrated by attention metrics (e.g., citation counts, download counts). Influential and selective publication or presentation venues are valued. As a highly collaborative field, candidates’ records often include only co-authored works, and there is no requirement for solo-authored works to appear in a meritorious or excellent record. Individually authored and co-authored works are both valued by the field. Candidates should articulate their contributions to co-authored works, and the significance of these contributions

may factor in evaluations of the scope and strength of the candidate's record of scholarly and creative work. Standards and other works by committee may be peer reviewed.

The Libraries Faculty endorsed the University of Colorado Boulder Open Access Policy[21] in April 2015. Further, the Association of College & Research Libraries Policy Statement on Open Access to Scholarship by Academic Librarians[22]:

"recommends as standard practice that academic librarians publish in open access venues, deposit in open repositories, and make openly accessible all products across the lifecycle of their scholarly and research activity, including articles, research data, monographs, presentations, digital scholarship, grant documentation, and grey literature. Authors should retain rights to these products of scholarship and make them available for reuse under an appropriate license." Excellence is often differentiated by exceptional impact, demonstrated by attention metrics, or distinguished through widely influential and selective publication or presentation venues. Excellence may also be evidenced by a strong scholarly reputation at the national or international level, demonstrated by formal acknowledgements or awards recognizing excellence in research, or invited publications or presentations.

- **Meritorious for tenure-track faculty:** a meritorious record of scholarly activity will generally include 3-5 substantive scholarly outputs including refereed book chapters, articles in refereed journals, refereed conference proceedings, or other modes of equivalent impact (e.g., digital projects, data sets, code). This is in addition to other scholarly work including non-refereed articles, presentations, grants and other research material. The record should demonstrate sustained activity.
- **Meritorious for teaching professor faculty:** a meritorious scholarly record will show evidence of activity, which may include presentations, book reviews, non-refereed publications, grants or other scholarly outputs.
- **Excellent for tenure-track faculty:** an excellent record in scholarly and creative work is demonstrated by sustained growth and exceptional impact. It will generally include 7-10 substantive scholarly outputs such as refereed book chapters, articles in refereed journals, refereed conference proceedings, or other modes of equivalent impact (e.g., digital projects, data sets, code). This is in addition to other scholarly work including non-refereed articles, presentations, grants and other research material .
- **Excellent for teaching professor faculty:** an excellent record in scholarly and creative work will demonstrate sustained activity and include regularly appearing substantive outputs such as refereed articles, chapters or conference proceedings; non-refereed publications; significant presentations; book reviews; grants; or other scholarly work.

[21] https://www.colorado.edu/libraries/research-assistance/open-access/open-access-resolutions

[22] http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/openaccess

**Research outputs encompassed by the term "Scholarly and Creative Work" may include, but are not limited to:**

- Books and monographs, single or co-authored
- Books of a scholarly nature, edited or co-edited
- Refereed scholarly outputs such as articles in refereed journals, refereed chapters in books, refereed conference proceedings, or other modes of equivalent impact
- Standards, essays in encyclopedias, other scholarly papers, technical reports, non-refereed chapters in books, high-impact blog posts, non-refereed articles or other publications
- Competitively selected or invited presentations or posters
- Reviews and abstracts such as book reviews, electronic resource reviews, or reviews of creative activities
- Grant proposals (even if not funded), contract funds for research, research awards, fellowships and scholarships
- Presentations, panels, or moderation of panels or roundtables
- Digital scholarship and other emerging forms of digital research outputs which may include, but are not limited to, digital projects, digital exhibits, datasets, databases, applications and software, programming packages
- Creative work produced in relation to the discipline or specialty
- Exhibitions, exhibition catalogs

## Leadership and Service

Leadership and service encompasses a library faculty member's work on committees, task forces or other elected/appointed bodies that are charged by the Libraries faculty, or for the CU System, CU Boulder and professional organizations. The role of professional organizations in directing and guiding the practice of librarianship results in increased impact and importance of service to the profession by librarians.

- **Meritorious:** A meritorious record of service and leadership is demonstrated by a definite and continuing commitment to service, marked by sustained growth and accomplishment.
- **Excellent:** An excellent record of service and leadership is demonstrated by a definite continuing commitment to service above the level of achievement of meritorious. Excellence is marked by a high level of responsibility and significant impact, and is often differentiated by elected positions; distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community; sustained significant accomplishments in service, resulting in a reputation for expertise; or, awards recognizing excellence in service.

**Activities encompassed by the term "Service" may include, but are not limited to:**

- Elected or appointed positions related to faculty governance within the University of Colorado
- Committees or elected/appointed bodies within the campus, the CU System and professional organizations
- Participation in professional associations and consortia

- Planning, organizing or conducting professional seminars, workshops, conferences, or programs
- Editing journals or newsletters, reviewing manuscripts, etc.
- Reviewing for grants, fellowships, or other awards
- Community engagement and volunteer work in relation to the discipline or specialty
- Mentoring activities (students, colleagues, etc.)

### Approval of Tenure Criteria

- Feb 01, 2024 – Approved by Libraries Faculty
- Feb 06, 2024 – Approved by Dean of the Libraries, Robert McDonald
- Feb 06, 2024 – Approved by Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, Michele Moses

## Part 3: Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-stream Faculty

See Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure Rank Faculty[23] by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

### Process

The tenure process is subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents, and to other university policies and procedures as applicable.

- Primary Unit (Tenure Committee) meets with candidates for review and explains the process.
- Candidate submits documentation (statements of librarianship, research, and service; current curriculum vitae; names of libraries and campus colleagues; librarianship portfolios (optional); FCQs from courses taught in other departments; three representative works; and names of potential external reviewers).
- Tenure Committee selects and contacts external reviewers, selected from a combined list of suggestions from the candidate and the members of the Tenure Committee.
- Tenure Committee determines which appropriate multiple measures to include.
- Tenure Committee forms Primary Unit Evaluation Committee and informs the candidate. The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee.
- PUEC arranges for multiple measures as needed.
- PUEC reviews dossier, prepares report. Tenure Committee (i.e. “Primary Unit”) reads and takes into consideration the report of the PUEC, discusses case, votes, and prepares report. Members take into account the content of the dossier. If a member of the PUEC or Primary Unit feels that relevant information is missing from the dossier they may write a letter to request inclusion of that information. The Candidate will receive a copy of all letters added to the dossier, except those from students and external evaluators.

[23] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion

- PUEC and Primary Unit reports must explicitly address all points contained in dossier or raised in discussion, both positive and negative. The Primary Unit report includes a vote tally.
- Dossier is forwarded to the Dean's Review Committee, which reviews the dossier, and prepares recommendation.
- Dean receives dossier, prepares recommendation, and forwards completed dossier to the Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs (VP-AVCFA). Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor refers dossier to the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) for consideration.
- Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor informs Dean of disposition of cases. Cases go through the Provost, the Chancellor, and in cases of tenure, to the University President and finally the Board of Regents before becoming official.
- Tenure in the University Libraries takes effect July 1.

## Special Circumstances

If there is a difference in recommendation between stages of the review process, the case will return to the prior stage of review for reconsideration and revote one time. For example, if the recommendation of the Dean's Review Committee is in conflict with the recommendation of the Primary Unit, the case would return to the Primary Unit for reconsideration and revote, after which a letter detailing the reconsideration and revote would be added to the dossier prior to the dossier moving forward. If after reconsideration and revote the recommendations are still in conflict, the case moves forward with the recommendations as such. Candidates are free to include written responses to any of the recommendations made at any point in the review process.

## Additions to the File

Candidates may submit additional information, updates, or responses at any point, which are considered from that point forward. Any review bodies may solicit additional information, and substantive information may be added by anyone involved in the review process. Candidates must be given the opportunity to respond to such additions.

Candidates are informed of recommendations made at each step of the review process, and may add a written response to the dossier to respond at any stage.

## Appeals

Appeals of final negative tenure decisions are made to the Privilege and Tenure Committee.

## Comprehensive Review

The comprehensive review, when for reappointment, is conducted in the fourth year at the rank of assistant professor, barring any hires with credit toward the tenure probationary period. A successful comprehensive review leads to reappointment for a period of three years, leading to tenure review. A negative comprehensive review leads to a one-year terminal contract.

In cases where a faculty member is hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period, the timing (in relation to the employee's date of hire) and nature (evaluative feedback only) of the comprehensive review are determined by the number of years of credit. In the case where the faculty member is hired with three years of credit, they will have one four-year appointment, and will not need to be reappointed, prior to tenure. They still must undergo a Feedback Only Comprehensive Review for advice and the Tenure Committee must vote on the action simply to assert that the review has been completed and advice provided to the faculty member. Comprehensive review is based primarily on internal documentation. It considers performance in librarianship, scholarly and creative work, and service, and answers the question: does performance so far suggest that the candidate will compile a record that will justify promotion and tenure at tenure review? By policy, in making such a judgment the benefit of doubt is given to the candidate. A record that indicates non- or barely meritorious performance in any of the evaluated areas, or that strongly suggests that the candidate will not meet the standards for tenure by the time tenure review takes place, may result in a recommendation against reappointment.

## Tenure Review

Tenure review normally begins in the seventh year after appointment as assistant professor; some documentation is collected at the end of the sixth year. A successful tenure review leads to promotion to the rank of associate professor and granting of continuous tenure. A negative tenure review leads to a one-year terminal contract.

In cases where a faculty member is hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period, the timing of the tenure review (in relation to the employee's date of hire) is determined by the number of years of credit awarded.

A candidate (including a candidate hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period) may stand for tenure simultaneously at the time of comprehensive review, or any time thereafter, before their mandatory tenure review (in the case of a candidate hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period, their mandatory tenure review is defined by the number of years of credit awarded at hire). The Tenure Committee must vote on both comprehensive review and tenure and promotion if they coincide. Tenure reviews undertaken at a time before the end of the probationary period are not mandatory and therefore candidates may withdraw from the review at any point and unsuccessful cases do not result in the one-year terminal contract; these candidates must return for tenure review at the mandatory time. The Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion/APS 1022[24] (see especially VII. Evaluation) provides specific guidance on early tenure.

[24] https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022

Tenure review involves consideration of both internal and external documentation, and answers the question "does performance so far provide convincing evidence that the candidate has made significant contributions in all three facets of performance, and that s/he will continue to do so?" At tenure review, the benefit of doubt is accorded the institution.

The Boulder Campus Policy on Hires with Tenure[25] states that an individual being hired with tenure does not need to be subjected to the identical review procedures as a candidate for tenure. Tenure review procedures for individuals who have received tenure at another institution and whose appointment does not include promotion to a higher rank are outlined in the Tenure Committee Procedures.

## Promotion to Full Professor

Upon request of a tenured associate professor, a review may be undertaken to consider promotion to the rank of full professor. A successful review leads to promotion. A negative review leads to continuation at the rank of associate professor with tenure. There is no minimum or maximum time that must pass between promotion to associate professor and consideration for promotion to full professor. Candidates may not be held to a higher standard due to the passage of time. Because this is not a mandatory review, a candidate for full professor may withdraw their candidacy at any time.

Review for promotion to full professor involves consideration of both internal and external documentation. CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1022 indicates that candidates for promotion to full professor will have "1. a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; 2. a record of significant contribution to graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and 3. a record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service."

In the case of promotion to full professor, excellence overall does not indicate a requirement for excellence in each individual category. Rather, the overall record, in all three areas combined and taken as a whole, needs to be reflective of excellence. The focus of the full professor review is primarily on the record post-tenure. In the case of a candidate for full professor who received tenure at another institution and was hired into the University Libraries with tenure, the record is assessed since their completion of tenure at their previous institution, rather than their moment of hire. Post-tenure, pre-CU work counts equally with post-tenure work completed at CU. The expectations for promotion to full professor should be considered to roughly repeat the expectations for tenure and promotion. The candidate's statement on librarianship should

[25] https://www.colorado.edu/today/node/25030/attachment

include, among other things, a discussion of challenges faced in teaching and/or mentoring and attempts to overcome them. The candidate's statement on scholarly/creative activity should explain research focus changes over time, which are normal and encouraged. Generally, the record of scholarly/creative activity will include 3-5 substantive articles in refereed journals or venues of equivalent impact, in addition to presentations and other research material, completed since the candidate's tenure. The record of service (university, professional, and public) is emphasized in an application for full professor and should have contributed to the overall mission and strategic priorities of the university. It is in the best interest of the Libraries and the University to have a robust number of full professors. Thus, the unit is encouraged to identify, mentor, and encourage potential candidates to apply. Associate professors are encouraged to stand for review when they are ready.

# Part 4: Reappointment and Promotion for Teaching Professor Rank (Non-Tenure Track) Faculty

See Reappointment of Instructor Rank Faculty[26]

## Reappointment

Faculty initially appointed to the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor or Associate Teaching Professor are usually reviewed during the last year of the appointment period. A typical annual merit formula for instructor-rank faculty may be 70% librarianship, 10% scholarly and creative work, and 20% service, but individual annual merit assignments may vary considerably both within and between units[27]. Teaching Professor rank faculty are evaluated according to criteria which define for their unit "meritorious" and "excellent" performance. Teaching Professor rank faculty with typical (70-10-20) annual merit formulas are generally expected to demonstrate excellence in librarianship, and meritorious performance in scholarly and creative work and service.

Upon successful review, Teaching Professor rank faculty are eligible for reappointment. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment period will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a multi-year reappointment or non-reappointment.

## Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) Responsibilities

This group from within the primary unit is appointed by the Faculty Governance Committee. The PUEC is responsible for assisting the candidate in assembling their dossier, soliciting opinions from outside review when appropriate, and providing a written and oral summary of the candidate's

[26] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-instructor-rank-faculty

[27] https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-instructor-rank-faculty

dossier to the membership of the Primary Unit. The PUEC makes a recommendation to the Primary Unit. The written report of the PUEC becomes part of the dossier.

## Primary Unit

The Primary Unit is composed of the faculty members of the Libraries authorized to vote on matters of reappointment and promotion.

- Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, Associate Professors, and Full Professors form the Primary Unit for a reappointment of Assistant Teaching Professor case.
- Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, Associate Professors, and Full Professors, form the Primary Unit for a promotion to Associate Teaching Professor case.
- Teaching Professors, Associate Professors, and Full Professors, form the Primary Unit for a reappointment of Associate Teaching Professor case.
- Teaching Professors and Full Professors form the Primary Unit for a promotion to Teaching Professor case.
- Teaching Professors and Full Professors form the Primary Unit for reappointment to Teaching Professor case.

The Primary Unit is chaired by the Faculty Chair. If the Faculty Chair has a conflict of interest or is not a member of the Primary Unit, the Primary Unit will be chaired by the Faculty Vice-Chair, followed by the most recent eligible previous Chair. When there is no eligible Faculty Vice-Chair or previous chair, Faculty Chair may appoint an eligible faculty member to serve as chair of the Primary Unit.

The Primary Unit is charged to evaluate the record as contained in the dossier and make a recommendation to the Dean. The vote of the Primary Unit and any accompanying summary, including the PUEC report and the report of the primary unit chair, becomes part of the dossier.

## Teaching Professor Rank Reappointment

The Faculty Governance Committee appoints a PUEC (three faculty members from the primary unit at greater rank including, where possible, at least one Teaching Professor rank faculty member). The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee.

- Candidates submit an updated CV and statements of librarianship, service, and scholarly and creative work, summarizing activities.
- PUEC arranges for multiple measures as needed.
- PUEC reviews dossier, prepares report and presents its recommendation to the Primary Unit at a meeting of the Primary Unit.
- The Primary Unit reviews the dossier and votes on the case by ballot.
- The Primary Unit is charged to evaluate the record as contained in the dossier and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Primary Unit writes a letter summarizing the

discussion of the meeting, including the vote, makes a recommendation to the Dean, and adds that to the dossier.

## Expedited Reviews for Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors

After the first four-year appointment, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors will undergo a formal, but expedited review. The Dean will review the Associate Teaching Professor's or Teaching Professor's file. If the Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor has been meeting or exceeding expectations, as indicated by appropriate measures of librarianship for example, then a new four-year contract may be issued. If the Dean sees the need for a full review, that review will be conducted.

## Full Reviews (Reappointment) for Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor

After the first eight years as an Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor, the faculty member will undergo a full formal review by the Libraries. If the Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor continues to be employed by the university, reviews will alternate between expedited reviews and full reviews, with this timeline for and rigor of the full review being in rough parallel to post-tenure review for tenured faculty.

- The Faculty Governance Committee appoints a PUEC (four faculty members from the primary unit including, where possible, at least one Teaching Professor rank faculty member). The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee.
- Candidates submit an updated CV.
- Candidates may submit optional statements of librarianship, service, and scholarly and creative work, summarizing activities for the past appointment.
- PUEC reviews annual evaluations of librarianship, scholarly and creative work, and service for the past appointment.
- PUEC writes a brief summary report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations and forwards the report to the Primary Unit, the Dean, the faculty member, and the appropriate department director.

## Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Libraries faculty with the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor are eligible for promotion to a non-tenure track appointment carrying the rank of Associate Teaching Professor after a period of six years of continuous appointment at greater than 50% time. Up to three years credit toward promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial appointment. Promotion after six years is not mandatory, nor is it a right.

- The Faculty Governance Committee appoints a PUEC (three faculty members from the primary unit including if possible, at least one Teaching Professor rank faculty member). The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee.

- Candidates submit an updated CV, and statements of librarianship, service, and scholarly and creative work, summarizing activities.
- PUEC arranges for multiple measures as needed.
- PUEC reviews the dossier, prepares a report for the Primary Unit. The PUEC presents the case at a special faculty meeting.
- The Primary Unit reviews the dossier and votes on the case by ballot.
- Primary Unit writes a letter summarizing the discussion of the meeting, including the vote, and makes a recommendation to the Dean. The letter becomes part of the dossier.
- The Dean considers the nomination and, if they approve it, they make the appointment.

## Promotion to Teaching Professor

See Eligibility, Expectations, and Review Process for, and Privileges Pertaining to, Promotion to the Third Instructor Rank[28]

After a minimum of three years at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, individuals who have been exemplary librarians and members of the university community may be considered for the title of "Teaching Professor." There is no expectation that the granting of this title will occur at a particular point in the individual's career after three years in rank as Associate Teaching Professor, nor is there an expectation that each Associate Teaching Professor should seek this title. Although Associate Teaching Professors may, as a matter of convenience, seek promotion to Teaching Professor at the point of regular reappointment and contract renewal, an individual may seek promotion at any time after three years in rank. If someone is nominated for the title of "Teaching Professor" and then is not approved, that decision has no implications for the individual's status as an Associate Teaching Professor; that individual could be nominated for promotion to Teaching Professor again.

When an Associate Teaching Professor wishes to apply for promotion to Teaching Professor, or when the unit wishes to nominate that person:

### Primary Unit Level Review

- The Faculty Governance Committee appoints a PUEC (three faculty members from the primary unit including, if possible, at least one Teaching Professor faculty member). The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee.
- Candidates submit an updated CV, statements of librarianship, service, and scholarly and creative work, summarizing activities.
- PUEC arranges for multiple measures of exemplary performance in librarianship as needed.
- PUEC reviews the dossier, prepares a report for the Primary Unit. PUEC presents the case at a meeting of the Primary Unit.
- The Primary Unit reviews the dossier and votes on the case by ballot.
- Primary Unit writes a letter summarizing the discussion of the meeting, including the vote, makes a recommendation to the Dean, and adds that to the dossier.

[28] https://www.colorado.edu/bfa/sites/default/files/attached-files/4.15.2016_appvd_teaching_prof_process.pdf

- If the vote is positive, the case will be forwarded to the Dean.
- The Dean considers the nomination and, if they approve it, they write a letter of support and send the case to the Provost.

#### Campus-Level Review

- The Provost convenes a committee composed of three vice provosts and four faculty members, selected by the Provost with the approval of BFA; initially, the four faculty members will all be tenured faculty members, but as teaching professor track faculty receive the title of "Teaching Professor" they will provide at least two of the four faculty members.
- The Provost, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, will grant the title.
- Only positive recommendations move from to subsequent levels of review.

# Part 5: Evaluation of the Dean

## Criteria for Evaluation of Libraries Dean

As part of the evaluation process for the Libraries Dean, we will focus on several key areas:

- **Leadership:** Achieves results by identifying opportunities, challenging assumptions, taking strategic risks, leading in times of crisis, and advancing innovations in a decisive and strategic manner that is attuned to the priorities of the Libraries and University. Promotes high standards in the work of staff and faculty. Communicates priorities, policies, and administrative procedures effectively. Articulates a shared vision for the future. Communicates ideas in a clear and timely fashion to faculty, staff, and other University administrators. Fosters professional development of faculty and staff, including the mentorship of future leaders. Positions the University Libraries as a national and statewide leader in the field. Contributes to the leadership of the University and effectively advocates for all relevant constituencies.
- **Administration and Management:** Oversees and supports the recruitment, career development, and retention of highly qualified administrators, faculty, and staff. Seeks input and accepts responsibility for decisions. Works effectively with other administrative officers. Makes decisions in a timely fashion. Manages a fiscally responsible and viable Libraries. Develops a disciplined and equitable approach to finances within the Libraries. Pursues opportunities for non-University resources and funding.
- **Diversity and Inclusion:** Leads the library in developing a culture of inclusivity for students, faculty, staff, stakeholders, and all library users. Demonstrates and encourages respect for all persons in the Libraries and the University especially in respect to cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. Creates a hiring and retention environment that invites and supports a diverse and inclusive community to thrive.
- **Organizational Culture:** Fosters a compassionate culture that authentically enacts our values in all aspects of our work. Treats everyone with fairness and respect. Establishes the mutual support and trust necessary for faculty and staff to express diverse ideas. Encourages initiative, experimentation, assessment, openness to new ideas, and continuous learning. Builds trust by making decisions transparently, communicating

openly, operating in an ethical manner, being accessible and responsive, and acknowledging lessons learned. Fosters collaboration by effectively managing conflicts, forging partnerships, and advancing shared purposes in a manner that includes diverse perspectives in collaborative decision making.

## Section 4: Maintaining the Faculty Handbook

The Handbook is publicly accessible. Revisions to the Handbook are reflected in Faculty Minutes and in the official copy of the handbook. Approved revisions should be added and marked with month and year of latest revision. The party that proposed the change is responsible for delivering the modified text to the Assistant to the Associate Dean, and for verifying that the resulting document reflects what was approved by the Faculty.