

**University of Tennessee, Chattanooga**  
**Lupton Library**  
**Bylaws**

Updated, September 2012

## Table of Contents

	Introduction	p. 3
Section 1	Faculty Ranks	p. 4
Section 2	Criteria and Procedures for Appointment	p. 5
Section 3	Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment	p. 7
Section 4	Criteria and Procedures for Tenure	p. 9
Section 5	Criteria and Procedures for Promotion in Rank	p. 11
Section 6	Evaluation and Development by Objectives and Expectations of Rank	p. 13
Section 7	Evaluative Criteria: Performance as a Librarian	p. 15
Section 8	Evaluative Criteria: Scholarship and Research	p. 16
Section 9	Evaluative Criteria: Service to the University and Community.	p. 21
Section 10	Support for Travel and Professional Development	p. 22
Section 11	Sabbatical – TL working on draft	p. 23
Section 12	Research Leave Program	p. 27
Section 13	Library Orientation Program	p. 30
Section 14	Library Mentoring Program	p. 31
Section 15	Faculty Honors Day	p. 33
Section 16	Exceptional Merit Guidelines	p. 34
Appendix 1	Rank, Tenure, Reappointment Committee and Procedures	p. 45
Appendix 2	Research Category Form	p. 52
Appendix 3	Standards Dossier	p. 53

*The original version of the Lupton Library Bylaws were created by Bylaws and Expectations Task Force and approved at Faculty Meeting in Spring 2005. Subsequent changes were discussed and approved by Library Faculty in February 2008, February 2009, December 2010, and September 2012.*

## Introduction

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) faculty librarians are active contributors to the educational mission and goals of the University, as well as active contributors to the larger scholarly community of academic librarianship and information science. The University provides for advancement based upon the librarian's academic credentials and experience, professional performance, contributions to the University community, contributions to the profession of librarianship, and service to the general community through his/her professional expertise. In order to ensure that recommendations and administrative decisions relative to the promotion of librarians are equitable, the following guidelines and procedures set forth in this document are observed.

The criteria for measuring and rewarding accomplishment within each rank of this system confirms the unique and distinct status of librarianship, which has its own values, concerns, and appropriate areas of activity within the University community. This document defines criteria governing employment of full-time, continuing librarians at UTC, including rank, appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and evaluation. While librarians at UTC hold faculty rank and participate fully in the faculty process, librarians are distinct and unique from teaching faculty. Faculty librarians normally have 12 month contracts and follow the guidelines established by the University for 40 hour per week, exempt academic employees in terms of time and attendance.

Librarians employed as full-time instructors or on a part-time basis do not follow the criteria outlined in this document as it pertains to rank, appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Part-time instructors and lectures do follow the criteria outlined in the Bylaws as it pertains to evaluation, orientation, mentoring, faculty honors, and exceptional merit. Part-time and lecturer positions are renewed annually based on the needs of the Library.

Please note that the much of information in this manual is drawn from the *UTC Faculty Handbook*. The *UTC Faculty Handbook* covers the topic in general, while these Bylaws were created to provide specific expectations and examples for faculty librarians.

Exceptions to the guidelines put forth in this manual will be made on a case-by-case situation by the Dean of the Lupton Library, in consultation with Library Faculty.

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

## **Section 1      Faculty Ranks**

### *Faculty Ranks*

UTC faculty librarians are defined as library personnel, appointed to a professional, tenure-track position, who hold a Masters in Library Science (MLS), or equivalent degree. All UTC faculty librarians are assigned a rank upon entrance into the UTC system. Ranks are assigned regardless of job title or department.

UTC librarians have the following ranks, in order of lowest to highest:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

## Section 2      Procedures and Appointment Criteria

### Initial Appointment

Initial appointments are made as outlined in Section 3.1 of the *UTC Faculty Handbook*. The Provost, upon recommendation of the Dean of Lupton Library determines a newly hired librarian's initial rank. A new UTC librarian may be assigned a number of years of service, if applicable. The recommendation is made following the established criteria for each rank and the individual's experience and achievements prior to appointment at UTC.

The following criteria are used in the appointment process:

### Assistant Professor

- An MLS from a program accredited by the American Library Association.
- Potential for effectiveness in job performance in librarianship.
- Potential for scholarship and professional growth in librarianship.
- Potential for university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.

Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor requires that the candidate meet the *minimum* criteria of a professional librarian. This rank is assigned to individuals who may have little or no professional experience in academic librarianship.

### Associate Professor

- An MLS from a program accredited by the American Library Association.
- Evidence of job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and contributions towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, completed or in progress, in which career direction is evident and which demonstrates growth and impact on librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to effect changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon documented evidence of job performance which demonstrates a mastery of position responsibilities, contributions in library-wide initiatives, contributions in the area of research and scholarship, university and community service, ability to relate to colleagues and students, ability to effect change, membership in professional organizations, and attendance at professional meetings.

### Professor

- An MLS from a program accredited by the American Library Association.
- Evidence of outstanding job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and leadership towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, which are of significance to librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of leadership in university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to lead change in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

Appointment to the rank of Professor is based upon documented evidence of *outstanding* job performance which demonstrates a mastery of position responsibilities, leadership in library-wide initiatives, significant contributions in the area of research and scholarship, university and community service, ability to relate to colleagues and students, ability to lead change, membership in professional organizations, and attendance at professional meetings.

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

### **Section 3      Procedures and Criteria for Reappointment**

#### Reappointment

Faculty members holding probationary, tenure-track appointments are considered annually for reappointment. The high quality of the services and collections of the Lupton Library depends on the high caliber of its librarians. One of the primary means the University employs to ensure this quality is the thoughtful use of reappointment for librarians. Probationary appointments can be terminated due to poor performance or financial exigency. Reappointment does not ensure any specific assignment within the UTC Library.

The reappointment process will follow the outline below:

1. Dean calls organizational meeting of tenured faculty and provides the Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (RTRC) with a record of EDO evaluations for librarians eligible for reappointment.
2. Tenured faculty members organize a Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (RTRC), composed of all tenured faculty, and select a chair for the year.
3. RTRC send out a request to all librarians eligible for reappointment to submit a current curriculum vita and a statement on philosophy of librarianship for consideration to the RTRC.
  - 3a. Librarians seeking reappointment in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the cycle will be asked to provide a summary statement of progress and development for the following areas: librarianship, service, and research.
4. Librarians seeking reappointment submit current curriculum vita and a statement on philosophy of librarianship to RTRC committee.
5. RTRC meets to review, discuss, clarify, and vote on reappointment for eligible librarians.
6. RTRC chair submits a written recommendation, with a copy to the librarian seeking reappointment, to the Dean with records of the discussion, committee attendance, and voting results (approval or denial).
7. Dean makes a written recommendation, with a copy to RTRC chair, for reappointment to the Provost and notifies the faculty member seeking reappointment of written recommendation.
8. Provost makes a written recommendation for reappointment to the Chancellor and notifies the faculty member seeking reappointment of written recommendation.
9. Chancellor notifies the faculty librarian seeking reappointment of final decision.

### Assistant Professor

Reappointment during the probationary period at Assistant Professor requires evidence of progress towards meeting the standards for Assistant Professor. The criteria used for evaluation, with job performance being primary, are:

- Evidence of effectiveness in job performance in librarianship.
- Evidence of scholarship and professional growth in librarianship.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to accommodate changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

### Associate Professor

Reappointment during the probationary period at Associate Professor requires evidence of progress towards meeting the standards of Associate Professor. The criteria used for evaluation, with job performance being primary, are:

- An MLS from a program accredited by the American Library Association.
- Evidence of job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and contributions towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, completed or in progress, in which career direction is evident and which demonstrates growth and impact on librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to effect changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

Please see Section 7, 8 and 9 of these Bylaws for specific evaluative information regarding performance as faculty librarians, scholarly and creative activities, and university and community service.

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

## **Section 4      Procedures and Criteria for Tenure**

Tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member the continuation of his/her appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure, or until termination of tenure for adequate causes, such as financial exigency or academic program discontinuance. The burden of proof that tenure should be awarded rests with the faculty member. Tenure is acquired through a positive action of the Board of Trustees. It is awarded in a particular department on campus.

Tenure track faculty must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. It is UTC policy to review probationary, tenure-track librarians annually, to ensure that reappointment is in order. The probationary period shall be no less than one and no more than seven academic years. The original appointment letter shall state the length of the probationary period and the academic year in which he/she must be considered for tenure if he/she has met the minimum eligibility requirements for consideration.

Tenure is awarded after a thorough review which culminates in the University acknowledging a reasonable presumption of the faculty member's professional excellence, and the likelihood that excellence will contribute substantially over a considerable period of time to the mission and anticipated needs of the Library. The criteria for appointment reflects the basic elements for tenure consideration; however, a positive recommendation for tenure requires demonstrated excellence in performance. In all cases, excellence in performance as a librarian is considered primary.

An evaluation of a tenure candidate's qualifications, professional contributions, potential, and determination of whether he/she should be accepted as a tenured member of the campus community requires the judgment of both the candidate's faculty colleagues and the responsible administrator.

The tenure process will follow the outline below:

1. Dean calls organizational meeting of tenured faculty.
2. Tenured faculty members organize a Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (RTRC), composed of all tenured faculty, and select a chair for the year.
3. Dean sends out a request for and receives dossiers for librarians eligible for tenure and those eligible for early consideration.
4. Dean gathers dossiers and provides to the RTRC.
5. RTRC meets to review, discuss, clarify, and vote on tenure for librarians.
6. RTRC chair submits a written recommendation on tenure to the Dean, with a copy to the librarian seeking tenure, with records of discussion, committee attendance, and voting results (approval or denial).
7. Dean makes written recommendation, with a copy to the RTRC chair, on tenure to the Provost and notifies the faculty member seeking tenure of written recommendation.
8. Provost makes a written recommendation on tenure to the Chancellor and notifies the faculty member seeking tenure of written recommendation.
9. Chancellor makes a written recommendation on tenure to the Board of Trustees / UT System President and notifies the faculty librarian seeking tenure of written recommendation.
10. The Board of Trustees, in conjunction with UT System President, makes a final decision on the awarding of tenure and notifies the faculty librarian seeking tenure of written recommendation.

The criteria listed below are used to guide decisions governing the awarding of tenure:

- Demonstrated excellence as a librarian.
- Evidence of research and scholarly competence in librarianship.
- Evidence of professional growth and activities.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to accommodate changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Membership and participation in relevant local, state, national, or international professional organizations.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Evidence of meeting the staffing needs of the University.

In the tenure application, librarians must address each of the criteria listed above, and must specifically provide a summary demonstrating his/her growth and progress in the areas of librarianship, research and scholarly competence, and service. Please note that the above list is not comprehensive, nor are the items of equal significance. In all cases, excellence in performance as a librarian is considered primary.

Activities in the tenure application will be considered on the basis of substantive impact on librarianship or other academic disciplines (but not to the exclusion of librarianship) without regard for financial compensation, medium of publication/presentation (print, online, live, asynchronous), or number of authors/contributors (authors, presenters, committee members, etc.).

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

## **Section 5      Procedures and Criteria for Promotion in Rank**

In general, the criteria for promotion in rank are the same as those for reappointments in various ranks.

### Promotion

Faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Professor and Professor are considered annually. Promotion does not ensure any specific assignment within the UTC Library.

The promotion process will follow the outline below:

1. Dean calls organizational meeting of tenured faculty.
2. Tenured faculty members organize a Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (RTRC), composed of all tenured faculty, and select a chair for the year.
3. Dean sends out a request for and receives dossiers from librarians eligible for promotion.
4. Dean gathers dossiers and provides to the RTRC.
5. RTRC meets to review, discuss, clarify, and vote on tenure for librarians.
  - a. Note: All librarians serving on the Promotion Committee must be at the same or at a higher rank than the rank sought by the requesting librarian.
6. RTRC chair submits a written recommendation on promotion to the Dean, with a copy to the librarian seeking promotion, with records of discussion, committee attendance, and voting results (approval or denial).
7. Dean makes written recommendation, with a copy to RTRC chair, on promotion to the Provost and notifies the faculty member seeking promotion of written recommendation.
8. Provost makes a written recommendation on promotion to the Chancellor and notifies the faculty member seeking promotion of written recommendation.
9. Chancellor makes a final decision on promotion and notifies the faculty librarian seeking promotion of written recommendation.

### Associate Professor

Promotion in rank from Assistant to Associate Professor requires evidence of meeting the standards for Associate Professor. The criteria used for evaluation, with job performance being primary, are:

### Associate Professor

- An MLS from a program accredited by the American Library Association.
- Evidence of job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and contributions towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, completed or in progress, in which career direction is evident and which demonstrates growth and impact on librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to effect changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

For promotion in rank, normally a minimum of four years is required as an Assistant Professor.

### Professor

Promotion in rank from Associate to Professor requires evidence of meeting the standards for Professor. The criteria used for evaluation, with job performance being primary, are:

### Professor

- An MLS from a program accredited by the American Library Association.
- Evidence of outstanding job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and leadership towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, which are of significance to librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of leadership in university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to lead change in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

For promotion in rank, normally a minimum of five years is required as an Associate Professor.

In the promotion application, librarians must address each of the criteria listed above, and must specifically provide a summary demonstrating his/her growth and progress in the areas of librarianship, research and scholarly competence, and service. Please see sections 7, 8 and 9 of these Bylaws for specific evaluative information regarding performance as faculty librarians, scholarly and creative activities, and university and community service.

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

## **Section 6 Evaluation and Development by Objectives and Expectations of Rank**

### *Evaluation and Development Objectives (EDO)*

All faculty, probationary and tenured, must complete an annual performance and planning review (EDO).

The University seeks to make clear to each faculty member general expectations and duties. Library supervisors are required to schedule regular conferences with faculty librarians to make plans, set goals and objectives, and review performance as part of an ongoing effort to make each faculty member an effective and responsible participant in the achievement of the University's goals and mission.

As part of the EDO process accomplishments are compared with the specific goals that the faculty member and the supervisor have previously set, and/or new goals are set. The nature of these conferences is highly individual. The process takes into account all the diverse things that occupy a faculty member's time. The central aim of the conference is the improvement of performance, the development of common ambitions and projects, and sharing through honest, realistic assessments given, received, and discussed. The planning aspects of these annual conferences should take place in the context of broader Library-wide goals. If a librarian fails to perform or provide output in a particular category, for example, research, a statement noting this fact will be made in the EDO document. If a librarians repeatedly fails to perform or provide output over a number of years, it will results in an unsatisfactory EDO evaluation. A process is available for faculty librarians who wish to appeal his or her performance rating.

Conference elements will include:

- clear, mutually agreed upon, individual objectives.
- appropriate, clearly understood standards, methods, and procedures for assessing the degree of achievement of objectives.
- provision of necessary support to do the job.
- honest judgment of peers/ administrative colleagues, reflecting reliable assessment of achievements.
- appropriate recognition and reward for good work.

Conference procedures will include:

- an examination of the current year's activities.
- the establishment of activities for the year ahead, assuring that planning takes place in the context of long-term library and university plans and goals.
- a review based on guidelines and criteria specific to department, assuring that the review is a key element in merit pay or performance based salary adjustments.
- a review of the Library Bylaws, as needed, to make clear the criteria and procedures to be followed, including criteria for each level of performance.
- the completion of documentation summarizing the review, including an objective rating, that is signed by the faculty librarian and supervising librarian.
- the transmission of information from the supervising librarian to the Dean.
- the transmission of information from the Dean to the Provost.

Performance rating for annual reviews will include:

- exceeds expectations for rank
- meets expectations for rank
- needs improvement for rank
- unsatisfactory for rank

### Expectations of Rank

In general, the criteria for expectations in rank for EDO are the same as those for reappointments and promotion. The expectations for rank in regards to performance are the same regardless of whether a librarian is probationary or tenured.

The criteria for evaluation of Assistant Professor are:

- Evidence of effectiveness in job performance in librarianship.
- Evidence of scholarship and professional growth in librarianship.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to accommodate changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

The criteria for evaluation of Associate Professor are:

- Evidence of job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and contributions towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, completed or in progress, in which career direction is evident and which demonstrates growth and impact on librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to effect changes in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

The criteria for evaluation of Professor are:

- Evidence of outstanding job performance which demonstrates a mastery of his/her assignment and leadership towards library-wide initiatives.
- Evidence of professional contributions in research, scholarship, or other creative activities, which are of significance to librarianship or other academic disciplines, but not to the exclusion of librarianship.
- Evidence of leadership in university and community service.
- Demonstrated ability to relate effectively to colleagues and students.
- Demonstrated ability to lead change in the evolution of library and information science practices, services, and collections.
- Attendance at professional conferences, workshops, or seminars.
- Membership in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

Please see sections 7, 8 and 9 of these Bylaws for specific evaluative information regarding performance as a librarians, scholarly and creative activities, and university and community service.

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information.

## **Section 7      Evaluative Criteria: Performance as a Librarian**

Excellence in the area of performance as a librarian is of primary importance; however librarians must provide demonstrated evidence of strong performance in all areas to support applications for reappointment, promotion, tenure, EDO, and exceptional merit. A record of truly exceptional performance in some areas of the basic responsibilities to librarianship, scholarship and research, and service may mitigate against a slight contribution in another area in consideration for reappointment, promotion, tenure, EDO, and exceptional merit within the performance guidelines established for each rank. The evidence to support exceptional considerations must be unequivocal.

### *Performance as a Librarian*

The quality of performance in the area of the librarian's assigned responsibility is the most important and essential criterion for reappointment, promotion, tenure, EDO, and exceptional merit. Performance is defined as the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the librarian's primary assignment and growth beyond the minimum requirements of that assignment. The ability to carry out competently the full range of library functions pertaining to the librarian's particular assignment must be demonstrated and confirmed through assessment. This includes working both independently and collaboratively. In addition, certain characteristics are common to the evaluation of the job performance of every librarian regardless of rank.

Factors considered in evaluating the performance of primary responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- Consistent, high quality performance in the planning, organization, and implementation of positional and professional responsibilities, including both routine, ongoing objectives and new initiatives,
- Leadership in addressing current issues and future trends in areas of expertise,
- Dependability,
- Accuracy,
- Ability to relate job functions to the broad goals of the Libraries and the University,
- Effective communication skills,
- Effective accommodation of change in the position,
- Adaptability and flexibility in approaching situations and individuals,
- Initiative,
- Sound judgment and quality of decision making,
- Creative approaches to problem solving,
- Constructive response to criticism and suggestions,
- Ability to innovate, particularly the development of high quality innovative services.

Appropriate evidence of job performance might be taken from:

- Activity reports or Annual goal-based evaluations
- Administrative and internal publication, such as reports, statistics, handbooks, manuals, etc.
- Departmental logs and minutes
- Description of programs or projects completed or in progress
- Evaluations by colleagues and clients both within and outside the Library
- Formal evaluations of teaching by students, faculty or peers
- Materials produced to meet Library program and service goals
- Membership lists for library committees and task forces
- Recognition of expertise in assigned duties by individuals outside the Library
- Transcripts or other evidence of formal education activities

## Section 8      Evaluative Criteria: Scholarship and Research Activities

### Scholarship and Research Activities

Faculty librarian research, scholarship and creative activities include activities that impact and advance the practice and science of librarianship. Such activities accomplish the exchange of information, professional practice and research findings, and may take place in workshops, seminars, meetings of professional organizations, and/or publications. Therefore, a candidate's contributions through any of these instruments can be considered equally legitimate elements of scholarship and professional contributions. Similar activities within other academic disciplines also constitute professional contributions, and may be undertaken in addition to, but not to the exclusion of, professional contributions in the discipline of library science.

Evaluation and assessment of activities in the area of scholarship and research must reflect both the structured time frame in which library faculty must work and the nature of scholarship in the field of library science. Less is required of those who have not earned Associate Professor or Professor rank because it is very important that such individuals first establish unambiguous strength in the area of Performance as Librarian. Nevertheless, an appropriate number of ongoing, substantive, quality achievements in this area must be demonstrated for any positive personnel action to be recommended.

Please see Appendix 2: Research Category Form for additional information.

### Minimum Standards

In regards to reappointment, tenure and promotion, listed below are the **minimum** criteria of activities (discrete activities are listed on subsequent pages) that have been established for consideration. The number of activities is cumulative, and the quality of the activities is of equal importance, if not more importance, than the number. A predominant number of activities must be focused on librarianship. The activities are categorized as levels 1, 2, or 3, signifying increasing levels of complexity.

To be considered for tenure and promotion the minimum criteria must be met, but it does not assure a positive tenure decision.

In regards to EDO evaluations, output expectations remain the same regardless of whether a librarian is probationary or tenured (over the course of five to seven years).

### Duplication of effort and role

In the case where a work of original authorship is duplicated in multiple venues (for instance, when an article is translated into multiple languages, reprinted in an anthology, or republished or presented in a different form), the candidate is expected to address why that duplication should be considered an enhancement to the previous work and be considered for further credit. In the case in which a particular role is duplicated because of the nature of the activity, only one activity may be reported for dossier credit. For instance, if you serve on the board of an association by virtue of a particular position held elsewhere, and not as an elected board member, that other position is what should be listed as an activity for credit.

### Category 1 Activities

It should be noted that Category 1 activities are appropriate for both new and continuing professionals. The intent of Category 1 activities is to provide a platform for faculty members to build upon during their career. As such, it is expected that faculty will not limit themselves to engaging in a single Category 1 activity to the exclusion of other activities.

### Category Petition Process

The Library's Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee and the librarian under evaluation have the right to petition for a category review. The evidence to support such a consideration must be unequivocal.

The faculty member seeking promotion/tenure will suggest categories for each activity submitted as laid out in the Bylaws. This activity/category proposal should be submitted as part of the regular dossier. If a faculty member suggests a category level (1, 2, 3) other than that defined by the Bylaws for a particular activity, the candidate must present unequivocal evidence to petition for a category level increase.

If a faculty member has petitioned to increase a category level above the values stated in the Bylaws, the committee will respond in writing with their approval of or disagreement with the category change and copy this response to the Dean. In the case that all category suggestions are accepted by the committee, regular review of the dossier will continue. In the case of the committee disagrees with the category level (1, 2, 3) at which the candidate has requested that an activity be considered, a clear statement in writing shall be provided to the candidate (and copied to the Dean), to include:

- The candidate's proposed category level of the activity
- The committee's detailed statement as to why the activity does not meet the proposed category level
- The committee's suggested designation of the activity's category level as presented in the dossier
- What evidence the committee would recommend that would present a more compelling case for the increase in category level of the activity.
- The due date for a response to the committee from the candidate either accepting the proposed category designation, or providing the requested additional evidence.

The candidate shall have 5 business days to respond in writing offering additional unequivocal evidence as to why the item should be eligible for category review/elevation. A copy of the candidate's justification must be sent to the dean. If necessary, the committee should respond to the candidate's petition in a timely manner.

#### **Assistant Professor**

- A minimum of four activities, which fall into Categories 1, 2, or 3,

#### **Associate Professor**

- A minimum of five activities that fall into Categories 1, 2 or 3, at least three of which are Categories 2 or 3,

#### **Professor**

- A minimum of five activities that fall into Categories 2 or 3, at least three of which are Category 3.

## Definitions

For the purposes of these Bylaws, “research and writing” will include both original authorship as well as editing, categorized and handled in the manner listed below. The petition process may be used by the candidate for exceptions to this list.

“Authorship” as referred to in the Library Bylaws shall include works such as: books; bibliographies; indexes; chapter(s) of a book; peer-reviewed articles; popular or trade articles; book reviews; conference proceedings; professional blogs; creation of professional websites, games or online tools, and similar activities.

“Editing” shall include work such as: editing a book; editing a book with original content; editing a professional journal (peer-reviewed); serving as a reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal; editing a trade or popular publication; editing conference proceedings; editing a newsletter (national, international, state, local; online, print); maintenance of professional websites, games or online tools; indexing a monograph; and similar activities.

Activities in the tenure application will be considered on the basis of substantive impact on librarianship or other academic disciplines (but not to the exclusion of librarianship) without regard for financial compensation, medium of publication/presentation (print, online, live, asynchronous), or number of authors/contributors (authors, presenters, committee members, etc.).

Appropriate evidence of research and scholarship includes or might be taken from:

- Copies of publications: articles, chapters, reports, books, media productions, software, bibliographies, databases, indices, critical reviews
- Copies of programs for seminars, workshops, conferences, or other events in which one participated or assisted with planning
- Description of works in progress
- Evaluations of products or activities
- Exhibit catalogs
- External letters outlining responsibilities and accomplishments
- Fellowships, awards and honors received
- Funded grants and grant proposals
- Membership lists for local, state, national, and international professional organizations
- Products of committee work
- Published proceedings

Listed below are sample activities that will be considered in the area. This is not a comprehensive list and other activities may be considered. Please indicate whether the contribution is refereed, non-refereed, or invited where appropriate.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Broad Area</b>
<b>Board or Council</b>		
Member, elected board, library or related association : national or international	3	boards or councils
Member, elected board, library or related association : local or state	2	boards or councils
<b>Presentation</b>		
Presentation, presented paper, speech : national or international	3	presentations
Presentation, presented paper, speech : state	2	presentations
Presentation, presented paper, speech : local	1	presentations
Workshop : national or international	3	presentations
Workshop : local or state	2	presentations
Discussion group, leader : national or international	2	presentations
Discussion group, leader : local or state	1	presentations
Panel, participant or moderator : national or international	2	presentations
Panel, participant or moderator : local or state	1	presentations
Poster session : national or international	2	presentations
Poster session : local or state	1	presentations
Roundtable, leader : national or international	2	presentations
Roundtable, leader : local or state	1	presentations
<b>Committee</b>		
Chair, national or international committee	3	committee work
Chair, local or state committee	2	committee work
Member, national or international committee	2	committee work
Member, local or state committee	1	committee work
<b>Writing</b>		
Authoring a book	3	writing
Authoring a book chapter	3	writing
Authoring a peer-reviewed article	3	writing
Authoring a popular or trade article	2	writing
Authoring a book review	1	writing
Authoring a conference proceeding	1	writing
Authoring a professional blog	1	writing
Authoring a professional website, game, or online tool	1	writing
Authoring an article in a newsletter	1	writing
Conducting a published interview	1	writing / editing

<b>Editing</b>		
Editing a book with original content	3	editing
Editing a book	2	editing
Serving on the board or editing a peer-reviewed, scholarly journal	2	editing
Editing a blog or website	1	editing
Editing a conference proceeding	1	editing
Editing a newsletter	1	editing
Editing a trade or popular publication	1	editing
<b>Grants</b>		
External grant	tbd	grants
Teaching, Honors, Professional Development, Consulting Notes		Removed 7/2010

## Section 9 Service to the University and Community

### Service to the University and Community

Faculty librarians are expected to actively serve the institution through the donation of time and professional expertise. Professional service to the community will also be considered.

The UTC Faculty Handbook notes service includes such activities as: service through administrative and committee assignments, service to professional organizations, appropriate consulting, advisement or sponsorship of student activities, coordination of special departmental, school, college or university activities, and discipline- and university-related community services.

Below are sample activities that will be considered in the area. This is not a comprehensive list and other activities are welcome.

- Actively participating in major campus events, such as graduation.
- Participating in community outreach activities such as conducting general library tours, or making presentation to campus or community groups.
- Serving and actively participating on standing or ad hoc campus groups.
- Serving as the Library's liaison to civic or campus groups.
- Serving as a member of Faculty Senate committee.
- Serving as chair of a Faculty Senate committee.
- Serving as chair of university-wide standing or ad hoc committee, board, or similar group.
- Serving as a member of a UT-wide or regional committee.
- Serving as a mentor for library faculty colleagues.
- Making significant contributions to community groups or charitable organizations or activities.
- Providing organizational leadership to community groups, governmental agencies or charitable organizations or activities. (Remove)
- Serving as a volunteer for local, state or national governmental agencies (e.g., serving as an Elections Day polling place volunteer) (Remove).

Appropriate evidence of university and community service might be taken from:

- Activity reports
- Description of tasks in progress
- Elected or appointed posts in community projects or boards
- External letters outlining responsibilities and accomplishments
- Governance or consultative responsibilities within the library or institution
- Outline of memberships and committee assignments
- Membership lists for university committees and community organizations
- Minutes of meetings
- Products of committee work
- Program announcements
- Published proceedings

Note:

*UTC Faculty Handbook* calls for faculty members to attend two graduations. Faculty Librarians agreed, at the 9/4/2007 Faculty Meeting, that attendance at graduation should be taken into consideration when conducting EDO evaluations and when awarding exceptional merit.

## **Section 10 Support for Travel and Professional Development**

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is committed to providing monetary support and administrative leave to faculty librarians for travel and professional development purposes.

Librarians engaged in travel and professional development are essential to creating a successful University in which all students, faculty, and staff, are learners who continually strive to improve his/her performance.

The Lupton Library is committed to ensuring success for all students through the recruitment and retention of active, engaged librarians who improve the Lupton Library through his/her professional developments efforts and/or improve the profession as a whole.

## **Section 11 Sabbaticals**

### **The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga Lupton Library Sabbatical / Faculty Development Leave**

**Draft November 4, 2010**

The guidelines below differ from University guidelines on sabbatical and faculty development leaves due to the fact that library faculty are 12 month employees with a range of interdependent responsibilities, rather than 9 month teaching faculty. Information on University guidelines can be found in the Faculty Handbook, section 7.1

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of sabbatical or professional development leave (hereinafter referred to as “leave”) is to serve the objectives of the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga by affording library faculty the opportunity to enhance performance and scholarship. Leaves are intended to promote high levels of scholarly and professional activities. A faculty member is awarded leave on the merits of a specific proposal and for the combined benefits of the faculty member, the Lupton Library, and the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. The award is an investment by the University.

The purposes for which sabbatical or professional leave may be granted include:

Enhance scholarship and academic excellence of the University, contribute to the professional growth of the faculty member, and strengthen the University’s curriculum and/or the Library’s collections and services in ways that cannot be accomplished under the constraints of regular workload.

#### **Eligibility Requirements**

Faculty member must be tenured, with six years of outstanding performance and service (per the Faculty Handbook), and not have taken sabbatical or faculty development leave in six years.

#### **Guidelines**

- No more than 10% of the tenured library faculty may be on leave at any one time.
- The absence of a colleague due to leave should not negatively impact the workload of other faculty and staff members, except in minimal ways.
- The services, collection, and projects of the Lupton Library should be not be negatively impacted as a result of a leave taken by a colleague.
- The Lupton Library, in providing the opportunity for a library faculty to participate in leave at full pay, assumes that during the period of absence no replacement will be required.
- Leaves are expected to produce a tangible outcome.

## Duration

Eligible full-time faculty members may be granted leave for the months of June and July.

## Additional Compensation and Benefits

- Library faculty normally will be permitted to accept only such grants, contracts, awards, fellowships, and other additional compensation as are given to support the approved leave project or are consistent with University policy. The approval of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs must be obtained prior to accepting any additional compensation.
- Library faculty may apply for and receive funds for travel while on leave.
- Anna is looking into benefit situation: annual leave and sick leave, retirement, health, long term disability, dental, what else?

## Return to the University

The leave recipient shall return to the University for one year following the leave or return the appropriate funds to the University (per Faculty Handbook, need to find a copy of contract).

## Return Reporting Requirement

- By the end of the Fall semester immediately following leave:
  - the faculty member shall submit to the Dean of the Library a report of activities undertaken. This report will be become part of the faculty member's permanent file and will be used in evaluating any future applications for professional leave.
  - the faculty member will be expected to make a formal library-wide presentation.

## Application Process

### 1. Department Notification

Prior to the submission of an application, the faculty member should inform their department head of their intention to apply. When completed, a copy of the application should be submitted to the Dean of the Library, with a copy to the department head. If the applicant is a department head they should notify the department of the intent to apply, and submit the application to the Dean of the Library.

### 2. Review Committee

Upon receipt of a proposal, the Dean of Library will call together a Review Committee of tenured department heads, in lieu of a single academic department head, to review the proposal. Together, these library faculty members will assess the merit of the proposal, the effects of the leave on the department and overall library operations, and how the faculty member's responsibilities will be met in their absence. The Review Committee will make a recommendation to approve, postpone, or reject each application indicating the vote of the Committee, a statement of majority opinions, and attaching any dissenting opinions.

The recommendation should clearly state:

- The reasons for the decision, including an appraisal of the project;
- Why the decision is consistent with this policy;
- An assessment of the effect the faculty member's absence, if approved, on the Library.

If there are less than three tenured department heads, the Dean of the Library will appoint a third, tenured member of the library faculty to serve on the Review Committee. If a department head applies for leave they are ineligible to serve on the Review Committee for that year.

### *3. Dean of the Library*

The Dean of the Library will review the proposal and the statement from the Review Committee, and assess effects of the leave on the Library and indicate how the faculty member's responsibilities will be met. The Dean will forward a recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs on the leave request.

### *4. Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs*

The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review the proposal, and the recommendations, and make a recommendation to the Chancellor on the leave request.

*Note:* Unsuccessful applicants may resubmit an application for leave the following year and request feedback to strengthen the application. The applicant must complete a new application and does not receive preferential treatment

## **Timeframe**

*Note: if any day falls on a weekend, consider the proposal due the following Monday.*

*Note: leave is granted for the upcoming summer.*

Prior to September 15: Faculty member should notify department head or department of intent to apply for leave.

September 15<sup>th</sup>: Faculty member submits completed proposal to Dean of the Library

October 1st: Review Committee forwards recommendation to the Dean of the Library

October 20<sup>th</sup>: Dean of the Library forwards recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

## **Proposal Requirements**

A sabbatical or professional leave proposal should include at least the following information:

1. an up-to-date curriculum vitae, including dates of employment at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga;
2. a statement of the purpose and nature of the leave project; including a summary of project related activities accomplished to date;
3. a description of the importance of the project to the professional development of the faculty member, and the mission of the Library and the University;

4. a description of the methodology to be used;
5. a statement of the anticipated outcomes from the leave project;
6. a statement on why leave is necessary to conduct the project (i.e., why is the project not within the normal scope of scholarly or service activities expected routinely of faculty members);
7. a statement including the dates of previous sabbatical, professional leave, and Library-granted research leaves and the outcomes of those leaves;
8. a statement detailing any expected outside compensation or reimbursement;
9. a completed University sabbatical / professional leave form
10. a packet of leave application materials (two-page contact/fringe benefits sheet; one-page Tennessee State Retirement Credit form; materials generated by the approval procedure (see below). I don't know if we have this –

### **Criteria Used in Evaluation**

The Review Committee shall review and rank the proposals according to the following criteria:

- The feasibility and benefits of the proposal to the faculty member, the Lupton Library, and the University
- The impact of the faculty member's absence on departmental and library-wide operations and projects;
- The practicality of the proposal in light of available resources;
- The applicant's record of librarianship, service, and scholarly work;
- The number of years an applicant has served at the University; and
- The results of an applicant's previous leaves.

## **Section 12 Professional Development and Research Leave Program**

Approved May 2006

### Policy

The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga (UTC) and the Lupton Library support professional development activities for faculty librarians. Professional development through research activities is necessary to achieve tenure and promotion, to remain engaged in the profession, and to stay current in national and international library trends and developments.

### Intent

Faculty librarians are full-time, 40 hour a week, exempt employees at UTC, and do not have summer to pursue research activities with the diligence of 9 month faculty. The practical intent of this policy is to provide faculty librarians time away from ongoing, daily responsibilities and the opportunity to do quality, focused research. One means of achieving this end is through granting release time to faculty members for research purposes.

### Procedures

Release time requests are reviewed by a group of faculty librarians. Recommendations on release time are submitted to the dean of the Lupton Library, who in cooperation with library department heads, will make final release time decisions. The release time granted to any faculty librarian will be determined by the needs of the Library as a whole and the specific department involved. Variables affecting each request can include the amount of vacation time granted within the specific department, the number of people requesting leave time, and the total amount of leave time requested.

Release time requests are granted for a specific number of days and specific time periods. The maximum amount of release time in any fiscal year is 10 days. Release time must be used within the time period specified and unused days do not carry forward.

Release time requests are usually granted exclusively during the summer or when the University is not in session. During these periods, time demands on faculty members are fewer and demands for our services are lower. In some cases, it may not be possible to grant an individual all the release time he or she requested, or the specific times requested. In rare cases, the Library administration will grant release time during the fall or spring semesters.

Release time requests are granted to faculty librarians who have a specific objective or a project in mind. Release time is not intended for exploratory investigations.

### Forms

Faculty librarians requesting release time for research purposes are required to complete the "Release Time Request Form" and submit it to the dean of the Lupton Library. The form requests: the nature of the research project, how a librarian intends to use the time granted, preparation work previously undertaken, amount of release time requested, dates or preferred schedule of release time, impact of faculty librarian's time away from department, etc.

Upon completion of the release time and return to ongoing duties faculty librarians are required to complete and submit the "Release Time Completion Form" to the dean of the Lupton Library. The form requests a narrative update on the progress of your research achieved during the release time, the next steps for the project, and evidence of work undertaken.

**University of Tennessee, Chattanooga**  
**Lupton Library**  
**Release Time Request Form**  
 Form revised March 2007

Please use as much space as needed to describe your project request.

1.	A.	Describe the nature of your research. Examples could include: library communication patterns, librarian salaries, information commons, etc.
	B.	Describe the anticipated outcome of your research. Examples could include: a conference presentation, publication in professional journal, etc.
	C.	Provide specifics of what you will do during your release time. Example could include: travel to another library to access materials, write a paper, prepare and conduct a survey, prepare a presentation, etc.
	D.	What have you already undertaken in preparation for this project?
2.	A.	How many days (total) are you requesting?
	B.	What is your preferred schedule? Please provide specific dates.
3.		What is the impact of your absence on your home department? Library-wide?
4.		Have you been granted release time in the previous two years? If so, when?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature of Faculty Librarian

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature of Department Head / Dean

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

**University of Tennessee at Chattanooga**  
**Lupton Library**  
**Release Time Completion Form**

Name:

Date:

1. Below please describe the work accomplished during your release time and the next steps in your research project.
  
2. Please attached evidence of work accomplished, such as:
  - a. copy of proposed article, chapter, etc.
  - b. compiled data
  - c. completed dossier or a progress report

## **Section 13     Library Orientation Program**

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga provides orientation at three levels for new faculty hires.

- All new tenure-track and full-time faculty members participate in a university-wide, three-day New Faculty Orientation (NFO) event prior to the start of each Fall semester. Traditionally, tenure-track faculty positions usually begin employment at the start of the Fall semester. The sessions at NFO include orientation to teaching, research, and service practices at UTC, as well as ensuring the completion of important benefits paperwork. While, faculty librarians participate in NFO, the extent of his/her participation is based on when the faculty librarian began employment with the University. Unlike discipline faculty, faculty librarians are recruited throughout the year, when positions come vacant, and thus, by necessity, may have already completed benefits paperwork and other topics covered in NFO.
- All new faculty librarians and staff specialists in the Lupton Library participate in a library-wide orientation program. The administrative assistance in the Library Dean's Office coordinates the library-wide orientation schedule. The orientation begins within two to three weeks of the start date for the new staff member. Each new staff member visits each library department to become familiar with staff in the department, goals, statistics, and departmental policies and procedures.
- Local department heads will coordinate the orientation for new staff members within each department.

## **Section 14 Library Mentoring Program**

Drafted Fall 2005

Each new faculty librarian is assigned a mentor for his/her first year in the Library. Included below are the overarching principles that guide the Lupton Library Mentoring Program, as well as the specific steps involved in the program.

### **1. Definition**

The term “mentor” is used in various contexts, as an advisor, coach, counselor, and support person. Conroy and Jones define mentoring as an interpersonal exchange requiring one-to-one communication skills, where communication calls for openness, trust and frankness.<sup>1</sup>

At the Lupton Library, the mentoring initiative may be defined as a program for the development and support of all newly hired librarians, personally and professionally.

### **2. Benefits to participants**

Mentee: advice, feedback, increase in knowledge, networking, professional development  
Mentors: feedback, increase skills and knowledge, professional development  
Institution: increased productivity and commitment from faculty, etc.  
Profession: increase in quality of professionals and their contributions, etc.

### **3. Characteristics and Responsibilities of Mentor Program Participants**

#### *Mentors characteristics:*

- be committed to helping a mentee learn about the Library, the University, and the community, as well as the development of her/his own specific professional goals.
- be knowledgeable, respected, well established in her/his career and thus not threatened by success of a more junior person.
- should also be respectful of diversity and differences.

#### *Mentor responsibilities:*

- actively initiate the mentoring relationship;
- obtain and share knowledge about the institution’s environment;
- transfer knowledge of institutional politics;
- provide emotional support and encouragement;
- lead by example and establish an environment in which the mentee’s opportunities for advancement are maximized;
- introduce the mentee to other key individuals and resources inside and outside the library;
- identify opportunities for mentee;
- encourage mentee to ask questions;
- listen and address the mentee’s questions on a range of issues;
- define expectations for different career paths; and
- evaluate the mentor program, as required.

*Mentees characteristics:*

- A mentee should be newly hired at the institution.
- A mentee should be on the tenure-track or serving as an instructor.

*Mentor responsibilities:*

- assume responsibility for job success;
- assume responsibility for career development,
- actively participate in the mentoring relationship through the development of a constructive relationship.
- ask questions on a range of issues;
- evaluate the mentor program, as required.

#### **4. Mentoring Process at Lupton Library**

1. A new librarian is hired.
2. The Faculty Committee matches a new librarian (mentee) with a volunteer colleague (mentor).
3. The Dean of the Library will email the mentor and mentee to inform them of the match. The Dean will be the contact person for questions or problems, should any arise.
4. The mentor should make the initial contact as soon as possible. If a mentor is unavailable for an immediate meeting, then contact through voice mail or e-mail should be established.
5. During the first four to six weeks and throughout the next year, the mentor would meet casually at lunch or on coffee break on some mutually agreeable schedule with the mentee.
6. The mentor will assist the mentee in meeting colleagues from other units or libraries on campus. A mentor might wish to accompany or arrange for another colleague to accompany the mentee to meetings considered of interest or importance to staff. A mentor should provide the mentee with information about local professional and continuing education opportunities.
7. The mentor and the mentee will be contacted by the Dean of the Library for periodic follow-up. It is very important to receive the reactions, suggestions, criticisms and impressions of the process and the program from both the mentor and the mentee.
8. While the Faculty Committee expects that both mentors and mentees will decide what to talk about, the Committee believes it will be primarily be related to the library, the university, the community, and the profession. Topics are, however, entirely up to the mentor and the mentee.
9. In the event the mentor or the mentee feels the "match" is not working, either may request a new match. The Dean of the Library should be contacted to discuss the matter.

End Notes

1. Conroy, Barbara and Jones, Barbara Schindler. (1986). Improving communication in the library. Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

## **Section 15 Faculty Honors Day**

At Faculty Honors Day, the Library distributes one award, the Joseph and Marion Jackson Award. The award was established by a former Lupton Library Dean Joseph Jackson and his wife Mary Jackson, a former professor of Nursing at UTC. The intent of the award is (and this comes from the gift agreement) *"to recognize achievement in library faculty development and distinguished accomplishments, using the following criteria: knowledge in the field, dedication to the profession, attitude of faculty member, leadership ability, exceptional service, and exceptional research."*

The award may be given to one faculty member or it may be distributed amongst several colleagues. This award comes with a cash bonus, the amount of which varies each year. The recipient(s) of this award is selected by the Dean of the Lupton Library, based on recommendations from library faculty.

**University of Tennessee at Chattanooga  
Lupton Library  
Faculty Exceptional Merit Procedures**

Revised and approved by the Library Faculty, Spring 2008

**LUPTON LIBRARY FACULTY EXCEPTIONAL MERIT PROCEDURE**

A Preface from Dean of the Lupton Library  
Theresa Liedtka  
February 2008

The intent of exceptional merit or exceeds expectations for rank is to recognize outstanding performance by members of the faculty. The intent of this document *Lupton Library Faculty Exceptional Merit Procedures* is to ensure fairness and objectivity in awarding exceptional merit to librarians.

My experience over the course of the past three years is that the awarding of exceptional merit is a tricky business. One that is fraught with emotions that result in feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the part of staff members receiving and not receiving the award. This situation is complicated by the fact that UTC limits the number of faculty who can receive exceptional merit.

Our intent in creating this document is a worthy one, to lay out what it takes to receive exceptional merit and create the clearest guidelines possible for this designation. This policy was created by a task force composed of faculty librarians of assorted ranks and years of experience. It was then discussed, revised, and approved by the entire Library Faculty.

My purpose in penning this preface is to ask for your consideration and to raise awareness that a fine line exists between what is a consistent, high quality performance versus a performance deserving of exceptional merit. In the Library this line is complicated by a number of factors:

- 1) Faculty librarian positions vary widely in terms of responsibilities, workloads, time commitments, flexibility, supervisory elements, etc. How do these factors enter the equation in awarding exceptional merit?
- 2) The issue of rank, which we have attempted to define in a very basic manner, is still very unclear in how it plays into the award. We all know it does, but how specifically?
- 3) A faculty librarian's self-perceptions of his/her performance can be very different than the perceptions of others, and vice versa.
- 4) Exceptional merit is a competitive award process due to the limited number of exceptional merit slots. A librarian may have a fantastic year, but colleagues may have a better one.
- 5) We are fortunate to have an exceptional group of high achieving accomplished faculty.

In order to illustrate the complexities of awarding exceeds expectations for rank, I thought it might be useful to provide you with some examples of situations I have already encountered or that I can foresee us encountering in the future.

There is one slot for exceeding merit left. What would you do these situations?

- ◆ Two librarians have very similar jobs. Both have an excellent year in librarianship, research, and service. The librarians sit at different ranks, assistant and associate.
- ◆ Two librarians have very dissimilar jobs, one is on call nights and weekends and the other is not. Both have met all expectations for librarianship, research, and service.
- ◆ Two librarians perform equally well in librarianship, fulfilling all daily objectives and most new goals. One librarian supervises a single function; the other librarian supervises two discrete areas each of which requires unique knowledge and expertise.
- ◆ Two librarians have exceptional years in librarianship. One of the two had an article published in *American Libraries*, and met all service obligations. The other librarian served as chair-elect of a SELA Committee, and exceeded service expectations.

- ◆ Two librarians have met all expectations for rank and exceeded those in librarianship. One of the librarians proactively responded to all calls for help or volunteerism, including coming in when the Library was closed, covering weekend shifts, etc. The second librarian has willingly accepted all assignments, but never volunteered for the extra.
- ◆ Two librarians perform outstandingly in librarianship, one took release time to accomplish scholarly objectives and the other did not.

Exceptional merit is, in a nut shell, very difficult to define. However, my experiences at UTC have demonstrated to me that exceptional merit is usually not rewarded as a result of a single accomplishment or attribute. Instead it is the aggregation of overall performance, attitude, and contributions to our institution, librarianship, and especially our library. It calls for system-wide thinking, selfless behavior, getting your hands dirty, challenging our way of doing business as usual, and most important, getting into the mindset of our patrons and making them our priority.

Utilizing the procedures outlined in this document, I commit to do my best and to be fair and objective in making exceptional merit awards. I encourage open, direct conversations about meritorious performance and I urge you to participate fully in the process. Please seek me out if you have need of clarification or if you question my decisions. Such dialogue will result in a clearer understanding of expectations, yours and mine.

## LUPTON LIBRARY FACULTY EXCEPTIONAL MERIT PROCEDURE

This document was created by the Exceptional Merit Task Force, Spring 2006, and approved by Library Faculty on August 15, 2006, and revised in February 2008

### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this document is to identify a process that will help ensure fairness and objectivity in determining who of the Library faculty should be recommended for the Exceptional Merit Award for performance, typically recognized on Faculty Honors Day and determined each year as part of the University's annual Evaluation and Development of Objectives (EDO) process. Furthermore, this document provides guidance regarding: evidential requirements for recommending a faculty member for exceptional merit performance; quantification of the decision-making phases of the process; notification and archival practices.

As of the writing of this document (May, 2006), the University imposes certain limitations on the number of faculty members who may be recommended for the University's Exceptional Merit Award (20% of tenured/tenure-track faculty per department; the Library is considered a "department"). Removal of such limitations will necessitate review of this document.

Statements of intent are provided throughout, in order to explain and preserve the rationale for the principles established herein.

### Executive Summary

A *nomination* for Exceptional Merit performance, regardless of origin (see "Nomination Process"), constitutes a *recommendation* to the Library Dean.

The Library Dean is responsible for determining, through the process outlined in Appendix A: Quantifying Performance, whether evidence provided is sufficient to recommend a person for the Exceptional Merit Award to the Office of the Provost.

The Office of the Provost is responsible for the final decision regarding who of all University faculty shall receive an Exceptional Merit Award from the University.

The guiding document for evaluating performance is the edition of the Library Faculty Handbook (also referred to as the "Library Tenure and Promotion Bylaws," and hereinafter known as "Bylaws") in effect at the start of an evaluation period.

### Process Review

This procedure shall be reviewed at least annually, immediately following the normal evaluation period, or when the Library revises its Bylaws or the University revises EDO or related processes.

## Eligibility for Exceptional Merit Nomination

### Who is eligible?

According to the Bylaws, all Library faculty are required to participate in the annual EDO process that drives the Exceptional Merit Award. Therefore, all Library faculty, unless noted under “Exceptions,” are eligible for exceptional merit nomination (see “Nomination Process”). This includes full-time or part-time faculty, whether tenured, tenure track (probationary), or non-tenure track (instructors, lecturers, etc.). Providing this opportunity to all Library faculty is intended as an incentive to exceed performance, regardless of title, rank, or number of hours worked.

### Exceptions:

- Faculty who are on sabbatical are eligible for exceptional merit nomination for the period of time in which they are actually performing their librarianship duties.
- To be eligible for exceptional merit nomination, first year faculty must have participated in library-wide and departmental goal setting processes and have established their personal goals/objectives off of these. (Note: The goal-setting process typically occurs at the start of each new evaluation period.) Exceptions can be made by the Library Dean, provided that the nomination meets all other requirements in this document. First year faculty generally need their first year to begin to “establish unambiguous strength in the area of Performance as Librarian” per the Bylaws. The new faculty member’s first year also provides an opportunity for the faculty member to contribute to the planning process for developing departmental and Library goals and objectives for the following year.

### Eligibility related to performance

To be eligible for an exceptional merit nomination the faculty member must first perform successfully in all job responsibilities related to **librarianship**, as stated under the section “Evaluative Criteria: Performance as a Librarian” of the Bylaws, including:

- performance of routine responsibilities for the position,
  - progress on goals, particularly those related to librarianship,
  - contributions to relevant department and Library goals,
  - user-centered customer service (internal or external customers),
  - common evaluation characteristics, including: consistent, high quality performance in the planning, organization, and implementation of positional and professional responsibilities; leadership in addressing current issues and future trends in areas of expertise; dependability; accuracy; ability to relate job functions to the broad goals of the Libraries and the University; effective communication skills; effective accommodation of change in the position; adaptability and flexibility in approaching situations and individuals; initiative; sound judgment and quality of decision making; creative approaches to problem solving; constructive response to criticism and suggestions; ability to innovate, particularly the development of high quality innovative services.
- other factors as noted in the Bylaws.

Second, the faculty member must meet **expectations for rank** for the current rank, as stated in the Bylaws under “Evaluation and Development by Objectives and Expectations of Rank.”

## **Definition of Exceptional Merit**

An exceptional merit nomination is justified and encouraged when each of the following is demonstrated by the faculty member and documented by the nominating party (see “Nomination Process”):

- a faculty member contributes in one or more remarkable, distinguished, or exceptional ways with regards to librarianship or within the University or profession (through scholarship or service)
- and
- the contribution(s) is over and above the successful job performance and meets expectation for rank criteria described in the section entitled, “Eligibility related to performance.”

Contributions can be in the form of a number of individual activities or a major project (see Appendix A: Quantifying Performance).

## **Nomination Process**

If eligibility requirements are met, faculty members may be nominated for exceptional merit performance by one of the following:

- Immediate supervisor,
- Library Dean,
- Library colleague(s), including staff, individual or in consort with others,
- Self.

One nomination is sufficient for consideration; multiple nominations are possible, but not expected or required.

Nomination, in itself, does not guarantee that the Exceptional Merit Award will be recommended by the Dean or approved by the University.

## **Documentation Requirements**

The nominating party is responsible for documenting, in writing, exceptional performance described under “Definition of Exceptional Merit,” providing specific, detailed evidence of the level of contributions. This documentation is to be no less than ½ page and no more than one page, single space, and is to be attached to the Exceptional Merit Nomination Form in Appendix C.

Nominations are to be submitted to the Library Dean, who will append the form and its attachments to the faculty member’s current EDO form. Additional copies are to be distributed as described on the form. Note that supervisors who have recommended an employee for “exceeds expectation for rank” will also need to complete this form and include documentation as described in the above paragraph.

The intent is for all nominations to become part of the faculty member’s permanent Library record, providing a history of performance which may be useful in determining future salary increases, rank status for a particular person or position, etc.

## Documentation guidelines

To assist in preparing documentation, the following is a general list of activities that might contribute to exceptional merit performance. Nominating parties should also review Library Bylaws and appendices to this procedure. Level of contribution based upon rank should be taken into consideration, i.e., higher expectations for higher ranks. Degree of difficulty of project, extent of impact on the library, and the level of contribution above and beyond normal job responsibilities, workloads, and expectations should be addressed.

- Customer service that results in consistent accolades from users or colleagues about exceptional service.
- Successful implementation of wholly new services, products, or programs that meet the needs of external or internal users.
- Going the extra mile consistently to enable a user or a group to advance goals in a cohesive and effective way.
- Contributions which result in significantly increased productivity or service, such as streamlining a process, creating efficiency, eliminating redundancy, or that become a new accepted practice for one's position or for the Library.
- Contributions which result in a specific new process, service, or application that positively and significantly impacts work or brings recognition to the Library.
- Contributions which result in building new and enhanced relationships, such as collaborations or partnerships, which generate new or improved processes or services to advance Library goals or expand the use of Library resources.
- Creation of a vision for a major project that shapes direction, anticipates challenges and possibilities, and leads the project.
- Active participation or leadership role in an activity that results in a significant contribution to the library or the profession.
- Successful application for grant funding and/or oversight of a grant program which benefits the Library.
- Presentation (including poster session) or publication which garners professional recognition on a local, state or national level.

Contributions can be an individual effort or from being part of a task force, committee, departmental or other group effort that result in performance meeting the criteria in "Definition of Exceptional Merit."

## **Approval and Award of Exceptional Merit Recognition**

The Library Dean is responsible for deciding if the documented evidence (including the EDO) supports nomination for exceptional merit performance and which, if any, nominations are recommended to the Office of the Provost as deserving of the Exceptional Merit Award. The decision-making process may involve consultation with the nominating party and other Library personnel, as necessary. Evidence will be translated into quantifiable results as described in Appendix A: Quantifying Performance.

When the number of *qualified* faculty exceeds the number of spaces allotted to the Library by the University for the Exceptional Merit Award and if all other things are equal, the Library Dean may consider recommending Exceptional Merit Awards for faculty who have not received the award in the previous year. This provides an opportunity to expand formal recognition to those not recently recognized. Notations regarding the use of this clause in the Dean's decision-making process should be included in the files of all *qualified* faculty members, so that their exceptional performances are permanently recorded.

Faculty who have been nominated for "exceeds expectation for rank" or "exceptional merit performance" by a supervisor, self, colleague(s), or the Library Dean will be informed by the Library Dean as to the outcome of his/her nomination.

A copy of the Library Dean's notification to the Office of the Provost of the recommendation for Exceptional Merit Award should be placed in the faculty member's permanent Library record.

## Appendix A:

### Quantifying Performance

Criteria for meeting expectations for rank, activities provided in the EDO and documentation for the Exceptional Merit nomination will be rated on a scale of 1 to 3 by the Library Dean and accumulated as a total to assist in objectifying and quantifying performance.

#### Rating Scale:

- 1 = Fails to meet expectation/unsatisfactory performance
- 2 = Meets expectation/satisfactory performance
- 3 = Exceeds expectation/above average performance

If a “1” rating is received in any area, the faculty member will not be eligible for Exceptional Merit nomination.

The Dean will weigh each activity against the major categories provided for in the Bylaws:

- Consistent, high quality performance in the planning, organization, and implementation of positional and professional responsibilities;
- Leadership in addressing current issues and future trends in areas of expertise;
- Dependability;
- Accuracy;
- Ability to relate job functions to the broad goals of the Libraries and the University;
- Effective communication skills;
- Effective accommodation of change in the position
- Adaptability and flexibility in approaching situations and individuals;
- Initiative;
- Sound judgment and quality of decision making;
- Creative approaches to problem solving;
- Constructive response to criticism and suggestions;
- Ability to innovate, particularly the development of high quality innovative services.

#### Distinctions between Ranks

Different ranks come with different expectations and the higher the rank, the higher the performance expectations. In order to differentiate between ranks for exceptional merit considerations the following formula is applied to the quantification system employed above:

Assistant Professor -	receives 100% of the points awarded above towards merit
Associate Professor -	receives 97.5% of the points awarded above towards merit
Professor -	receives 95% of the points awarded above towards merit

## Examples

In some cases, successful completion of a major project, service, or personnel change, while performing all routine duties without interruption (the latter is a basic requirement defined under “Eligibility for Exceptional Merit Nomination”) may be awarded points in multiple Bylaw categories, causing the total of all points to be high enough to qualify for Exceptional Merit Award. Such undertakings would not only include successfully planning, organizing, and implementing phases, but also documentation of the subtasks, such as benchmarking or assessment of existing models, documenting rationale for project and process, establishing reasonable priorities and timelines, meeting deadlines and budget, effectively communicating with those who need to know.

In other cases, a series of individual activities may be accomplished in such a manner so that the combined total of all points are high enough to qualify for Exceptional Merit Award.

Individual activities that may result in high ratings include:

- Ability to be open-minded, critically assess new ideas that you may not personally support, or bring up new ideas in a positive and constructive fashion, with a vision on how to move forward toward implementation.
- Ability to think of the overall greater good of the Library or the University when making decisions.
- Ability to embrace, model, and facilitate change and be a constructive influence on colleagues in your department or throughout the Library.
- Ability to innovate and think out of the box to improve a service, policy, or procedure, resulting in greater efficiency or optimization of resources.
- Ability to respond professionally in all situations to patrons and colleagues, particularly those that are difficult and demanding, continuously demonstrating grace and respect for others through active listening, appropriate responses, engaging in productive conflict, and demonstrating a personal commitment to colleagues, the Library and the Institution.

## **Appendix B:**

### **Monetary Awards for Exceptional Merit Performance**

Monetary awards for Exceptional Merit and exceeds expectation for rank are often dictated by University/Campus rules. However, when the Library Dean is responsible for distributing these monetary awards, the amounts awarded will ideally be applied on a percentage basis, using the total number of points as a guideline to determining percentages (e.g., higher points mean higher percentage of the money available). This is one model. In another scenario, the Library Dean may elect to *financially* reward all the librarians who qualified for merit, even if all nominees for Exceptional Merit could not be officially recognized by the University due to the percentage limitation on merit awards. The final monetary award for Exceptional Merit will be determined by the Provost, based on a recommendation from the Dean of the Library.

**Appendix C**

**A. EXCEPTIONAL MERIT NOMINATION**

**I. The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga**

Nominee's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Library Department \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

A recommendation for the rating of Exceptional Merit Nomination requires specific, detailed evidence of the level of contributions. Evidence should highlight performance that is remarkable, distinguished, or exceptional.

Nominations should be no less than ½ page and no more than one page (single spaced) and should be attached to this form.

The Library Dean will append this form and its attachments to the nominee's current EDO as part of the nominee's permanent library record. Receipt of this nomination form by the Library Dean does not constitute an actual Exceptional Merit Award.

Signature of Person(s) making the Nomination

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Nominating party(s) are responsible for providing copies of this form and any attachments for the following:

- Library Dean (original)
- Nominee's Supervisor
- Nominee

## **Appendix 1**

### **Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee**

The Lupton Library Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (RTRC) is composed of all tenured faculty members of the Lupton Library.

In addition to procedures outlined in the *UTC Faculty Handbook*, the RTRC operates under the following assumptions:

- The RTRC recommendation (approval or denial) is determined by a majority of those present and voting (yes or no). Abstentions are not counted with regard to the recommendation.
- All ballots are secret.
- All votes are validated by two committee members, as designated by the chair.
- Ballots are shredded following the tallying of the vote.
- All deliberations of the RTRC are confidential.

### **Guidelines of the Library Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee**

- Dean calls organizational meeting of tenured faculty before October 15th.
- Tenured faculty members organize a Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (RTRC), composed of all tenured faculty members and select a chair for the year before October 15th.
- All dates in this document are subject to change per adjustments made to the UTC Faculty Handbook.

### **Reappointment**

- The RTRC Chair sends out an email request to all eligible candidates to submit one electronic and one paper copy of each of the following: current curriculum vita, current and previous year's EDO's, original appointment letter, research category form, and a statement on their philosophy of librarianship (See: Reappointment Folder checklist).
  - In addition, starting in the 3rd year, a one page comprehensive summary letter outlining all achievements toward tenure and promotion should be submitted.
- Please see the Faculty Handbook for reappointment, tenure, and promotion dates and deadlines.
- RTRC Chair reviews the folder(s) for completeness. If any items are missing, the chair advises the candidate(s) to submit the same.
- RTRC Chair circulates the folder(s) among the members of the committee for review and evaluation and calls a meeting. The chair should make every effort to ensure that all members have the ability to attend.
- The RTR Committee members meet to discuss how and to what extent the candidate and the materials submitted meet the criteria for reappointment as laid out in the Lupton Library Bylaws and UTC Faculty Handbook. The Chair will contact the candidate if the committee requires any further information. At the conclusion of deliberations, the committee votes. At least 2/3 of the committee members must be present to vote. If called for, the voting should be anonymous. Approval or denial of reappointment is determined by a simple majority of those present and voting.
- Based on the committee deliberations, the RTRC Chair composes a detailed letter to the Dean justifying the decision to approve or deny reappointment and explaining any concerns, contrary votes, and disagreements among committee members as appropriate. The letter includes both the vote count and a list of committee members in attendance (See: Sample Letter to Dean).

- The RTRC Chair distributes the letter to the committee and calls a meeting where the letter can be discussed, clarified, and finalized. At least 2/3 of the committee members must attend this meeting, and those attending must unanimously approve the final document.
- The final recommendation letter and Reappointment Folder are submitted to the Dean by the recommendation date applicable to the renewal year of the candidate (shown above).
- The RTRC Chair notifies the candidate of the reappointment decision via written recommendation. The letter sent to the candidate differs from the one sent to the Library Dean only in that it does not include the committee vote. However, the candidate may request the vote count from the Library Dean.
- The Dean makes a written recommendation (approval or denial) for reappointment to the Provost and sends a copy to the candidate and to the Chair of the RTRC. The Chair shares the information with the members of the committee.
- The Provost reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the Chancellor, and sends a copy to the candidate.
- The Chancellor notifies the candidate of the final decision.

### **Tenure**

- By July 1st, the Dean sends out a request via email to librarians eligible for tenure, including those requesting early consideration, to submit their dossier by October 15th. (See: Dossier Checklist)
- The Dean hands over the dossier(s) to the Chair.
- RTRC Chair reviews the dossier(s) for completeness. If any items are missing, the chair advises the candidate(s) to submit the same.
- RTRC Chair circulates the dossier(s) among the members of the committee for review and evaluation and calls a meeting. The chair should make every effort to ensure that all members have the ability to attend.
- The RTR Committee members meet to discuss how and to what extent the candidate and the materials submitted meet the criteria for tenure as laid out in the Lupton Library Bylaws and UTC Faculty Handbook. The Chair will contact the candidate if the committee requires any further information. At the conclusion of deliberations, the committee votes. At least 2/3 of the committee members must be present to vote. If called for, the voting should be anonymous. Approval or denial of tenure is determined by a simple majority of those present and voting.
- Based on the committee deliberations, the RTRC Chair composes a detailed letter to the Dean justifying the decision to approve or deny tenure and explaining any concerns, contrary votes, and disagreements among committee members as appropriate. The letter includes both the vote count and a list of committee members in attendance (See: Sample Letter to Dean).
- The RTRC Chair distributes the letter to the committee and calls a meeting where the letter can be discussed, clarified, and finalized. At least 2/3 of the committee members must attend this meeting, and those attending must unanimously approve the final document.
- The final recommendation letter and dossier are submitted to the Dean by March 1st.
- The RTRC Chair notifies the candidate of the tenure decision via written recommendation. The letter sent to the candidate differs from the one sent to the Library Dean only in that it does not include the committee vote. However, the candidate may request the vote count from the Library Dean.
- The Dean makes a written recommendation (approval or denial) for tenure to the Provost and sends a copy to the candidate and to the Chair of the RTRC. The Chair shares the information with the members of the committee.
- The Provost reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the Chancellor, and sends a copy to the candidate.

- The Chancellor reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the President, and sends a copy to the candidate.
- The President reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, and sends a copy to the candidate.
- The Board of Trustees notifies the candidate of the final decision.

### **Promotion**

- By July 1st, the Dean sends out a request via email to librarians eligible for promotion to submit their dossier by October 15th. (See: Dossier Checklist)
- The Dean hands over the dossier(s) to the Chair.
- RTRC Chair reviews the dossier(s) for completeness. If any items are missing, the chair advises the candidate(s) to submit the same.
- RTRC Chair circulates the dossier(s) among the members of the committee for review and evaluation and calls a meeting. The chair should make every effort to ensure that all members have the ability to attend.
- The RTRC Committee members meet to discuss how and to what extent the candidate and the materials submitted meet the criteria for promotion as laid out in the Lupton Library Bylaws and UTC Faculty Handbook. The Chair will contact the candidate if the committee requires any further information. At the conclusion of deliberations, the committee votes. At least 2/3 of the committee members must be present to vote. If called for, the voting should be anonymous. Approval or denial of promotion is determined by a simple majority of those present and voting.
- Based on the committee deliberations, the RTRC Chair composes a detailed letter to the Dean justifying the decision to approve or deny promotion and explaining any concerns, contrary votes, and disagreements among committee members as appropriate. The letter includes both the vote count and a list of committee members in attendance (See: Sample Letter to Dean).
- The RTRC Chair distributes the letter to the committee and calls a meeting where the letter can be discussed, clarified, and finalized. At least 2/3 of the committee members must attend this meeting, and those attending must unanimously approve the final document.
- The final recommendation letter and dossier are submitted to the Dean by March 1st.
- The RTRC Chair notifies the candidate of the promotion decision via written recommendation. The letter sent to the candidate differs from the one sent to the Library Dean only in that it does not include the committee vote. However, the candidate may request the vote count from the Library Dean.
- The Dean makes a written recommendation (approval or denial) for promotion to the Provost and sends a copy to the candidate and to the Chair of the RTRC. The Chair shares the information with the members of the committee.
- The Provost reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the Chancellor, and sends a copy to the candidate.
- The Chancellor reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the President, and sends a copy to the candidate.
- The President reviews the recommendation, makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, and sends a copy to the candidate.
- The Board of Trustees notifies the candidate of the final decision.

## Appendix 2 Research Category Form

A template for the research category form, to be submitted each year with the candidate’s review documents and provided as an editable spreadsheet, is available on the library wiki. The following is an example of how the printed spreadsheet may appear.

Broad Area <sup>1</sup>	Activity <sup>2</sup>	Category <sup>3</sup>	Description <sup>4</sup>	Year <sup>5</sup>	Comments <sup>6</sup>

**1. Broad Area:** (Choose One) Board, Committee, Editing, Grant, Presentation, Writing, Service, Other

**2. Activity:** Select activity from within the broad area.

**3. Category:** (Choose One): 1, 2, or 3. If the category selected is higher than that indicated by the handbook, explain in the comments field.

**4. Description:** A brief citation or description of the work being considered.

**5. Year:** The year the activity was completed.

**6. Comments:** Use to explain why the category selected is higher/lower than that suggested by the handbook.

## **Appendix 3 Standard Dossier**

### Standard Dossier

Faculty being considered for tenure and promotion will be asked to submit a dossier.

The dossier should include, but is not limited to the following materials:

- An introductory letter that articulates the candidate's growth and justifies tenure/promotion in rank in each of the three areas of evaluation: librarianship, research, and service.
- A one page summary of accomplishments.
- A current vita describing the candidate's education and experience prior to coming to UTC or progression at UTC.
- Copies of publications, presentations, appointment letters, letters documenting public service, and other materials of value to the evaluation process.
- Copies of EDOs.

Sample dossiers are available upon request to review in the Deans Office.

The University has a checklist of items that must be included in a dossier or that must accompany a dossier. Please check the Faculty Handbook or ask the Deans Office for the most recent version of the checklist.

Please refer to the *UTC Faculty Handbook* for additional information