Libraries Faculty Handbook

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. The Associate Deans will review the evaluation scores in librarianship of the faculty in order to ensure consistency and fairness between departments and divisions. The supervisors will provide the recommended scores to the Associate Deans by the deadline in the evaluation memo. After the Associate Deans have approved the librarianship scores, they will be provided to the supervisors for discussion with individual faculty.

Appeals of Scores
Faculty may appeal their scores to the FPC, who will review the requests and either change the score or ask the faculty member to send their appeal to the Appeals Committee for further consideration.

Calculation of Scores
Annual Evaluation Scores are determined by faculty’s workload distribution. For example, a faculty member with a 40% librarianship /40% research /20% service distribution (the standard), with scores of 4/4/2 would receive a score of 3.6. Annual Career Merit Scores are completed by a combination of the career documentation score, professional experience and annual evaluations (see the Evaluation for Career Merit for details). These two scores are used in determining the distribution of the salary pool.

Distribution of Libraries Salary Pool
The Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) proposes to the Dean and Executive Committee specific distribution of that part of the salary pool that may be reserved to equity adjustments either at the direction of the Provost, or as a result of its own equity process.

The remainder of the salary pool, is divided into three separate “pots” as follows: Forty percent (40%) is divided among faculty according to their annual performance score for librarianship; forty percent (40%) is divided among faculty according to their annual performance score for research and scholarly work; twenty percent (20%) is divided among faculty according to their
annual performance score for service.

The FPC recommends to the Dean the level of salary increases to be used in a given year, considering:
- The aggregate merit scores 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 informs the Provost of his recommendations for salary increase. The Dean informs the faculty of merit distribution.
Part 2: Evaluation

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 Far Exceeds Expectations | **Librarianship:** This ranking recognizes distinguished or exceptional demonstrations of leadership and/or individual initiative in the area of librarianship.  
**Scholarly Activity and Creative Work:** May include, but is not limited to: at least 2 peer reviewed papers; publication of a scholarly monograph. Grants funded will also be considered in this category when accompanied by additional scholarly activity and creative work that together far exceed expectations.  
**Service:** May include, but is not limited to: evidence of exceptional activity on committee(s) or in professional organization(s) at the international, national, regional, University, Campus, or Libraries level. Holds office at the national level. |
| 4 Exceeds Normal Expectations | **Librarianship:** Excellence in meeting the primary assignment and demonstration of initiative and leadership in librarianship.  
**Scholarly Activity and Creative Work:** May include, but is not limited to, additional activities as follows: a peer reviewed paper; national presentations; grants funded; or published annotated bibliographies.  
**Service:** May include, but is not limited to additional activities as follows: evidence of significant responsibility on or contribution to several committees at the international, national, regional, University, Campus, or Libraries level; unpaid professional consulting activities; editorial activities; grant proposal review board. |
| 3 Meets Normal Expectations | **Librarianship:** Very good performance within the primary assignment.  
**Scholarly Activity and Creative Work:** Meets the guidelines for [2] and at least one more activity from, but not limited to, the following: papers (non-refereed); scholarly presentations at the local level; grant proposals submitted; significant book reviews; papers in press (with citation) or published bibliographies.  
**Service:** Meets the guidelines for [2], and at least one or more activity from, but not limited to, the following: Attendance/participation at professional meetings; evidence of committee activity in a professional society, the University, the Campus or the Libraries. |
| 2 Below Normal Expectations, but Satisfactory | **Librarianship:** Satisfactory performance in some areas but needs improvement in others.  
**Scholarly Activity and Creative Work:** May include, but not limited to, one or two of the following: book reviews; local presentations; or research in progress.  
**Service:** May include: community service; minimal local service; memberships in professional organizations. |
| 1 Unsatisfactory | **Librarianship:** Generally performs in an unsatisfactory manner; has not met goals.  
**Scholarly Activity and Creative Work:** No evidence of activity.  
**Service:** No evidence of activity. |

Factors for Evaluating Librarianship
The performance of librarianship is evaluated by the first level supervisor. The supervisor can consider the items listed below when writing their evaluation:

1. **Professional Competency**  
2. **Currency in the Field**  
3. **Collegiality**  
4. **Interpersonal Relations**  
5. **Supervision and/or Leadership**  
6. **Support of University, Campus, and Libraries mission and goals**

**Factors for Scholarly Activity and Creative Work**  
It is the responsibility of each faculty member to detail all Scholarly Activity and Creative Work on the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) and curriculum vitae.

The Faculty Personnel Committee is guided by the following general considerations as it assesses a record of scholarly activity and creative work for annual compensation purposes or career merit. The considerations are applied to all works, regardless of format. Note that the list is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. Other factors may be considered as appropriate.

- **Factors to be considered for all 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., international, national, state, local)  
  - nature of the review process (e.g., peer review, editorial review, adoption/endorsement by an organization)

- **Factors to be considered for particular 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.  
  - Research in Progress. Research in Progress must eventually lead to a public presentation, publication, performance, exhibit, etc. If the same research has been cited as “in progress” for multiple years it may, at the discretion of the FPC, be excluded in calculating the research score.  
  - 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. Credit is given to individuals who contribute significantly to the writing of grants. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide grant specifics, including grant size, funding source, significance, and other relevant details. The faculty member should indicate the extent of their involvement in grant activities, and explain how the nature of the grant applies to their Scholarly Activity and Creative Work and/or Service. Operational work performed on a grant is evaluated as librarianship by the first-level supervisor.

**Factors for Evaluating Service**  
It is the responsibility of each faculty member to detail all Service and Outreach activity on the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) and curriculum vitae.
The Faculty Personnel 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. All tenured faculty are expected to participate in the mentoring program in order to receive a score of 3 or above in their annual service evaluation. Other factors may be considered as appropriate.

- impact of the activity (e.g., setting standards or best practices, organizational policy and governance, informational, etc.)
- scope of parent body (e.g., international, national, state, local, institutional)
- purpose of parent body (e.g., institutional, professional, disciplinary)
- role in service (e.g., appointed, elected, chair, ex officio)
- degree to which activity may be regarded as “part of one’s librarianship assignment”

Part 3: Evaluation of Career Merit

All campus academic units are mandated to have in place a faculty Salary Equity Evaluation System, in accordance with University policy. The factors must be quantifiable so that they can be interpreted numerically and have the capability of being weighted. Within the Libraries, these factors take into account Librarianship, Research/Creative Work, and Service.

Career Documentation

The following documents may be considered by the FPC when establishing the qualitative level for this factor of Career Merit: a current curriculum vitae, the Faculty Report for Professional Activities (FRPA), evaluators' letters, and review/reappointment dossiers when available, a one-page summary of highlights of career accomplishments in the area of librarianship, or letters from faculty outside the libraries supplied by the faculty member being reviewed. The quality of performance, not just the quantity, is used in the establishment of qualitative levels. These levels are:

5. Performance is above meritorious in all three areas of teaching/librarianship, research/creative work, and service.
4. Performance is above meritorious in two of the three areas of teaching/librarianship, research/creative work, and service.
3. Performance is above meritorious in one of the three areas of teaching/librarianship, research/creative work, and service.
2. Performance is meritorious.
1. Performance is non-meritorious.

This score is calculated every three years. New hires within those three years will receive a score of 1.

Annual Evaluations.

The average of evaluation scores from the last three (3) years is used.

Professional Experience.

The number of years in a professional position, using the ranges below.

5. 25+ years experience.
4. 15 years to 24 years, 11 months experience
3. 7 years to 14 years, 11 months experience
2. 3 years to 6 years, 11 months experience
1. 0 year to 2 years, 11 months experience
Weight
For equity purposes only, the FPC assigns these weights to each factor:

1. Career Documents 50%
2. Annual Evaluations 35%
3. Professional Experience 15%

The three factors are multiplied by their weight percentage, then added together for a Career Merit Score. This measure is for internal use by the FPC only, and only for the purpose of establishing equity.

Part 4: Workload Distribution
Standard Workloads
Standard workload is broken down by librarianship, research/creative works, 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.

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.

1. 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 FPC 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.

2. Leaves of Absence
When leave of 6 months or less occurs in a single calendar year, the faculty member's annual merit scores for each of the three evaluation areas for that year will be determined by the normal faculty evaluation process. When such leave occurs, neither supervisors nor the FPC are to take into account the length of the leave or the administrative impact of the leave in determining merit scores.

When exceeds 6 months in a single calendar year, the faculty member's annual merit scores for each of the three evaluation areas for that year will be determined by averaging the relevant merit scores earned by the individual during the previous 6 years, or in the case of an individual who has worked less than 6 years, all relevant
merit scores earned since the start of employment. In such instances, letters of evaluation from supervisors are neither required nor prohibited as part of the evaluation process. However, the faculty member must still submit all other required documentation associated with the annual evaluation process.
Section 2: Emeritus/a Status

Emeritus/a status “is awarded those faculty, in the ranks of full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Instructor, or Instructor, 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 Instructor or above
- Full time appointment, or part time phased retirement appointment for at least 5 years
- Performance at an overall level of at least “meets 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, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review


Part 1: Appointment and Reappointment
Instructor, Senior Instructor, Lecturer see https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/faculty/recruiting-and-hiring/ii.-non-tenure-track-faculty.

Senior Instructor, Tenure Track
With the approval of the Vice Chancellor, faculty with less than two years professional experience may be appointed at the rank of senior instructor with the explicit understanding that after two years of service they undergo a review that will result in either transfer to the tenure track at the rank of assistant professor, or to a terminal contract. The purpose of such an initial appointment is to enable relatively new librarians to obtain valuable practical experience in librarianship before their “tenure clock” starts. For eligible candidates, the choice between Senior Instructor and Assistant Professor rests with the candidate. Standard workload distribution at this rank is 70% librarianship, 10% research, and 20% service. Work conducted at this rank is included in the eventual tenure dossier.

Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor see https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/faculty/recruiting-and-hiring/recruiting-process-tenure-track-and-tenured-faculty.

Senior Instructor (tenure track), Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor see https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/faculty/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-of-tenure-rank-faculty

Part 2: Tenure Process
The 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 is informed of all recommendations, excluding external evaluators.
- Candidate submits documentation.
- 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 Committees 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”) discusses
case, votes, and prepares report. Members take into account the content of the dossier as well as their own knowledge and experience of the candidate.

- PUEC and Primary Unit reports must explicitly address negative points contained in dossier or raised in discussion. The Primary Unit report includes a vote tally.
- Dossier is forwarded to the Dean’s Review Committee, which reviews dossier, and prepares recommendation.
- Dean receives dossier, prepares recommendation, and forwards completed dossier to Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs (VCFA). Vice Chancellor refers dossier to the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC) for consideration.
- Vice Chancellor informs Dean of disposition of cases. Cases go through the Chancellor, then University President and finally the Board of Regents before becoming official.

Special Circumstances
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.

Appeals
Candidates are informed of recommendations made at each step of the review process, and may respond at any stage. Recommendations made by the PUEC, Tenure Committee, and Dean’s Review Committee are not formally appealable since they only constitute advice to the Dean. A candidate may make a request for reconsideration to the Dean after the Dean has made a decision.

The Dean may consult with the Review Committee, but does not request the PUEC or Tenure Committee to reconsider their recommendations. The result of reconsideration by the Dean or the Dean's Review Committee is forwarded to the Vice Chancellor.

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

Transfer to Tenure Stream
Review for transfer to the tenure stream is based on internal documentation only. Although primary emphasis of this review is on librarianship, a successful evaluation also requires acceptable progress in developing a research agenda, and planning for professional service.

Pre-Comprehensive-Review Coaching Process
The Tenure Committee offers an opportunity for faculty who are in their second year as an assistant professor to obtain formal advice. This structured process is optional.

- The Chair of the Committee notifies those who are in their second year at the rank of assistant professor that they are eligible for the Pre-Comprehensive Review Coaching process.
- The faculty member submits a curriculum vitae, position description, and professional plan.
- Two or three Tenure Committee members meet with the faculty member to review the documentation and discuss progress toward tenure.
- The panels summarize their discussions for the entire Tenure Committee to discuss and reach consensus about what advice should be given to the faculty member.
- The Chair of the Tenure Committee or designee drafts a written report with advice and suggestions for the faculty member. The draft is reviewed by the Committee prior to
being finalized and sent to the faculty member.
● A copy of the written advice is added to the faculty member’s personnel file.

Comprehensive Review
The comprehensive, or reappointment, review, is conducted in the fourth year of at the rank of assistant professor. 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.

Comprehensive review is based primarily on internal documentation. It considers performance in librarianship, scholarly 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 sixth year after appointment as assistant professor. A successful tenure review leads to promotion to the rank of associate professor and granting of continuous tenure. A negative comprehensive review leads to a one-year terminal contract.

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.

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. Because this is not a mandatory review, a candidate for full professor may withdraw her/his candidacy at any time.

Review for promotion to full professor involves consideration of both internal and external documentation. University standards state that: Professors (also called “Full Professors”) should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and; (a) a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to graduate and/or undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (c) a record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/creative work, and service.

Part 3: Criteria for Evaluating Libraries Faculty for Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure

General criteria for evaluating Libraries faculty for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review are the (1) scholarly research and creative contributions (2), practice of librarianship, which is considered the equivalent of teaching in other campus departments, and (3) professional service. Meritorious performance assumes that the individual performs with...
initiative and efficiency to achieve results that are effective and significant. Excellent performance is at a level above meritorious performance in quality and impact.

Multiple Measures of Librarianship
Dossiers for all candidates for comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion to full professor must include at least three “multiple measures” by which the practice of teaching/librarianship is evaluated. At least one of these measures must be something other than the letters described below.

Multiple measures most commonly used within the Libraries
Letters solicited by the Tenure Committee

● 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.”

● First level evaluator letters
  ○ A letter is solicited from the candidate’s first level evaluator. This evaluation is the equivalent of what teaching faculty might regard as a multi-year teaching evaluation.

● Second level evaluator letters
  ○ A letter is solicited from the candidate’s second level evaluator. This evaluation is the equivalent of what teaching faculty might regard as a multi-year evaluation.

● Exceptions to soliciting first and second level evaluator letters
  ○ For those faculty whose first or second-level evaluator would be the Dean, letters from additional Libraries colleagues may be solicited.

● 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 library colleagues is solicited for comprehensive review dossiers, and no more than three are solicited for review for tenure or for promotion to full professor. Working from the names supplied, the Tenure Committee solicits such evaluations as it believes will be useful for the review.

Evaluation of classroom teaching or other instructional activities

● Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs)
  ○ Any FCQs received by Libraries faculty who teach regular classroom courses are included in review dossiers.

● Teaching Evaluation
  ○ All pre-tenured faculty who have regular classroom teaching assignment are evaluated by the Tenure Committee Teaching Evaluation subcommittee, a group of four drawn from the tenured faculty. The Subcommittee members rotate annually. At least one classroom visit should be conducted annually. These evaluations are added to a candidate’s dossier at the time of any tenure-related review.

● Student letters
  ○ Some candidates may serve as academic advisors, mentors, or classroom instructors. Candidates may suggest the names of students from whom to solicit
letters. Working from the names supplied, the Tenure Committee 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.

- **Group Interviews**
  The group (or “focused”) interview is derived from a practice utilized by other University departments as a multiple measure of teaching. A group interview encourages honest assessment, and provides safeguards against “outlying” opinion being accorded too much importance. The written anonymized transcript is included in the dossier.

Types of group interviews include

- **Focused interviews for Comprehensive or Tenure Review**
  - Candidates for review who do not have sufficient other multiple measures, or who believe that some aspect of their librarianship is not adequately covered in the dossier, should have a focused interview. These interviews usually focus on a candidate’s practice of librarianship.
  - The Chair invites the candidate to submit (optionally) a brief description of primary responsibilities and suggestions regarding areas or questions of particular importance. Candidates are asked to suggest names of those who are sufficiently acquainted with their work to give an informed assessment. The PUEC determines whether to conduct a focused interview.
  - Those interviewed are selected according to their ability to provide an informed assessment of the responsibility being addressed, without regard to rank or classification. Individuals who have already contributed an evaluative statement to the dossier, and members of the PUEC are not included. Although candidates are asked to suggest the names of those who should be interviewed, the PUEC may invite additional participants.
  - Anyone invited who is unable to participate in the group interview may submit to the PUEC a written, signed letter, addressing the questions covered in the colleague interview.

- **Group interviews for promotion to full professor**
  - All Libraries faculty are invited to participate in faculty interviews for candidacy for full professor. The candidate’s curriculum vitae and self statements are made available in advance.
  - Any Libraries faculty member who is unable to participate in a Colleague interview for full professor may submit to the PUEC a written, signed letter, addressing the questions covered in the colleague interview. This letter becomes part of the dossier.
  - Candidates are also asked if they wish to have a second group interview of classified staff conducted on behalf of their candidacy.

- **Selecting the interviewers**
  - At least two members of the PUEC schedule and conduct each interview. Members are selected to assure a breadth of perspective. Should the PUEC not include members with an appropriate breadth of perspective, a tenured faculty member not on the PUEC may be included. In the case of the Group Interview for full professor, as many members of the PUEC as possible attend the interview.

- **Preparing for the interview**
  - The PUEC determines in advance the areas to be covered in the interview, and agrees on questions to be asked.

- **Conducting the interview**
  - PUEC members introduce the concept and purpose of the focused interview, and
answer questions about the process before proceeding with the actual interview. The notes are combined into a detailed "near-transcript," which is added to the dossier.

Other - supplied by the candidate
Examples of such items may include:
- Unsolicited letters and e-mails from students, colleagues, patrons, etc. "Unsolicited" in this sense means not solicited by the Tenure Committee or the PUEC. Such 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.
- 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.
- Other evidence of achievement (e.g. Programs, tributes, awards, statistical measures, etc.)

**Scholarly Research and Creative Activities**
Individually authored and co-authored works are equally valuable in the field. Sometimes standards and other works by committee are, in effect, peer reviewed. Generally, a meritorious record of scholarly activity will include 3-5 substantive articles in refereed journals or venues of equivalent impact, in addition to presentations and other research material. Activities encompassed by the term "Scholarly Research and Creative Activity" may include
- Single or co-authored books and monographs,
- Edited or co-edited books of a scholarly nature,
- Articles in refereed journals, refereed chapters in books, refereed electronic publications
  - Standards, papers in proceedings, refereed presentations, essays in encyclopedias, other scholarly papers and electronic publications, technical reports, unrefereed chapters in books, unrefereed electronic books,
  - Abstracts, book reviews and reviews of creative activities.
  - Receiving grant or contract funds for research, research awards, fellowships and scholarships
  - Presenting papers at international, national, regional, state or local conferences and meetings
  - Producing creative work related to the discipline or specialty.

**Practice of Librarianship**
Librarians specialize in diverse areas of the field. Consequently, the portfolios vary widely. Activities encompassed in the term "Practice of Librarianship" may include:
- Developing the Libraries' collections
- Providing intellectual and physical access to collections
- Library related instruction
- Outreach to library users at all levels
- Management and supervision of faculty and staff
- Management of material and financial resources

**Service**
Librarianship is, by its nature, a collaborative field. Thus, librarians tend to have broad service portfolios. Activities encompassed by the term "Service" may include:
- Participation in international, national, regional, state and local professional associations and consortia
- System, campus, and departmental service
● Planning, organizing or conducting professional seminars, workshops, conferences, or programs
● Editing journals or newsletters, reviewing manuscripts, etc.
● Reviewing grant proposals, fellowship applications, or other awards
● Volunteer consulting in a professional capacity as public outreach
Serving as a thesis or dissertation advisor, or as member of a thesis committee
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.