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1. **Committees: Responsibilities and Service**

In addition to I of APS 1405.11, the college has additional criteria and one exception.

Because the University Libraries is both a single department and college, there is no College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee, as described in I.B.5 of APS 1405.11. In addition, the Dean serves as both Dean and Chair in the Libraries’ administration.

The Unit Peer Review Committee (I.B.1) consists of seven members, including at least four tenured members. The Dean and Associate or Assistant Deans will not serve on or be reviewed by the committee. Department Heads (i.e., non-administrative faculty members) who supervise faculty members will be eligible to serve on the committee but must recuse themselves when faculty members whom they supervise are reviewed. All Department Heads will be reviewed by the committee. The Unit Peer Review Committee will be elected in accordance with III.C.2.i of APS 1405.11.

The Unit Tenured Faculty (I.B.2) will exclude the Dean and Associate or Assistant Deans. The Unit Tenured Faculty will make recommendations on both promotions in rank and candidacies for tenure of all faculty members, including administrators, as well as recommendations on both rank at or above Associate Professor and tenure of all faculty members, including administrators, at initial appointment.

The Unit Promoted Faculty (I.B.3) will exclude the Dean and Associate or Assistant Deans. The Unit Promoted Faculty will make recommendations on promotions in rank of all non-tenure-track faculty, including any non-tenure-track administrators, as well as recommendations on rank at or above Associate Professor of all non-tenure-track faculty, including any non-tenure-track administrators, at initial appointment.

The Unit Personnel Committee (I.B.4) consists of five members, including a minimum of three tenured members at or above full rank. The Dean and Associate or Assistant Deans, as well as Department Heads who supervise faculty members, will not serve on the committee. The committee will review all candidacies in University Libraries for promotion and tenure, including the candidacies of administrators and Department Heads who supervise faculty members, as well as all recommendations in University Libraries on rank at or above Associate Professor and tenure, including the candidacies of administrators and Department Heads who will supervise faculty members, at initial appointment. The committee also conducts the third-year reviews of the tenure-track faculty (see III.D). The Unit Personnel Committee will be elected in accordance with IV.B.11.a of APS 1405.11.

1. **Initial Appointment**

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Below the Rank of Assistant Professor

In addition to II.A. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional criteria.

Appointment to library faculty positions generally requires a master's degree accredited by the American Library Association. A master’s or doctoral degree in another discipline may be accepted in lieu of—or required in addition to—this degree. In these cases the Dean will determine the minimum credential(s) after consulting with the library faculty. The advertisement must state the minimum credential(s) required at appointment, as well as any credential that is preferred at appointment but must be earned within a stated period after appointment.

B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor

In addition II.B. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional criteria and/or processes.

After the successful interview of a finalist for a position that allows higher rank as stated in the advertisement, either 1) the search committee or Dean may recommend appointment of the finalist at a higher rank or 2) the finalist may request to be considered for a higher rank. The Unit Personnel Committee and either Unit Tenured Faculty or Unit Promoted Faculty, as applicable, shall have access to the application packet. Members of the committees may not vote for appointment to a rank above their own. The letters from the chairs of the committees should represent the views expressed by all members of the committee in the assessment of the candidate. Positive recommendations are then submitted in sequence to the Dean, Provost, and Chancellor.

Specific criteria pertaining to the rank of Associate Professor (Associate Librarian) consist of the following:

* All the criteria required for Assistant Librarian
* Clear evidence of a high standard of achievement in professional performance, scholarship, and service
* Effective application of specialized knowledge and skills
* Demonstrated ability to work productively with others

This rank requires evidence of growth in the professional assignment across the three areas of professional performance, scholarship, and service. Examples of relevant scholarship and service are listed in II.C.ii–iii. Candidates should have a record of peer-reviewed scholarship and service within and beyond the library and university. Scholarship and service outside librarianship will be valued but given less weight in the deliberations than scholarship and service within librarianship. In cases of initial appointment of librarians with experience primarily or exclusively in non-faculty lines or at non-academic institutions, a satisfactory record of pertinent professional service beyond their employer will meet the criteria for service.

Specific criteria pertaining to the rank of Professor (Librarian) consist of the following:

* All the criteria required for Associate Librarian
* Sustained, long-term professional performance in the upper range of fully meets expectations to greatly exceeds expectations
* Continued growth through assignments of increasing responsibility and the application of greater knowledge and skills
* Substantial record of peer-reviewed scholarship
* Substantial record of service, including activities at the national or international level

This rank requires evidence of uniform excellence in the professional assignment across the three areas of performance, scholarship, and service. Examples of relevant scholarship and service are listed in II.C.ii–iii. Candidates should have a record of scholarship and service that indicates a nationally (or internationally) recognized stature. Scholarship and service outside librarianship will be valued but given less weight in the deliberations than scholarship and service within librarianship.

Specific criteria pertaining to the rank of Distinguished Professor consist of the following:

* All the criteria required for Librarian
* Sustained, long-term professional performance at or near greatly exceeds expectations in annual evaluations (internal candidates) or comparable evidence of such performance for external candidates
* Exceptional record of peer-reviewed scholarship and substantial record of service at the national or international level

The faculty of the University Libraries will follow the general guidelines of APS 1405.13 in assessing candidates for nomination to Distinguished Professor. To advance a successful case for exceptional scholarship, candidates must present compelling evidence that their body of work is rigorous and has made a significant impact within the field. Quantity of work will be required but alone is insufficient; quality must be demonstrated. Candidates are advised to show that their work has appeared in the best journals in the discipline, or, in the case of books, by the top publishers, and has been favorably received. External reviews will be crucial evidence, particularly in their critique of the scholarship of candidates for Distinguished Professor.

C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure

In addition to II.C. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional criteria and processes.

After the successful interview of a finalist for a position that allows tenure as stated in the advertisement, either 1) the search committee or Dean may recommend appointment with tenure or 2) the finalist may request to be considered for appointment with tenure. The Unit Personnel Committee and Unit Tenured Faculty shall have access to the application packet. Members of the committees may not vote for appointment with tenure to a rank above their own. The letters from the chairs of the committees should represent the views expressed by all members of the committee in the assessment of the candidate. Positive recommendations are then submitted in sequence to the Dean, Provost, and Chancellor.

In tenure decisions, the candidate is evaluated in each of the following areas: performance, scholarship, and service. Performance is the largest component and is given the greatest weight in deliberations on nominations for tenure. Scholarship and service outside librarianship will be valued but given less weight in the deliberations than scholarship and service within librarianship. To strengthen their case for meeting the requirements for tenure, candidates should demonstrate impact or outcomes whenever possible. The Unit Personnel Committee and Unit Tenured Faculty should not recommend tenure unless they consider accomplishments in all three categories to meet the standards for tenure. As noted in V.A of APS 1405.11, expectations for professional performance and scholarship are higher than for service.

* + 1. Performance

To be recommended for tenure, a faculty member is expected to have a consistent record—in professional performance—of annual evaluations in the range of fully meets expectations to greatly exceeds expectations. Promise of continued professional growth should be shown. Responsibilities for the position are fulfilled with command of the knowledge and skills required. Sustained commitment and high motivation are evident in the quality and quantity of duties performed. Candidates must clearly indicate their individual contributions in team-based activities and, when they supervise, their specific responsibility for the success of the work of their units/departments/divisions.

* + 1. Scholarship

To be recommended for tenure, a faculty member is expected to have published or created a strong body of work and a consistent record—in scholarship—of annual evaluations in the range of fully meets expectations to greatly exceeds expectations. Evaluations of scholarly contributions will consider quality, impact, and quantity of work. Assessments of quality and impact will include available factors such as those listed in III.F.2 of APS 1405.11, as well as the nature of the peer review and the rigor of the methodology and argument. The normal expectation of quantity is two peer-reviewed journal articles; however, a scholarly book or a combination of book chapters, published work in proceedings, and exceptional presentations may suffice. Candidates for tenure are responsible for making a convincing case in their dossiers that their work is substantial in both quality and quantity and, in the words of APS 1405.11, “indicates progress toward a national or international reputation” (IV.A.1).

Scholarship is characterized by one or more of the following traits:

* Makes a substantial and original contribution to practical or theoretical knowledge
* Demonstrates competence in formulating questions, assessing and evaluating appropriate sources, and articulating findings in accordance with standards of qualitative and quantitative scholarship
* Demonstrates effort to develop and apply one’s artistic or creative abilities
* Shares expertise through scholarly communication so that others may benefit

Scholarship may be in traditional or digital format. Candidates must clearly indicate their individual contributions in multi-authored works. (Note: Although librarians integrate performance and scholarship on a regular basis, each product must be assigned a category for tenure, promotion, and in annual evaluations. Products that are specific, assigned responsibilities of the librarian or a unit should be counted as performance.)

* + 1. Service

To be recommended for tenure, a candidate is expected to have a record of active service that extends beyond the library and University. An activity of a greater extent (e.g., national versus local) that is otherwise equivalent to one of lesser extent will be given more weight. (Note: Activities that are a duty of the librarian’s specific position should be counted as performance. Other activities, either by appointment, election, or volunteering, should be counted as service.)

Activities should be professionally related and benefit the library, University, or profession. Contributions should be active and meaningful. Activities and venues include but are not limited to the following:

* Library committees
* Committees or other bodies of the University
* Active membership (e.g., service as an officer or on a committee) in one or more professional organizations related to the candidate’s position
* Organization of conferences or other events
* Editorships and service on editorial boards and juries
* Service as an external reviewer
* Professionally relevant participation in the community
* Consulting
* Reviewing grant proposals

1. Initial and Successive Appointments of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

In addition to II.D. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional procedures and criteria.

The Dean decides when to hire a non-tenure-track faculty member, with the approval of the Provost. The specific approach to recruitment and hiring is at the discretion of the Dean; however, all faculty in the hiring department, in addition to any supervisor and/or administrator in the supervisory line of the candidate(s), shall have the opportunity to meet the candidate(s) and provide an assessment to the Dean. If the Dean chooses to use a search committee in hiring a non-tenure-track faculty member, procedures as outlined in § II should be followed in principle.

Non-tenure-track faculty are generally on appointments not to exceed one academic year. In some instances, multi-year appointments may be extended to instructors or non-tenure track faculty in professor ranks. Such appointments are generally intended for faculty hired in competitive searches or who have established a notable and consistently strong record of effective performance during their period of service to the University.

Multi-year appointments, to the extent they are utilized, must have satisfied a merit-based review process employing evaluative criteria and procedures established in this personnel document as supplemented in departmental personnel documents. These appointments require the review and recommendation of the Unit Personnel Committee and the approval of the Dean and the Provost. The first such merit-based appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with the evaluation procedure set out herein, an initial merit-based term appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for faculty in professor ranks for periods of up to five years.

Any merit-based term appointment of more than one year shall only be recommended when the candidate has consistently demonstrated (or, for initial appointment, shown clear potential for) highly effective professional performance and/or, as appropriate to the appointment, a record of highly effective research or service/administration, as well as the ability and willingness to work productively with colleagues.

See APS 1405.111 for detailed procedures.

1. Required Notification

In addition to II.E. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional notifications.

In the first month of appointment the faculty member shall write a statement of assigned duties and responsibilities, with goals, for the current year. The supervisor approves and signs this statement, which will be the basis of the first annual review.

**III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review**

A. Successive Appointments for Tenured and Tenured-Track Faculty

The college adopts III.A. of APS 1405.11.

B. Annual Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

In addition to III.B. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

The period covered by the review is the calendar year. For new faculty members the period covered will be the initial date of employment through December 31. The following definitions will apply:

* Annual review is the process
* Faculty Review Checklist is the University’s form
* Evaluation form is the form used by library supervisors
* Annual review documents consist of these two forms, a current statement of duties and responsibilities, any additional forms or documentation (either print or digital) as directed by University, and any applicable accompanying materials

Tenured and tenure-track faculty

For each annual review, the supervisor of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member shall complete an evaluation form and assign separate numeric values for the faculty member’s professional performance, scholarship, and service, with a composite score determined according to the relative weights of the three areas, as agreed upon by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Professional performance will be the most heavily weighted area of the three. The numeric scale for each area will be clearly noted and standard across all evaluations. The evaluation form will make clear the lowest composite numeric value (1) that indicates satisfactory performance. A composite score below 1 will represent overall unsatisfactory performance in the supervisor’s annual review of the faculty member (see also III.C and III.E).

Non-tenure-track faculty

For each annual review, the supervisor of each non-tenure-track faculty member shall complete an evaluation form and assign one numeric value for the faculty member’s professional performance. The professional performance of a non-tenure-track faculty member will include service to the Libraries and University. Service beyond the campus and scholarship shall not be expected of non-tenure-track faculty members, although those considering promotion in rank—or more broadly, advancement in their careers— are encouraged to review IV.A.1–2 of APS 1405.11 and discuss with their supervisor the Libraries’ support for these activities and how best to integrate their interests in scholarship and service with their professional performance. The evaluation form will make clear the lowest numeric value (1) that indicates satisfactory performance. A score below 1 will represent overall unsatisfactory performance in the supervisor’s annual review of the faculty member.

All faculty

If the supervisor is a department head, and not an administrator, the evaluation form shall also be signed by the Associate or Assistant Dean in the faculty member’s reporting line.

The Dean will receive a copy of every overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation by the supervisor and make a final determination of the case after reviewing both the evaluations of the supervisor and the Unit Peer Review Committee (see also III.C and III.E). To keep the evaluations of the supervisor and the Unit Peer Review Committee separate, supervisors will not have access to the evaluations of the Unit Peer Review Committee until after the supervisors have completed and submitted their evaluations.

C. Peer Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

In addition to III.C. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

University Libraries uses the Unit Peer Review Committee (see § I above and I.B.1 of APS 1405.11) for conducting annual peer reviews. Membership and scope are described in § I.

The Unit Peer Review Committee shall evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty in the areas of professional performance, scholarship, and service in a process parallel to, but distinct from, the evaluation by the faculty member’s supervisor. The committee shall use a standard form with a score for each area. Each area shall be assigned a numeric value and a composite numeric value assigned according to the relative weights of the three areas. The Dean will be notified when any tenured or tenure-track faculty member receives a composite score below 1, an overall unsatisfactory peer review (see also III.B and III.E).

The Unit Peer Review Committee must evaluate non-tenure-track faculty in professional performance and intramural service in a process parallel to, but distinct from, the evaluation by the faculty member’s supervisor. The committee may offer optional comments on scholarship and extramural service. The committee shall use a standard form and assign one numeric value, in professional performance. The Dean will be notified when any non-tenure-track faculty member receives a score below 1, an overall unsatisfactory peer review (see also III.B and III.E).

1. Third-Year Review for Tenure Track Faculty

In addition to III.D. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

The Dean shall convene a meeting of the Unit Tenured Faculty for a frank, thorough discussion of the candidate’s progress. The Unit Tenured Faculty shall have access to the candidate’s dossier prior to the meeting. The chair of the Unit Personnel Committee will chair the meeting and poll by secret ballot the members of the Unit Tenured Faculty to determine if they believe that the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

After this meeting, the members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall vote on which of the three options outlined in APS 1405.11 they recommend. The chair will submit to the Dean and candidate the written report evaluating the faculty member’s overall progress toward tenure, including the numeric votes of the committee and Unit Tenured Faculty.

The third-year review supplements but does not replace the regular annual review of each faculty member as outlined in III.B. The candidate shall also submit all materials for the annual review.

1. Post-Tenure Review

In addition to III.E. of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

The Dean shall determine, in consultation with any administrator in the supervisory line, if a tenured faculty member has an overall unsatisfactory performance if the faculty member receives a rating of unsatisfactory (composite score below 1) on either or both the 1) supervisor’s evaluation and 2) report of the Unit Peer Review Committee.

The remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member’s supervisor, with the assent of the Dean, any administrator in the supervisory line, and the Unit Peer Review Committee.

1. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

The college adopts III.F. of APS 1405.11 with specific additions noted in the sections below.

1. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching or Professional Performance

In addition to III.F.1 of APS 1405.11, the college has additional process and evidence.

Librarians who serve as an instructor of record for a credit-bearing course must supply documentation for Evidence of Achievement in Teaching as specified in III.F.1 of APS 1405.11. All librarians must supply documentation for professional performance as specified in III.F.1 of APS 1405.11. Although all faculty members shall document their annual performance, they should strive for continual improvement and build long-term records of excellence that prepare them for promotion, when applicable.

Supervisors and the Unit Peer Review Committee will also consider evidence as detailed in II.C.i of this Personnel Document.

1. Evidence of Achievement in Scholarship

In addition to III.F.2 of APS 1405.11, the college has additional evidence.

Supervisors and the Unit Peer Review Committee will also consider evidence as detailed in II.C.ii of this Personnel Document.

1. Evidence of Academically-Related Service.

In addition to III.F.3 of APS 1405.11, the college has additional evidence.

Supervisors and the Unit Peer Review Committee will also consider evidence as detailed in II.C.iii of this Personnel Document.

**IV. Promotion for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above**

A. Criteria for Promotion

In addition to IV.A of APS 1405.11, the college has additional criteria.

The evaluation criteria, cited in II.B. in this Personnel Document (except for University Professor), are used to conduct reviews of candidates for promotion. External reviews will be a crucial element of each candidate’s dossier.

Candidates for University Professor must meet the following criteria:

* Service at the rank of Professor at the University of Arkansas, generally for a period of at least ten years
* Sustained, long-term professional performance at or near the mark of greatly exceeds expectations in annual evaluations
* Substantial record of peer-reviewed scholarship and exceptional record of service at national or international level or exceptional record of peer-reviewed scholarship and substantial record of service at the national or international level

The Dean and Associate or Assistant Deans are ineligible for promotion to University Professor. Department Heads in University Libraries are eligible for promotion to University Professor. This rank cannot be awarded at initial appointment.

B. Procedures for Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

In addition to IV.B of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

The Unit Personnel Committee and Unit Tenured Faculty shall conduct business separately, although the Unit Tenured Faculty shall have access to the official documentation that the Unit Personnel Committee sent to the Dean. For both committees, a positive recommendation will require a majority vote (i.e., more than half the votes cast). All business of each committee must be kept confidential. Each committee chair shall send an official voting form with the tally of the votes and a separate official letter to the Dean. The letters from the chairs of the committees should represent the views expressed by all members of the committee in the assessment of the candidate.

In deciding whether to make a positive or negative recommendation in a specific case, the Dean will normally discuss the candidacy with any relevant Department Head and/or Associate or Assistant Dean in the candidate’s supervisory line.

Additional Processes for External Letters of Evaluation

The administration will contact the external reviewers in the order of priority listed in the final list from the Unit Personnel Committee.

Outside of official communication through the Libraries’ administration, the external reviewers and faculty members of University Libraries should not discuss the candidate with the other evaluating party during the process.

The candidate shall provide the following materials to the administration to be forwarded to the external reviewers:

* Criteria for promotion (and tenure when applicable)
* Candidate’s curriculum vitae
* Candidate’s cumulative Faculty Review Checklist

A candidate who has reviewed redacted versions of the letters from the external reviewers shall be allowed to respond to any substantive issues raised in the reviews and shall address any response in writing to the Unit Personnel Committee and either Unit Tenured Faculty or Unit Promoted Faculty.

**V. Tenure**

1. Criteria for Awarding Tenure

In addition to V.A of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

The evaluation criteria, established in II.C of this Personnel Document, are used to conduct reviews of candidates for tenure. External reviews will be a crucial element of each candidate’s dossier.

B. Procedures for Awarding Tenure

In addition to V.B of APS 1405.11, the college has additional processes.

The college follows the additional processes described in IV.B in this Personnel Document.

C. Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period

The college adopts V.C of APS 1405.11.

D. Mandatory Sixth Year Review—Terminal Appointment

The college adopts procedure specified under V.D of APS 1405.11.

**VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

The college adopts procedure specified under VI of APS 1405.11.

**VII. Dismissal of Multi-Year Appointed Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

The college adopts procedure specified under VII of APS 1405.11.