

**BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY**  
**PROCEDURES FOR PERSONNEL CASES**

**Office of the Provost**

**August 2024**

This document is intended to be helpful to Department Chairs, Deans, and Initiating Personnel Committees (hereafter referred to as IPC) by serving as a guide to the effective fulfillment of their recommendations on personnel cases. It defines deadlines, describes salient provisions of Article VII of the *Faculty By-Laws*, establishes other administrative procedures, and clarifies the criteria the Administration will use in reaching decisions on personnel cases. These guidelines have been developed after consultation with the University Personnel Committee.

**1. REVIEW CYCLE** - The Administration, with the approval of the All-University Personnel Committee, has established the following pattern of appointment, review, and renewal for non-tenured faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor and Assistant Librarian. Under normal circumstances, this sequence allows a junior untenured faculty member two years following initial appointment to establish a research program, to demonstrate teaching ability, and to perform an appropriate amount of University service before a substantive review takes place. It also provides time for direction and mentoring by senior colleagues as the faculty member progresses toward the tenure decision. It is expected that these faculty members will be informally reviewed within their academic units annually, and that they will be kept informed of the results of those reviews.

- a. The usual initial appointment will be for a period of three years as Assistant Professor/Assistant Librarian.
- b. A substantive review of the record of teaching performance, scholarly productivity, and service contributions will take place during the third year of the appointment. A finding of sufficient progress on all three aspects of the University's missions will normally result in a recommendation for an additional three-year appointment. A negative recommendation will result in a one-year terminal appointment.
- c. A substantive review of the record of teaching performance, scholarly productivity, and service contributions will take place during the sixth year of the appointment for consideration for promotion and tenure. A negative recommendation will result in a one-year terminal appointment.
- d. The Administration, with the approval of the All-University Personnel Committee, has established the following pattern of appointment and review for faculty hired without tenure at the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor:
  - i. The usual initial appointment will be for a period of three years as Associate Professor or Professor.
  - ii. A substantive review of the record of teaching performance, scholarly productivity, and service contributions will take place during the second year of the appointment. A finding of sufficient progress on all three aspects of the University's missions will normally result in a recommendation for tenure, effective at the beginning of the third year in the title. A negative review will normally result in the recommendation that, upon expiration of the current appointment, a renewal will not be offered.
- e. Units may recommend to the Dean and the Provost that a review schedule other than the one outlined above should be followed when more appropriate to the circumstances of an individual case.
- f. All units should informally review all untenured faculty each year as part of on-going mentoring programs.

**2. LEAVES**

- a. A request for a leave of absence without or at reduced pay or for a leave at qualified rank by a faculty member whose mandated personnel action is scheduled to take place during the period of the anticipated leave may be accompanied by a request for an extension of the present appointment corresponding to the length of the leave.
- b. Should the leave request be approved, the extension will also be approved unless circumstances dictate otherwise.

**3. REVIEW CRITERIA** - According to Article XII, Title A. §4. of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees*, in conducting evaluations pursuant to this Title, the chief administrative officer of the college concerned, or designee, may consider, but shall not be limited to consideration of the following: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching;

scholarly ability; effectiveness of University service; and continuing growth. High quality in teaching and research, as well as a demonstrated willingness to serve the University and public, is required for promotions and/or the granting of tenure. Faculty's research should not be evaluated in isolation: scholarship, teaching, and service may be interwoven. Where exceptions exist owing to the particular nature of a position or discipline, they should be clearly specified by the personnel unit in a policy statement. For example, the "Library Guidelines," included as an addendum, list the criteria for promotion of librarians. In addition to the criteria outlined in the *Policies of the Board of Trustees* and the *Handbook for Faculty and Professional Staff*, personnel committees may also consider programmatic need. The senior administration must consider institutional priorities and programmatic needs in making personnel decisions.

- a. **Mastery of subject matter** – as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards and reputation in the subject matter field.
- b. **Effectiveness in teaching** – as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials or new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation [If the candidate has come to Binghamton University within three years of being reviewed, the IPC should solicit evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching from his/her previous institution].
  - i. Teaching is a multifaceted process; no single dimension can completely capture its complexity. Any adequate evaluation of teaching must assess its many components and perspectives. For purposes of making decisions about renewal or promotion and tenure, the evidence for the quality of a faculty member's teaching should include each of the following:
    1. A self assessment of teaching in relation to the individual's teaching philosophy and goals, including how feedback from students (performance on tests, student evaluations of the course, and so forth) has been used to improve the candidate's teaching and/or student learning;
    2. Peer evaluation of the syllabi of courses taught over the years;
    3. Peer evaluation of the processes used to assess student performance over the years;
    4. Peer evaluation of the faculty member's teaching over time;
    5. Representative student evaluations of the faculty member's teaching over time (note that no preference is given for the kind of student input desired; while SOOTs are voluntary and only one of many possible approaches to student evaluation of teaching, the critical importance of student input over time is affirmed; and
    6. A summary assessment of the faculty member's contributions to the instructional mission of the academic unit including:
      - a. Course program for at least the last two years (if at Binghamton that long), including semester, course number, course title, and enrollment.
      - b. Records as principal supervisor of graduate students working on advanced degrees, distinguishing between completed and uncompleted degrees; as principal supervisor of post-doctoral scholars; as supervisor of independent work of graduate and undergraduate students.
  - ii. For purposes of making decisions about renewal or promotion and tenure, the evidence for the quality of a faculty member's teaching may also include:
    1. Tabular summary of raw data such as that collected in the SOOTS;
    2. If applicable, evidence of contributions to the educational mission of the University beyond the faculty member's own academic unit(s), for example, assessment, experiential or community-engaged learning, interprofessional education and collaboration, general education, and internationalization.

3. In addition to the above, the IPCs should use as broad a range of exemplary materials as is possible. Other possible sources of information concerning teaching include: (a) the record of new courses or course materials developed, including use of materials from multiple cultures and in multiple languages; (b) library reserve lists and development of special library collections for courses or programs; (c) documentation of pedagogical innovations; (d) information on student performance (honors work, continuation in graduate programs, post-graduate achievements); (e) supervision of undergraduate and graduate projects and theses and work as an advisor and mentor; (f) organization and supervision of internships, international exchanges, study abroad, experiential learning sites and experiences, and undergraduate research opportunities; (g) involvement in collegiate or other extracurricular student activities; (h) organization of workshops to help students develop ancillary skills (critical thinking, library skills, use of computer programs, quantitative reasoning, team work, oral communication, writing skills, artistic performances, literary/technical publications, etc.); (i) surveys of graduating students and/or alumni; (j) contributions to the preparation and supervision of graduate teaching assistants and undergraduate peer assistants; (k) record of obtaining grant support for the advancement of the University's educational mission including grants, fellowships, and scholarships; (l) participation in advising.
- c. **Scholarly ability** – as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, community-engaged scholarship, interprofessional education and collaboration scholarship, publications and reputation among colleagues. Scholarship or other creative contributions are essential for promotion, especially to a position with tenure. For most fields, publication of refereed papers in professional journals of high repute is a clear sign of scholarly activity. Scholarly books released through recognized publishers, either academic or commercial, are another sign, as are artistic presentations such as juried shows and critically reviewed performances. The growth of digital media has greatly expanded and diversified the ways that university faculty conduct and disseminate scholarly research and creative activities. Academic units should demonstrate openness to peer reviewed scholarship and creative activities produced in new media. The tenure and promotion process should encourage innovative and ambitious work and not discriminate against work simply because it is presented in new media. The criteria of excellence, impact, and originality, apply to both print and digital scholarship and creative activities. In considering a case where scholarship or creative activities are produced in new media, the IPC should address explicitly how both the external evaluators and the IPC evaluated the venue and the work in its digital form in relation to excellence, impact, and originality.
- i. Publications and other creative and professional accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. Interpretations by the most qualified members of the department, as well as by outside referees of high national or international reputation in the discipline or in pedagogy are an essential element. Reviews, citations, and appraisals in the publications of others constitute particularly significant testimony. A strongly positive pattern of professional development as scholar or creative artist including the likelihood of future important contributions should be demonstrated.
  - ii. Original work should normally be counted only after acceptance for publication or exhibition. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying the advancement of a faculty member if it has been employed in earlier justifications, except in the sense of being part of a cumulative record, unless subsequent book reviews, anthologies, citations, etc. ascribe a notably higher significance to the piece of work than was the case in an earlier personnel consideration. The burden of proof is on such a claim of enhanced significance.
  - iii. Creative work in non-literary fields (studio art, music, and theater) must be evaluated by the testimony of nationally eminent people in their fields. Not only the number but also the place of exhibitions, concerts, or performances should be taken into account.
  - iv. Community-engaged scholarship is a mutually beneficial collaborative process between the scholar and community partner, grounded in the qualities of mutual respect, shared authority and co-creation of goals and outcomes. Community-engaged scholarship may be evaluated by outcomes such as peer-reviewed publications; reports to local, national, or international agencies; formal presentations

or creative activities; or resource acquisition. Criteria of excellence, impact, and/or originality apply to all forms of community-engaged scholarship as determined by the person's academic unit.

- v. Interprofessional education occurs when two or more professions learn from, with, and about each other with the goal of improving community and patient health outcomes. Interprofessional collaboration is a mutually beneficial relationship committed to shared responsibility, mutual authority and accountability for success. Interprofessional scholarship integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines to advance health-related outcomes. Interprofessional education and collaboration scholarship may be evaluated by outcomes such as peer-reviewed publications; reports to local, national, or international agencies; formal presentations or creative activities; or resource acquisition. Criteria of excellence, impact, and/or originality apply to all forms of interprofessional education and collaboration scholarship as determined by the person's academic unit.
- vi. Before making a decision concerning tenure or promotion, the Administration requires that at least four independent letters of evaluation be obtained from noted scholars or professional practitioners outside the University who are recognized authorities in the candidate's field of specialization. Outside letters are not required for Library tenure decisions. IPCs ordinarily solicit such letters, which will be a part of the records on which their recommendations are based. Evaluation rather than recommendation should be sought. The evaluators should comment on the quality of the faculty member's research and publication (works or performances) and on the potential for future growth and continued contribution. The letters should, where appropriate, indicate whether the quality of the candidate's work compares favorably to that of individuals promoted at the referee's institution. If electronic letters are submitted in a candidate's file, the IPC should attach a note discussing how the submission was authenticated when there is no signature attached.
  1. At least one of the letters is to be solicited from a person on a list submitted by the candidate, if so chosen, and such candidate-designated referees will be identified. It is important that at least two-thirds of the referees be designated by the IPC.
  2. The value of outside letters depends on their being from discriminating judges who are familiar with the candidate's major works or who are willing to become familiar with them and who can evaluate their quality and significance objectively. Evaluators should be distinguished scholars or professional practitioners equal to or above the rank being proposed. The higher the rank being recommended, the more renowned should be the writers of the evaluation letters. The choice of such persons is an important part of the total evaluation process. Those selected should not have a personal relationship with the candidate that would compromise their ability to offer an independent evaluation. For example, of the four required letters, external evaluators should not be a doctoral advisor, doctoral committee member, or co-author of the candidate. Binghamton values collaborative research and scholarship. Additional letters may be sought, from co-authors for example, to clarify the role the candidate played in the collaborative effort.
    - a. The candidate and the IPC should agree on which of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative works are to be sent to external referees for review. If they cannot come to an agreement, then the candidate shall decide which works to include, and the IPC will include with the materials sent to external referees a notice that states, "A complete list of the candidate's work may also be found on the enclosed curriculum vitae, and we will gladly provide you with any listed material upon request."
  3. Copies of all such letters and an evaluation of the credentials of the referees will accompany the IPC's or Department Chair's report. Any record of personal or extensive professional association with the candidate must be included in this evaluation.
  4. Outside letters will not be placed in Official Personnel Files unless released by their authors. If the signer wants identifying information held in confidence, the name and institution of that individual will be redacted. Customary assurances of confidentiality to referees are

appropriate. All letters received in response to solicitation will become a part of the Official Personnel File when accompanied by the appropriate release.

- d. **Effectiveness of University service** – as demonstrated by such things as service to the department, program, school, and University; to the discipline or profession; and local, state, national or international communities. As the most influential group on campus, faculty have an obligation to participate in the functioning of the campus, and particularly in campus governance. Faculty service may also be directed toward professional organizations and toward the local area, the state, and the nation. Service contributions should reflect the professional experience and talents of the faculty member, and will often be more apparent as the faculty member becomes more senior.
- i. Expectations regarding university service will be greater for persons seeking promotion to full Professor than for those seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure.
  - ii. Irrespective of the faculty member's rank, every effort should be made to ensure equitable assignment of service responsibilities and a fair evaluation of all service contributions.
  - iii. Because tenure track Assistant Professors should focus on developing strong records in teaching and research, their service expectations should be minimized and certainly be far less than service expectations for tenured faculty members.
  - iv. Tenure track faculty members should be fully included in all deliberations of their departments. However, they should not be given time-intensive service assignments (e.g., chairing search committees, serving as department chairs, program directors, or undergraduate or graduate directors). In small departments or schools, where there are few tenured faculty, it may be necessary for tenure track faculty to serve in some time-intensive roles. In such cases, which should be avoided and therefore rare, department chairs and deans should provide appropriate teaching release to compensate the faculty member for such assignments and allow them to advance their research.
  - v. Because tenured faculty have a responsibility to participate in department, school, and University governance and provide service to their disciplines, service expectations for promotion to full Professor are higher. Except in exceptional cases when candidates assumed heavy service responsibilities as assistant professors, candidates should demonstrate progressively greater service commitments between the time they are promoted to associate professor and the time they are considered for promotion to full Professor.
  - vi. University service includes membership on and/or leadership of department, school, and University committees, administrative positions held, and recruitment and mentoring of students and/or faculty.
  - vii. Service to the profession or discipline includes active participation in academic or professional societies, editorial boards, review of manuscripts, grant proposals, and tenure/promotion cases, and work on boards and commissions.
  - viii. Service to government, the community, and non-profit organizations that is commensurate with a faculty member's professional expertise or standing shall also be considered. The extent and impact of a faculty member's contributions to the outreach mission of the University may, in exceptional cases, serve as a major reason for promotion to Professor.
  - ix. In assessing the quality of University, professional, or external service, the IPC should evaluate the faculty member's contributions through:
    - a) The candidate's self-assessment of service that describes positions held and contributions made;
    - b) Documentation that the faculty member's contributions were appropriate for the person's academic unit and rank;
    - c) Documentation that engagement and community service activities were of high quality;
    - d) In cases of promotion from associate to full professor, documentation provided by peers in the form of solicited memoranda or letters that the faculty member's contributions were significant and sustained over time; and

- e) Consideration of the importance of different types of service to the mission of the faculty member's unit and the University.
- x. In reviewing the IPC report on service contributions, the AUPC shall recognize that unit and disciplinary expectations for service vary and shall evaluate a faculty member's service in the context of the unit's expectations and mission.
- e. **Continuing growth** – as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic employee's fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility.
  - i. In order to pursue new knowledge and present it to students and colleagues, a faculty member must stay current in the field of scholarship. For untenured faculty, evidence should show sustained intellectual growth that reflects progress toward the achievement of tenure. For tenured faculty, evidence of continued mastery of the subject area is expected. The evaluation of a candidate must take into account the contributions the individual may be making to interdisciplinary fields of study. When there is such a scholarly affiliation, evaluators must invite and consider materials submitted by interdisciplinary programs as evidence of the candidate's professional activities within that program.
- f. **Instructors** – The principal responsibility of instructors is to support Binghamton University's undergraduate teaching mission. Consistent with that responsibility, instructors carry heavier teaching load than other tenured and tenure track faculty. As a result, evaluation of instructors for renewal and tenure will focus primarily on assessing the quality and effectiveness of their teaching and contributions to student learning. Instructors are also obligated to provide service to the department, in areas related to its undergraduate teaching and advising mission, and to engage in activities that enable them to remain current in their field (e.g., participation in and presentations at conferences, papers and publications on pedagogy).
  - i. The IPC shall provide the UPC with the written statement of responsibilities and expectations that was drawn up at the time of hiring in consultation and with the endorsement of the School Dean. This statement will ordinarily provide the UPC with an understanding of the expectations for teaching, student learning, service, and remaining current in their field.
  - ii. Departments are expected to create a rich file of peer observations of instructors' teaching.
  - iii. When departments consider instructors for renewal or tenure, they must include at least four measures of teaching effectiveness. These might include the results of SOOT surveys; peer observations; surveys of former students; reviews of an instructor's teaching and teaching portfolio by qualified external reviewers; assessment results indicating an instructor's contributions to student learning and curriculum development; other measures developed by the department.

**4. REVIEW TIMETABLE**

Non-Mandated Decisions		Mandated Decisions	
<b>All promotions to full professor or cases for early decision (1, 2)</b>		<b>Renewal and tenure decisions for faculty whose term expires in August (3)</b> & Faculty whose term expires between May 30 and November 30	<b>Renewal and tenure decisions for faculty whose term expires December 31 or earlier</b> & Faculty whose term expires between December 1 and May 29
2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday in September	IPC initiates action as outlined in Article VII. Title E, 2b of the <i>Faculty Bylaws</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday in September	4 <sup>th</sup> Monday in April
2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday in December (4)	Report and recommendation of IPC must be submitted to Dean by	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday in February	4 <sup>th</sup> Monday in September
2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday in January	Dean, after review and consultation specified in Article VII, adds own report and forwards the case to the UPC	4 <sup>th</sup> Monday in February	2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday in October
1 <sup>st</sup> Monday in April	The UPC will consider the case and will send their recommendation to the Provost by	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday in April	1 <sup>st</sup> Monday in November
	The Provost will consider the case and send his/her recommendation to the President		
3 <sup>rd</sup> Monday in April	The UPC recommendation must be made to the President through the Provost by	3 <sup>rd</sup> Monday in April (5, 6)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Monday in November (5)
	Mandated date for President to notify faculty member	August 31st (7)	December 15th (7)

1. Faculty wishing to initiate consideration for promotion must petition the IPC in writing no later than the second Monday in September. IPCs may also initiate such considerations with the approval of the candidate.
2. IPCs should consider proposed promotions at the same time they consider contract renewals, especially when such situations relate to calendar-year appointments that do not commence on September 1.
3. Decision for terminal year or further extension
4. Non-mandated cases not sent from the IPC to the Dean by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday in December may be deferred until the next academic year.
5. If recommendations of the University Personnel Committee are not received in the President's Office by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday in April, the President may have to act without the benefit of this advice.
6. All library faculty cases requiring notification any time between May 30 and August 31 are included in this group. Other library faculty cases should be timed to enable the UPC recommendation to be submitted to the President one month prior to notification date.
7. Date mandated by the *Policies of the Board of Trustees* and by the *Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions*.

## 5. PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

- a. All departments, non- departmentalized Schools and the Library shall have a Junior Personnel Committee and a Senior Personnel Committee.
- b. The minimum size of an IPC shall be five voting members.
  - i. Decisions shall require a majority of the total of Committee members in residence, plus those members not in residence but voting. The results of this vote shall become a part of the Committee's report and recommendation. The record of the final vote taken shall include the number of Committee members in residence plus those not in residence but voting. NOTE: Article I.f. of the *Faculty-By-Laws* defines faculty in residence as: "Those members of the faculty whose duty assignments require their presence on campus and those faculty who will be on campus without duty assignments but declare their wish at the beginning of the semester to be listed in residence." Faculty members who are officially on sabbatical, Title F leave, sick leave, or leave without pay are considered not in residence unless they express a wish to the contrary.
  - ii. With the exception of Committee members not in residence, no member who is not present at the meeting of the Committee may vote when the question is completely put, unless the absence is for a bona fide cause, as determined by a majority of the Committee.
- c. The Department Chair of a departmentalized academic unit may be elected to chair an IPC, except when their own case is being considered. The Department Chair shall serve without vote.
- d. Deans shall not be members of any IPC.
- e. Types and Composition of Personnel Committees
  - i. Junior Personnel Committees. All full professors and associate professors on continuing appointment shall serve on the Junior Personnel Committee to consider cases of those below the rank of associate professor. Bartle Professors holding the title of full professor or associate professor, who agree to serve on the Committee during a given academic year, and within a 5-year limit from the date of appointment as Bartle Professor, shall do so. An academic unit which has fewer than five qualified members available shall notify all qualified members and the Provost, who shall then appoint, after consultation with the dean and the Junior Personnel Committee of the academic unit in which the case is being heard, the number necessary to make up the minimum complement of five voting members. In cases where no member of an academic unit is eligible for service on a Junior Personnel Committee, the members of that unit shall elect from among themselves a person who shall serve as the Chairperson-without-vote of the Junior Personnel Committee in question. Appointment of voting members of a Junior Personnel Committee from outside the University may be made only if such a procedure is approved by the dean and the Junior Personnel Committee of the academic unit in question. When a Junior Personnel Committee is formed by adding members from outside the unit, the Provost shall provide the appropriate University Personnel Committee a brief rationale.
  - ii. Senior Personnel Committees. In instances where there are less than five (5) full professors in an academic unit the following principles with respect to committee membership apply:
    1. All full professors in the unit are members of the committee.
    2. If there are three (3) full professors in an academic unit, Associate professors who are on continuing appointment with at least two semesters of academic service at this university must be notified and of the need to form a Senior Personnel Committee and may be elected to the IPC by the faculty within the unit to fill up to two vacant slots.
    3. If there are less than three (3) full professors in the academic unit, the vacant slots will be filled by full professors in other academic units of the university appointed by the Provost after consultation with the dean and the Senior Personnel Committee of the academic unit in which the case is being heard. When a Senior Personnel Committee is formed by adding members from outside the unit, the Provost shall provide the appropriate University Personnel Committee a brief rationale.



- iii. Special Personnel Committees. A Special Personnel Committee shall be formed to act as the IPC in those cases of faculty members not assigned to academic units having Personnel Committees. Special Personnel Committees shall be appointed by the Provost. Each Special Personnel Committee shall elect a Chairperson-with-vote and secretary from among its members and shall serve only for the duration of the individual case under consideration.
  - iv. Individuals who are on leave without pay from Binghamton University while holding a tenured or tenure track appointment at another University may not serve on an Initiating Personnel Committee.
- f. Personnel Committee Officers
- i. The Secretary. Each IPC shall elect a secretary to keep such records as the Committee shall designate.
  - ii. The Chairperson. The Chairperson shall be elected by secret ballot from the committee's membership and shall preside, with vote, at committee meetings. The Department Chair of a departmentalized academic unit may be elected to chair an IPC, except when their own case is being considered, but the Department Chair shall serve without vote. The Chairperson of an IPC shall not be present when his or her own case is being considered.

## 6. FACULTY CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. An individual who believes his/her own or any other case merits consideration, though it is not required to be considered according to any timetable, may petition in writing the appropriate IPC at a time consistent with the timetable for a given year.
- b. Information that the faculty candidate must provide to the IPC includes, but is not limited to:
  - i. An up-to-data vita, the vita must include:
    - 1. Degrees received, including dates and institutions.
    - 2. Previous academic and related employment, including time in various ranks.
    - 3. Complete citations for all publications and pieces accepted for publication, and any other creative activity if in the Fine Arts, distinguishing among the following categories: books authored, books edited, articles, papers, abstracts, book reviews, and any other publications, with some indication given as to whether the piece appeared in a refereed journal. Works accepted for publication, but not yet published, should be listed separately (candidates should provide documentation for such "accepted" works). Works in progress should not be cited under "Publications". For the Fine Arts, complete indication should be given of major pieces completed, gallery exhibitions, sound recordings, citation in publications, and any other pertinent information.
    - 4. Professional and scholarly activity, honorific membership or leadership in scholarly societies, editorial services to scholarly publications, consulting activity, professional honors and special recognition received, fellowships, and research grants received, professionally related public service, and University service.
  - ii. A self assessment of teaching in relation to the faculty candidate's teaching philosophy and goals.
  - iii. Syllabi of courses taught over the years.
  - iv. Statement on research, its importance, accomplishments, and trajectory for the future.
  - v. Copies of all, or a selection of, publications.
    - 1. The publications must be deposited in the unit office, and must be available to all faculty in the unit while the case is under consideration there.
  - vi. Statement on service and use of individual's knowledge and expertise to advance our service mission.
  - vii. A list of potential external evaluators [if case is for promotion or tenure].

- c. Individual faculty members whose status is under consideration may request that a caucus of the faculty members within the academic unit not sitting on the IPC in question meet and discuss the case, excluding the individual under consideration. A summary report of this meeting must be submitted to the IPC and appended to its report.
- d. Dossiers will be considered complete after the Dean's letter is written. Only materials reflecting significant and major developments in the candidate's achievements since the personnel case was initiated will be accepted as additional material added to the case.

## **7. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES**

- a. IPCs, excluding Special Personnel Committees, have the responsibility each fall semester of insuring, either by a meeting of the academic unit or by some considered alternative accepted by the faculty of the academic unit, that the entire faculty of the academic unit is aware of the performance criteria and procedures used to judge faculty cases, as well as the rights and prerogatives of individual faculty.
- b. Each IPC shall, in cooperation with the Department Chair of the academic unit, provide a mechanism for an annual review of the records of faculty members in their purview of responsibility to determine whether there are any individuals whose cases (e.g., for promotion) shall be considered. At the same time, an individual who believes his/her own or any other case merits consideration, though it is not required to be considered according to any timetable, may petition in writing the appropriate IPC at a time consistent with the timetable for a given year.
- c. The Chairperson of the IPC, in consultation with the Dean, shall be responsible for initiating action on personnel cases for consideration. This initial action shall consist of the following:
  - i. First, notifying the faculty member whose status is under consideration of the necessary performance information to be provided, and of the status of the information in the individual's file.
  - ii. Second, presenting each faculty member of that academic unit with a list of all faculty members who are to be considered or are being considered by the IPC for promotion, tenure, and renewal. The Chairperson shall provide for the faculty of his/her academic unit a summary of appropriate information including but not limited to educational background, professional experience, community service, and honors. Any faculty member has the right to file a written opinion, which must be appended to the report of the IPC.
  - iii. Third, notifying the appropriate Student Advisory Committee, if extant, of all faculty members under consideration, and requesting a report on the teaching effectiveness and student-teacher relations of the individuals under consideration.
    - 1. The Student Advisory Committee should be informed that faculty members under consideration in the academic unit must not be compared and contrasted. Students may choose to have their comments forwarded anonymously.
- d. The IPC, on a majority vote, may request that a caucus of the faculty members within the academic unit not sitting on the IPC in question meet and discuss the case, excluding the individual under consideration. A summary report of this meeting must be submitted to the IPC and appended to its report.
- e. IPCs will prepare a dossier for each individual under consideration, and make a recommendation in each case to the appropriate UPC through the Dean.

## **8. STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

- a. In an academic unit with declared majors and/or graduate students, the IPC shall ask students to elect a Student Advisory Committee or Committees. In the case one does not exist, the Dean may request that a student advisory board be formed. There may be one undergraduate student advisory committee and one graduate student advisory committee, or a single combined committee. Each committee shall consist of three to eight students, and shall elect its own chair. A wide range of students should be included.

- b. The student advisory committee(s), when extant, shall be asked to report on the teaching effectiveness and student-teacher relations of the individuals under consideration. The committee should gather student opinions as follows: 1) solicit the opinions of students in the academic unit; 2) verify that the opinions they have solicited do come from identifiable students in that academic unit; and 3) prepare a single report summarizing the range of viewpoints. The committee must ensure that in their report, no names of individual students appear. Student opinions may be collected in a number of ways, for example: through signed emails, signed letters, and surveys conducted in the faculty member's classroom. Only the members of the student advisory committee(s) should sign the committee's report.
- c. The report(s) of the student advisory committee(s) must be included with the report of the IPC. This report must be shared with the faculty member in question, who shall be given time to file a written comment with the IPC. This comment, when extant, must also be included in its report. If a report from the student advisory committee is not included in the report of an IPC, the reasons shall be stated in the latter report.

## **9. DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR DEAN RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

- a. The Department Chair, or in non-departmentalized schools the Dean, shall provide to the Student Advisory Committee in his/her academic unit, if extant, a roster of the declared majors and graduate students in his/her academic unit.
- b. The Department Chair, or in non-departmentalized schools the Dean, guides the IPC in assembling information relevant to the cases it considers.
- c. When the personnel case of the Department Chair is being considered by the IPC, the IPC chairperson shall take on the responsibilities listed in paragraphs 9.a.b. above.

## **10. PROCEDURES FOR PERSONNEL CASES OTHER THAN INITIAL APPOINTMENTS**

- a. Initiating Personnel Committee
  - i. Personnel cases and the information contained within them are assembled according to the Faculty Personnel Action Summary that can be found on the Provost's webpage <http://provost.binghamton.edu>.
  - ii. At the conclusion of its deliberations, the IPC shall conduct a secret ballot on the case under consideration. The Department Chair of a departmentalized academic unit is a full participant in discussions, except when their own case is being considered. The Department Chair has no vote in the IPC. Reasonable efforts shall be made to secure the views of Committee members not in residence, and such members shall be entitled to attend Committee meetings and to participate fully in all deliberations when in attendance, and to vote when in attendance or when their vote to be obtained by mail would not unduly interfere with scheduling and successive steps of Personnel Committee procedures. Decisions shall require a majority of the total of Committee members in residence plus those members not in residence but voting. The results of this vote shall become a part of the Committee's report and recommendation.
  - iii. Those not in residence but participating have an obligation to review the materials in the file before counting their vote.
  - iv. The Secretary shall prepare a written report including the report and recommendation of the Committee, the record of the final vote taken, and all supporting documentation.
    1. Written Report
      - a. The IPC report must include its recommendation either in favor or denying promotion and/or tenure, its rationale for the decision, and a summary of the faculty discussion of the case, which must include a discussion of how positive and negative comments from external reviewers and members of the IPC were taken into consideration, as well as the record of the final vote taken (as defined in 4.2.1 above). If members of the IPC do not concur with the content or the summations contained within the IPC report, they may opt to attach a dissenting minority report, which shall remain

anonymous. If a minority report is attached, it must be attached within 48 hours of the majority report, and the IPC will be afforded an opportunity to respond to the minority report. If a minority report has been attached and if an IPC response has been attached to the minority report, all documents shall be issued as the complete IPC report and given to the candidate.

- b. The IPC report should clearly indicate the sources on which the appraisals of teaching competence have been based.
- c. The IPC report should include the report from a Student Advisory Committee. If a report from the Student Advisory Committee is not included in the personnel case, the reason shall be stated in the IPC report.
- d. If a caucus of the faculty members within the academic unit not sitting on the IPC in question meet and discuss the case, a summary report of this meeting must be submitted to the IPC and appended to its report.
- e. The IPC report must be approved by a majority of the Committee members in residence plus those not in residence but participating. The Secretary should indicate in some manner that a majority of the Committee has accepted the report.

## 2. Supporting Documentation

- a. The vote of the IPC should be recorded on the Faculty Personnel Action Summary.
  - b. Reports from the Student Advisory Committee, if extant, and the faculty member's comments on those reports. If the faculty member chooses not to comment, this should be indicated.
  - c. Unsolicited statements written by other members of the University community. Such statements will be made available to the candidate with the rest of the materials, and will not be included in the "confidential file".
  - d. For personnel cases involving promotion, outside letters of evaluation and an evaluation of the credentials of referees. These letters are considered "solicited documents" in the policies concerning official personnel files.
  - e. Publications - one set to accompany the IPC report. These will become a part of the candidate's personnel file once the case is concluded.
  - f. When available, one set of published reviews of the candidate's work and/or listings from citation indices.
  - g. All other documents considered by the Committee, including a summary of any sub-committee reports on research, teaching, and service, any teaching evaluations released by the faculty member, and written opinions filed by other faculty members.
  - h. The IPC should include the candidate's third year review letter for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure cases. The IPC need not include the candidate's Annual Faculty Reports.
- v. Upon approval by the majority of the Committee members in residence plus those not in residence but participating, the report shall be submitted to the appropriate University Personnel Committee through the appropriate administrative officer.
  - vi. Individual faculty members or groups of faculty members may also submit separate reports to the UPC.
  - vii. The Chairperson shall notify in writing each candidate whose case the IPC has considered of its report and recommendation before said report is forwarded. The Chairperson shall at the same time inform the candidate in writing that they have five working days to review the report and recommendation and to respond in writing to the IPC report. This response, if any, shall be included in the evaluation file. In non-mandated cases, however, the candidate shall be allowed at least one

academic day after receipt of the written recommendation and consultation with the Chairperson to terminate the personnel proceedings before the case is forwarded to the appropriate Dean.

- viii. Submission - The IPC forwards the original and two (2) copies of material to the Dean by the date specified in the Timetable (one copy for the UPC, one copy for Human Resources, and one copy for the dean). This material consists of: the IPC Report and recommendation, the report and recommendation of the Department Chair (if applicable), and any other supporting documents. If the candidate has submitted a reply to any of the evaluative materials available to him/her, that reply is included with the rest of the materials.

b. Department Chair

- i. Except when their own case is being considered, the Department Chair shall submit an independent written report and recommendation to the UPC through the Dean at the same time the IPC report is forwarded. This report shall be made available to the members of the Personnel Committee that considered the case, subsequent to the Committee's decision, and to the candidate.

c. Dean

- i. The Dean shall be responsible for conducting a review of the reports and recommendations received on personnel cases.
  - 1. The Dean may, at this point, initiate informal discussions and consultation in order to clarify any difficulties contained in or created by the recommendations and/or candidate's response on a given case. The Dean may seek whatever additional information/evaluation of a candidate's performance they may deem appropriate to come to an independent judgment on the merits of the case.
- ii. Deans must include their reports and recommendations to the President through the Provost when forwarding the other reports and supporting evidence on a case to the UPC and must provide a copy of their report to the candidate and to the IPC responsible for the given case, subsequent to the IPC's decision.
- iii. Submission – the Dean will forward one (1) copy to the Provost for the University Personnel Committee and one (1) copy to Human Resources.

d. University Personnel Committee

- i. In personnel cases involving faculty status, the final campus review by faculty is conducted by the University Personnel Committee (UPC). This review is subsequent to reviews by the Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) and by appropriate administrators through the level of Dean.
  - 1. The appropriate UPC shall examine the official personnel file with the ultimate goal of achieving a decision that is reflected in the Final UPC Report. As an intermediate goal, the UPC will typically prepare a Preliminary UPC Report.
  - 2. Prior to completion of its Preliminary Report the UPC may, at its discretion, seek additional information, as well as clarification of information already in the file.
  - 3. Any additional documents received by the UPC in this process must be placed in the official personnel file. The UPC may also add written comments to the file. As with all information in the official personnel file, the added information is subject to all relevant rules and regulations.
  - 4. In cases where there is not concurrence by all parties, including the UPC, who have acted on the case, the UPC must include in the Preliminary UPC Report, and add to the personnel file, a summary (however brief) of the discussion that led to the UPC decision. Any minority report from the UPC membership must also be included.
  - 5. At any point in this process the UPC may decide to move directly to a Formal Review of the case. When this is done, the Preliminary Report will simply state the UPC's decision to move directly to a Formal Review and its rationale for doing so.

6. Notification of its action, in the form of the Preliminary UPC Report, shall be sent to the faculty member under review, IPC, appropriate administrators through the level of Dean, and the Provost.
  7. Any request for a formal review must be given within one week<sup>1</sup> of the Preliminary UPC Report notification.
  8. Unless prohibited by rules and regulations, including those concerning confidentiality, any information added by the UPC to the personnel file will accompany the Preliminary UPC Report.
  9. Except when there is a request for a formal review, the Preliminary UPC Report will automatically become the Final UPC Report one week subsequent to this notification -- at which time it will be forwarded to the President through the Provost.
10. The UPC shall hold a formal review of a pending personnel action upon the request of any one of the following: The faculty member involved, the appropriate Dean, the Provost, or one-third of the voting members of an IPC.
  11. Notification of the formal review shall be made to the faculty member involved, to the IPC, to the appropriate Department Chair, Dean, and to the Provost. Rationale, however brief, for holding a formal review must be given. Each of the parties shall be requested to submit to the UPC within two weeks of notification, in writing, all any new material considered relevant to the matter and reflecting a substantive change to the dossier. Any material received after two weeks, but prior to the final decision of the appropriate UPC, may be accepted as supporting evidence by the Committee at its discretion.
  12. The recommendation of the UPC shall be voted by secret ballot, and a majority of all Committee members eligible to vote shall be required for the establishment of the recommendation. A written recommendation and report of the Committee and a tally of the vote shall be submitted to the President through the Provost and a copy shall be placed in the official personnel file of the faculty member whose case is being considered. At least five days before the file is to be reviewed by the President of the University, the candidate must be informed in writing of the decision of the UPC and that they may review the file and respond. If the President is not inclined to implement the recommendations of the UPC, the President or the President's designee shall meet with the UPC to review the case. This must be done within three weeks of the receipt of the report from the UPC. If the President then decides against implementing the UPC's recommendation, they shall indicate the reasons for their decision.
- ii. Submission – The University Personnel Committee shall forward its recommendation to the Provost. The UPC shall also inform the following parties of its decision: the candidate, the Dean, the Department Chair, and the Chair of the IPC.
- e. Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
- i. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall be responsible for conducting a review of the reports and recommendations received on personnel cases.
    1. The Provost may seek whatever additional information/evaluation of a candidate's performance they may deem appropriate to come to an independent judgment on the merits of the case.
  - ii. Submission – The Provost, after consultation with the Dean, will inform the President and the candidate of his or her independent recommendation to promote/not to promote or renew/not to renew the candidate. Copies of his or her recommendation are sent to the Dean, the Department

---

<sup>1</sup> One week is considered to be seven calendar days.

Chair, the Chair of the IPC, the Chair of the UPC, and to Human Resources to be added to the candidate's Official Personnel File.

- f. Nothing in these procedures shall be construed to limit in any way informal consultation among appropriate administrative officers, the heads of the academic units, the IPC, and the UPC.
- g. All parties involved in personnel actions shall protect the confidentiality of all personnel proceedings and documents.
- h. In any case that is not mandated, the individual shall have the option of terminating the personnel proceedings at any point in the process prior to the President's decision.
- i. Nothing in this Article shall restrict the right of an individual to have his/her case reviewed by all of the committees and administrative officers identified in this Article. However, in any mandated case when any personnel committee, Department Chair, Dean, or Director has made a negative recommendation, and the individual resigns prior to completion of the case, the recommendations along with all documentation acquired in the personnel action to this point shall be sent to the UPC through the channels defined in this Article but shall not be subject to further review. Moreover, such documents and recommendations shall not be placed in any of his/her personnel files, unless the individual requests otherwise.
- j. When an IPC fails to carry out its mandated functions, the AUPC shall insure the proper processing of personnel cases. This may include the augmentation of the regular IPC. To effect this augmentation, the AUPC shall appoint additional members to the IPC in question in consultation with the President or his/her designee. No special augmentation or other variance from normal procedure shall occur unless (a) two-thirds of the AUPC approve, and (b) two-thirds of the department or school voting faculty involved approve.

## 11. INTER-UNIT JOINT APPOINTMENTS

- a. Inter-Unit Joint Appointment: An appointment to a position in more than one academic unit or subunit. Teaching obligation, line, space, and salary are shared between academic units. However, the personnel berth is assigned to only one academic unit.
  - i. For faculty with inter-unit joint appointments, it is the berth unit that initiates the personnel process and invites the non-berth unit to undertake its own review.
  - ii. In cases of inter-unit joint appointments, the personnel berth IPC will solicit a report and recommendation, including the Department Chair's recommendation if a departmentalized School, from the advisory IPC in the non-berth academic unit of appointment(s), and presentation by a representative of the non-berth IPC, to use in its deliberations.
  - iii. Additionally, the personnel berth committee must agree upon outside evaluators with the non-berth academic unit of appointment and must solicit letters from those outside evaluators. In such cases, all outside letters must be solicited jointly so that the recommendations of both academic units/subunits will be informed by these evaluations of the candidate's research record and potential.
  - iv. Any deviation from these procedures must be approved by the dean(s) and provost in writing in advance of the review.
  - v. In non-mandated personnel actions for faculty with inter-unit joint appointments, the non-berth unit may opt not to undertake the review, most usually because the individual does not meet that unit's criteria for promotion. A personnel action of this kind would result in a promotion in only the berth unit, e.g. Professor of X, Associate Professor of Y.

## 12. COURTESY TITLE

- a. Courtesy Title: A courtesy title may be granted to an individual who has an appointment to a position that is entirely within one unit, and who has formal and on-going teaching obligations only in that unit. The line and salary of the position are assigned entirely to that one unit. Courtesy titles constitute recognition of affiliation based upon the individual's interest in another discipline. Individuals holding courtesy titles may,

on a voluntary basis, participate in the teaching or research program of the other unit, but the courtesy title does not imply any obligation to do so. Courtesy titles are awarded for renewable terms of up to three years.

- i. If the faculty member has a courtesy title, the personnel berth IPC [at the request of the candidate], will consider materials, if submitted, by that interdisciplinary group as evidence of the candidate's professional activities within that organization.

### 13. INFORMATION RECEIVED AFTER IPC ACTION

- a. Documented information that may substantially influence a personnel case, and that was received after an IPC recommendation has been forwarded, shall be made available to all parties to the personnel process
  - i. All restrictions regarding solicited and unsolicited documents shall apply in such cases.
- b. Such new information may be used by individuals and committees and may serve as the basis for a reconsideration of the case by an individual or a committee.
  - i. A new recommendation may follow from such reconsideration.

### 14. CONFORMITY WITH POLICIES CONCERNING OFFICIAL PERSONNEL FILES

- a. Article 31, "Personnel Files" in The *Agreement Between the State of New York and United University Professions* provides specifically for four classifications of material to be placed in Official Personnel Files: "copies of personnel transactions, official correspondence with the employee and formal, written evaluation reports prepared in accordance with provisions of Article XII, Title A, Section 3 and Article XII, Title C, Section 4 of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees* and such other written evaluations and/or recommendations as may be prepared by an immediate supervisor, Department Chairperson, Dean, Vice-President, or other persons serving in a supervisory capacity in a direct line, as appropriate, in connection with matters of appointment, evaluation, reappointment or promotion." The candidate will be provided with a copy of any such evaluation before it is placed in the Official Personnel File.
- b. Any evaluation made by the Chief Administrative Officer or a designee in accordance with Article XII. Title A. Sect. 3 of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees* shall be placed in the Official Personnel File and a copy will be provided to the candidate.
- c. Other documents to be placed in the Official Personnel File are:
  - i. Reports of IPCs, including minority reports.
  - ii. Results of polls and summaries, prepared by the caucus of the departmental faculty, or any subcommittee internal to the IPC.
  - iii. The Report of the Student Advisory Committee, if such a report is submitted to an IPC, along with the faculty member's comment upon it.
  - iv. Supplementary written statements submitted to the University Personnel Committee by IPCs, by faculty members under review, or by representatives of the Administration.
  - v. Reports and recommendations to the President from the University Personnel Committee.
  - vi. Written reports, statements, or recommendations prepared by University officers, including Department Chairs.
- d. The file of evaluative material, containing all or part of the items mentioned in 11. 1, b, and c above, developed in connection with a recommendation for appointment, reappointment, or promotion, shall be available to the faculty member prior to its being considered by the President.
- e. Statements solicited in connection with the recommendation for appointment, reappointment, or promotion, and documents, including those listed above, which would identify the source of the statements, shall not be available to the faculty member unless so released by the author.
- f. Solicited Documents: *Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions*, Article 31 §31.2 b. When a statement is solicited pursuant to Article 31.2(a) such statement shall be made available to that employee according to the respondent's reply to the following: 1. May the candidate read this



recommendation? Yes/no; and 2. May the candidate read this recommendation if all identification as to its source is deleted? Yes/no. If the respondent does not reply to the above, or if the respondent's reply is negative, the statement shall not be available to the employee.

- i. Such statements may be used in the evaluation of the faculty member and in determining that personnel action be taken.
- ii. Sub-committee reports on research, teaching, and service are solicited documents if the sub-committee membership extends beyond the IPC membership.

NOTE: Regarding subcommittee reports, the position of System Administration on this issue is that a subcommittee report would not be "solicited" as long as the members of the subcommittee are also members of the IPC. If the subcommittee membership extends beyond the IPC membership, then it is no longer internal to the IPC and its report becomes a solicited document, and will be placed in the Official Personnel File only if released by the author(s). If an internal subcommittee report is forwarded by the IPC through channels to the President, the faculty member under review may have access to it in accordance with the above. If an IPC elects not to forward a subcommittee report to the President (neither the Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions nor the Faculty By-Laws requires that they be sent) or, in the case of a report solicited from outside of the committee if the authors solicited do not grant access the report shall not be made available to the candidate.)

- g. Unsolicited Documents: Unsolicited signed statements received in connection with a faculty member's promotion, tenure, or renewal used in the evaluation of the faculty member or in determining the personnel action will be made available to the candidate.
  - i. Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions, Article 31 §31.2 a. "In no event shall statements which are both unsolicited and unsigned be placed in the official personnel file".
- h. It is essential that documents be identified clearly and plainly as solicited or unsolicited, along with a statement of release or non-release. Candidate-designated referees should also be identified.
- i. The University Personnel Committee will advise the faculty member when this evaluative material is available for review.
- j. The IPC and/or the Department Chair, except when their own case is being considered, may solicit evaluative letters from any other persons whom they deem appropriate (e.g., professional colleagues either within or outside of the University, or other persons with whom the candidate may have had professional association); all such evaluations included in the confidential file of solicited letters must be accompanied by a copy of the original letter of solicitation and an explanation of the reason for the solicitation if that is not included in the letter of solicitation.

## **15. CONFORMITY WITH CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY POLICIES**

- a. At all stages of the process, individuals involved should recuse themselves if there is a conflict of interest concerning any candidate for promotion and tenure.
- b. Individuals should not sit on the committee, write letters for, or otherwise influence the review process for a current or ex spouse, partner, or relative.
- c. Department Chairs, administrators, and secretaries should exercise due diligence to ensure that committee members or others involved in the review process do not have access to the materials of any candidate for promotion and/or tenure who is a spouse, partner, or relative.
- d. In order that the objectivity of personnel committees and proceedings is unquestionable, the strictest confidentiality must be maintained throughout. Similarly, the principle of confidentiality should continue to be honored even after a committee has finished its work and made its recommendations.

- e. The IPC report, as well as the recommendation of the Department Chair (if applicable) and the recommendation of the Dean, should not contain the names, or any other identifying information, of the outside evaluators.

### **Addendum (Library Faculty Personnel Action Summary)**

Excerpted from the Libraries' *Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, Promotion and Continuing Appointment (Tenure)*, rev. 10/25/22.

The criteria for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure are closely allied to the criteria for promotion in academic rank but are adjusted to meet the needs of the Libraries.

As stated in the Provost's Procedures, in order to pursue new knowledge and present it to students and colleagues, a faculty member must stay current in the field of librarianship. Librarians are expected to show continued growth in their professional development while maintaining current competencies.

Academic librarianship is characterized by collegiality and teamwork. Academic librarians are expected to demonstrate effective communication and interpersonal skills in fulfilling their roles within a complex organization by maintaining positive working relationships with colleagues and students throughout the University.

An individual's contributions to the Libraries' mission are measured by effectiveness of job performance, scholarship, and service contributions.

#### **I. Job Performance**

##### **A. Mastery of Subject Matter**

The terminal degree is a master's degree in library and/or information science from an American Library Association accredited program. Appropriate supplementary evidence might include additional earned degrees, certificates of advanced and/or specialized training, and language or subject expertise commensurate with a particular position description. For example, subject librarians normally need to have a strong subject background and catalog librarians working with foreign area studies materials must have the appropriate language proficiency.

##### **B. Effectiveness as a Librarian**

The effectiveness in primary job responsibilities is the most important factor for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions and is therefore given greater weight than other criteria. In order for librarians to be effective, they must successfully manage, develop, organize, interpret, and promote access to a full range of library and information resources and services. Librarians must demonstrate a general appreciation and understanding of all of the above; however, individual librarians' job responsibilities may vary significantly depending upon functional specialization within the Libraries. Effectiveness in performing job responsibilities is evaluated on the basis of the individual librarian's current and past position descriptions. Incorporating new technologies, services, and responsibilities into an existing portfolio of activities is an additional indicator of effectiveness as a librarian as is demonstrating flexibility and insight into the changing nature of the profession.

#### **II. Scholarship**

A. It is essential that each librarian participate actively in a range of scholarly activities. In the academic setting, scholarly ability is evidenced by research that serves to increase the body of knowledge in a given discipline. Librarians make significant scholarly contributions to librarianship through publication and through presentations at the local, state, and national levels. They have opportunities to engage in pure and applied research in librarianship, and, depending on their professional specializations, academic backgrounds, and intellectual interests, in areas outside librarianship. The Library Faculty considers such scholarly research to be of equal significance for promotion and continuing appointment as long as such work meets the scholarly standards expected in that discipline.

Since limitations are imposed by the nature of a librarian's professional obligations, (i.e. a 12-month year consisting of structured work days spent largely on internal library responsibilities), evaluation should be primarily qualitative. In cases of joint authorship/creation, care should be taken to recognize and evaluate the unique contributions of the candidate.

B. Publishing results in the dissemination of scholarly contributions (see section II.C) to an appropriate community. Works generally undergo considerable scrutiny before publication (for example by peers, referees, editorial boards, anthology editors, etc.). Scholarly works or other information products subjected to post-publication review may also be considered evidence of scholarly accomplishment.

C. Scholarly contributions may include, but are not limited to

- Books
- Chapters in books
- Articles
- Editing of journals
- Conference papers presented and published
- Conference presentations, both invited and accepted
- Audiovisual productions
- Creative activities: original compositions (e.g. art, cinema, literature, music), performances (e.g., music, theatre) or exhibits (physical and/or virtual)
  - Computer software, databases, and other electronic media
  - Significant Web based publications that can be peer reviewed
  - Research aids such as indexes, thesauri, catalogs, and union lists
  - Significant bibliographies
  - Significant book or media reviews
  - Administrative documents

To be considered significant, bibliographies should be meaningfully organized and/or include features such as critical introductions and evaluative annotations, or they should contribute other special value to the information community.

To be considered significant, a book or media review should be a review essay that not only critically evaluates the material but also places it in the context of the relevant literature.

Administrative documents and work products in the form of reports, handbooks, manuals, Web productions, bibliographic records and similar items may be considered in this category if they present original intellectual content, incorporate research and are able to be reviewed by outside evaluators.

### **III. Service**

Librarians must participate in university and public service and make contributions to library professional organizations at local, state, national, or international levels. As stated in the Provost's Procedures, University service includes "University or major committees, editorial work, offices held, and committee work of professional organizations." Public service involves contributions to the public good.

### **Progression through Library Faculty Ranks**

These criteria cover the four ranks for the Library Faculty: Assistant Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian. The review cycle is based upon the Provost's Procedures. The usual initial appointment will be for a period of three years.

A substantive review will take place during the third year of the appointment. A finding of satisfactory progress will normally result in a recommendation for an additional three-year appointment and for promotion to Senior Assistant Librarian. If progress is not satisfactory, the usual recommendation will be for a one-year terminal appointment.

During the sixth year of service, the substantive review for tenure will take place. A positive recommendation will normally be for promotion to Associate Librarian with tenure. A negative recommendation will be for a one-year terminal appointment.

Initial appointments at ranks other than that of Assistant Librarian may follow a schedule different from that outlined above. The IPC also may recommend to the Dean of Libraries and the Provost that a review schedule other than the one outlined above be followed when more appropriate to the circumstances of an individual case.

The Libraries will informally review all untenured faculty each year as part of an ongoing mentoring process, as described in the "Library Faculty Review Guidelines."

Recommendations for promotion may be made at any time. It is not our practice to recommend tenure at the rank of Assistant Librarian. Tenure will rarely be recommended at the Senior Assistant Librarian level. At the Associate Librarian and Librarian levels, the recommendation for tenure will recognize achievement in job performance, scholarship, and service plus the potential for continuing contributions to the Libraries' mission.

### **Library Faculty Ranks**

#### **Assistant Librarian**

Librarians at this entry-level rank demonstrate competence in the basics of librarianship and a commitment to continued growth and development in the library profession. Generally, a person may expect to remain in this rank for two to four years.

#### **Senior Assistant Librarian**

Candidates for promotion to Senior Assistant Librarian demonstrate superior performance of assigned position responsibilities with evidence of initiative and creative ability in meeting the needs of the Libraries and its users. Candidates also demonstrate progress towards making substantial achievements in the areas of scholarship and service. Generally, a person may expect to remain in this rank for three to six years.

**Associate Librarian**

Candidates for promotion to Associate Librarian demonstrate mastery of assigned position responsibilities and an ability to work independently and with initiative to meet the needs of the Libraries and its users. Candidates show an increasing body of scholarly contributions (see section II.C). At least one scholarly contribution must result in a published work (see section II. B). Candidates' service activities demonstrate increasing impact within the Libraries, the University, the library profession, and the community. A person may remain in this rank indefinitely.

**Librarian**

Advancement to the rank of Librarian is not considered until the person has demonstrated significant readiness following promotion to Associate Librarian. Candidates will have made measurable contributions and demonstrated growth in job performance, scholarship, and/or service which have had a recognizable impact on the services, operations, and regional, state, or national reputation of the Libraries.

In order to assess a candidate's effectiveness and contributions, feedback will be collected from colleagues and students (as appropriate) in the Libraries and the university, as well as professionals outside of the university.

*6/1/97; rev. 4/4/02; rev. 9/27/07; rev. 10/25/11; rev. 1/7/14; rev. 9/8/14; rev. 10/17/16;  
Librarian rank information rev. 10/25/22*

*6/1/97; rev. 4/4/02; rev. 9/27/07; rev. 10/25/11; rev. 1/7/14; rev. 9/8/14; rev. 10/17/16*

*S:\libfacorg\Current\Library Faculty Criteria for Promotion & Tenure Documents*