THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI®

SCHOOL OF
LIBRARY & INFORMATION SCIENCES
ANNUAL EVALUATION
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Stacy L. Creel

Stacy L. Creel, Ph.D.   8/25.2021
Director   Date

W. Jeff Hanton   9/2/2021

Dean   Date

Steven Moser   9/2/21

Provost   Date

School Policies and Procedures: Evaluation Processes

School: Library and Information Sciences
Director: Dr. Teresa Welsh
College: College of Education and Human Sciences
College Dean: Dr. Trent Gould

Mission/Vision/Values

Mission: The mission of the School of Library and Information Science (SLIS) is to prepare qualified individuals for professional roles in libraries, archives, and other information environments with appropriate knowledge and skills to serve the information needs of their communities.

Vision: The School of Library and Information Science aspires to promote student success, improve information literacy, and serve diverse populations through excellence in teaching, research, service, and the use of emergent technologies.

Values: The School of Library and Information Science is committed to:

Student-centered learning: We are committed to cultivating an active, student-centered learning community.

Diversity and Inclusion: We recognize and value the diversity of modern society and support inclusiveness in learning.

Intellectual freedom: We embrace the ideals of intellectual and academic freedom and strive to nurture an open, respectful learning environment for the free exchange of ideas.

- Service: Because we believe it is a core of the profession, we support service at all levels and encourage ongoing professional development as a means of enhancing skills and knowledge.

- Community: We believe in creating, fostering, and participating in learning and research communities that span borders on state, national, and international levels.

- Research: We believe research is an essential part of scholarship, not just for creation of new knowledge but for support of teaching and learning and sharing of new knowledge with multiple communities of interest.

III. Faculty Evaluations: Annual Evaluation Performance Categories

General School Statement about Annual Evaluation Standards

Faculty Evaluation Process

Work performance criteria are designed to promote achievement in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The three-tier evaluation system is intended to be efficient and effective and is based on meeting expectations established by academic units. Schools are responsible for designating faculty workload allocation percentages that align with guidelines suggested below where flexibility exists for adjustments as necessary. The annual evaluation process should offer an opportunity for faculty members to communicate with their supervisors about professional objectives for the year ahead and to request resources necessary to accomplish those objectives. Evaluation meetings with individual faculty members should stimulate communication to achieve objectives, not merely serve as a disclosure and arbitration about activities during the previous year. Meetings should further include a conversation about how faculty can best align their professional goals with the needs and vision of the School, College, and University.

The annual evaluation process is detailed in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

Please refer to Appendix B for Annual Evaluation Rubrics and additional faculty expectations.

Faculty Annual Evaluations: Description of the Process

Faculty in the School are evaluated annually using evidence of success in Teaching, Research and Service submitted through Digital Measures (DM). Consistent with the [Faculty Handbook](#), voting members of the Corps of Instruction determine the parties responsible for the Annual Evaluation (e.g., Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Director).

Evaluation materials are pulled from Digital Measures and consist of the following:
- Annual Evaluation Summary (see DM tab: Annual Evaluation).
  - Complete each section by listing previous year's goals and providing self-assessment of progress toward these goals.
- Identify new goals in Teaching, Research & Service.
- Copies of syllabi should be uploaded to DM.
- High impact practices for each course should be designated, where applicable.
- Course Evaluations (automatically made available through DM).
- Evidence of research mentorship (tenured/ tenure-track only; thesis, dissertation committees; graduate and undergraduate research mentoring).
- Evidence of research and scholarly activities to include publications, presentations, and external funding activities.
- Evidence of service activities including School, College, University, and professional activities.
- Evidence of award nominations, awards won, or other noteworthy accomplishments.

All faculty members in the Corps of Instruction will submit annual activity reports to the School Director by May 31. Faculty are required to ensure their Digital Measures account is up to date

Approved by faculty May 18, 2021

each month. Directors distribute DM reports to FEC (if this option is selected). School Directors (and Associate Deans) are administrators who hold faculty rank; however, administrative functions are annually evaluated by their immediate superior administrator and the FEC for non-administrative components (i.e., teaching, research/creative activities, service). Associate Directors are reviewed by the FEC (if this option is selected) in all areas except administrative performance, which will be evaluated by the Director.

Faculty are rated on a three-point scale from "Does not meet expectations" to "Meets expectations," to "Exceeds Expectations" separately with respect to items assessing Teaching, Research (if applicable), and Service. Performance evaluation metrics are detailed elsewhere in this document. Annual evaluation reports should include a separate section for noteworthy activities and remarks for evaluators to mention specific achievements or deficiencies that might not otherwise be discernible from evaluation ratings. Additionally, activities considered exemplary of interdisciplinary collaboration are appropriate for inclusion in this section. Documented activities and remarks can be used alongside the ratings for tenure and promotion decisions, merit-based raises, or other important personnel decisions. Noteworthy activities and remarks are not intended to be a comprehensive list of annual faculty achievements or deficiencies, but instead to disclose aspects of a faculty member's performance that evaluators consider worth mentioning or to clarify assignment of a particular rating.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between June 1 – August 30. Two distinct meetings may be offered to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (i) review and evaluation of the previous year's activities (Director and FEC, if applicable – this meeting is optional) and (ii) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead (Director only- this meeting is required). The first meeting to evaluate the previous year is optional and may include the faculty member, School Director, and FEC members (if applicable). The proceeding should disclose rationale for the evaluation and clarify any miscommunication with respect to faculty activities during the year evaluated. The second meeting to establish professional objectives and workload percentages for the following academic year is to be done exclusively with the Director and the faculty member. In the event that a faculty member and the Director are unable to establish a consensus for what constitutes appropriate annual objectives, the college Dean serves as the final arbitrator.

Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty members may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues and/or requesting resources available for high-quality teaching and research. Faculty may also appeal results of their annual evaluation if they disagree with the assigned categories (i.e., "Does Not Meet Expectations" and "Meets Expectations") or written comments from the evaluation committee. In either case, if the return communication remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal process can be initiated pursuant to the grievance procedure outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Formal Development Plan

A formal development plan for improvement is initiated by the School Director and/or FEC after a faculty member receives: (i) their second consecutive assignment of "Does Not Meet Expectations" in one of the three categories of faculty workload (teaching, research/creative activities, service) or (ii) assignment of "Does Not Meet Expectations" in at least two categories in the same year. Please see the [Faculty Handbook](#) (4.5.4) for details on this process.

Administrator Evaluations

School Directors (and Associate Deans) are administrators who hold faculty rank; however, all aspects of job performance (i.e., teaching, research/creative activities, service, administrative functions) are annually evaluated by their immediate superior administrator regarding administrative functions and the FEC for non-administrative components (a special-called FEC will be constituted if Governance Option 1 is selected). Associate Directors, however, will be evaluated on their contributions to teaching, research/creative activities, and non-administrative service by their respective school's Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and/or the Director. The administrative performance of an Associate Director is evaluated by the School Director. Faculty administrators are expected to remain current in their respective field and demonstrate some contribution to scholarship in their field. However, as it is recognized that faculty administrators have significant administrative duties that impact their ability to sustain a program of research, scholarship, or creative activity, they should not be evaluated with the same expectations as the tenure-track faculty. General expectations for scholarly productivity should be established each year between the faculty administrator and the Dean, or in the case of an Associate Director, with the FEC and Director. If the faculty administrator meets these expectations, they should receive a minimum of "Meets Expectations" in the category of research, scholarly, and creative activity (see Section 1.6).

3.1 Tenured & Tenure Track Annual Evaluation
Introduction and Rationale
The following guidelines take into account the need for uniform policies throughout the University, but also recognize that disciplinary variations necessitate a certain level of autonomy within schools.

Essential to the University's mission is the recruitment, recognition, and retention of faculty members who contribute to the overall success and vision of the University through excellence in teaching, service, research and scholarship.

3.1.2 Annual Evaluation: Teaching
Teaching and student learning are central to the mission of the School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences. All faculty members are expected to have demonstrated teaching competency in assigned courses, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising and mentoring of students.

Meets Expectations:
- Student evaluations for each course, reflecting a pattern of positive evaluations.
- Teaching e-portfolio contains required elements and is updated.
- Meets expectations on peer review assessment.

Approved by faculty May 18, 2021

Collegiality Statement: Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Faculty are expected to demonstrate a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose. Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Faculty are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in their annual review.

Specific examples of collegiality in teaching, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:
• Collaboration within the unit in School, College, and University.
• Respect for department peers (initiating routine communication regarding course and program preferences, changes, logistics of teaching, etc.).
• Personal and academic integrity.
• Volunteering in order to contribute to equity of departmental workload.
• Respect for students→ Providing timely feedback; appropriate interpersonal interactions and awareness of professional boundaries per University standards and policies; Attendance at student presentations (particularly as a committee member).
• A commitment to the sharing of departmental resources and course resources.

Engagement Statement: Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. Examples in engagement in teaching are as follows:
• Consistently available to meet with students when needed.
• Consistently respond to students in a timely manner.
• Works to ensure that learning experiences show student engagement, retention, and completion.
• Carries equitable load of teaching responsivities and masters' research projects.

Fails to Meet Expectations:
Meets expectations criteria are not met in regards to teaching, collegiality, and engagement. Examples include the following:
• Teaching evaluations conducted by students do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.
• Peer teaching evaluation shows does not meet expectations.
• Teaching e-portfolio is missing one or more of the required items and/or one or more of the items are not current.

Exceeds Expectations:
Exceeds the meets expectations in regards to teaching, collegiality, and engagement. Examples include the following:
- Coursework reflects innovative development, which may include service learning, active learning, honors theses, SPUR projects, etc. consistent with school directives and exceeding the unit expectations.
- Teaching evaluations conducted by students exceed the standard level of performance level identified within the unit.
- Teaching e-portfolio has excellent design and exceeds the requirements to include other relevant items such as an image gallery.
- Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews show engaged learning based on innovative teaching methods.
- Teaching load, student numbers exceed School standard.

Examples of Documentation:
- Student enrollment and retention in courses.
- Development or significant revisions of programs and courses.
- Contribution to develop and/or update syllabi, lecture notes and updated reading materials.
- Collaboration and cooperation in multiple-section courses.
- Creation or utilization of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study.
- Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service- learning and outreach courses at home or abroad, where research and new knowledge are integrated.
- Academic advising activity.
- Student mentoring activity.
- Number of mentored student research/master's projects, indicating number completed.
- Number of external thesis or doctoral committees as member, indicating number completed.
- Number of practicum supervisions and independent studies directed.
- Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including mentored publications, projects, presentations, etc.
- Letters of support by colleagues/supervisors who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, have team-taught with the candidate, used instructional materials designed by the candidate, or have taught the candidate's students in subsequent courses.
- Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching.
- Grants related to instruction.
  - Receipt of grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities
  - Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs
- Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness as appropriate.

3.1.3 Annual Evaluation: Research and Scholarship

In accordance with the mission of this Carnegie R1 very high research university, the School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences acknowledges that scholarship and the creation and production of research are crucial to the advancement of knowledge. Scholarship is multifaceted and scholarly activity must be assessed

in diverse ways.

Meets Expectations

Faculty should have 1.25 of significant contributions successfully completed each year. This means one of the significant contributions listed below successfully submitted and accepted and a quarter completed of another that is in process (i.e., data gathered). Significant contributions may also include national or international invited publications, books, book chapters, juried/refereed conference papers published in proceedings, and/or funded external proposals.

Evidence of research or scholarly activities may include, but is not limited to:
- Research and/or scholarly publications. Faculty should publish their research in nationally recognized competitive, refereed journals or other refereed works such as subject encyclopedia articles. In addition, discipline-specific publications (e.g., training manuals, handbooks, etc.), articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, refereed research or scholarly posters, research notes, published reports and bulletins will be considered.
- Grants and other project applications, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.
- Presentation of research papers before technical and professional meetings or scholarly conferences.
- Honors or awards for research or scholarship.
- Application of research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional associations, or educational institutions.
- Other evidence of research or scholarly accomplishments as appropriate.

Collegiality Statement: Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose. Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Candidates are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in the narrative they provide for review.

Specific examples of collegiality in research, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:
- Collaboration within the School, College, and University on research, publications, and presentations.
- Respect for department peers (initiating routine communication regarding course and program preferences, changes, logistics of teaching, etc.).

- Personal and academic integrity.

Engagement Statement: Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. Examples in engagement in research are as follows:
• Maintains an active research agenda and process.
• Involves or supports peers in research/professional development.
• Seeks internal and external grants.

Fails to Meet Expectations
Candidate does not have documented an annual contribution of 1.25 listed contributions and does not have extenuating service or teaching that would keep them from successfully meeting the expectation.

Exceeds Expectations
Candidate exceeds the 1.25 significant contributions (especially in regards to peer-reviewed journals) or successfully obtains grant funding.

3.1.4   Annual Evaluation: Service
Service refers to the function of applying academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences in support of SLIS, College, and University missions. The School of Library and Information Science values service to society as well as to the University, College, School, and to professional disciplines and organizations. Service may include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management, and technical assistance. SLIS recognizes that service activities may be limited during the probationary period in order for the faculty member to meet teaching and research obligations.

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in School, College or University committees, developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects. All faculty members within the School are expected to participate in faculty meetings and to support the SLIS strategic plan.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for national, regional, or state professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional associations and learned societies' publications; and review of grants applications.

A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of promotion if any of the following conditions are met and deemed appropriate by SLIS:
1. Utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. Direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. Ultimate purpose for the public or common good.
4. New knowledge generated for the discipline and/or the community.

5. Clear relationship between the program/activities and the mission of SLIS.

Meets Expectations

Serves on appointed/elected committees at the School, College, and University level as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit; attends meetings, meets deadlines, and contributes to the needs of the committee. Reports on the committee work at faculty meetings.

Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.

Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and research as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.

Collegiality Statement: Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality as a requirement for tenure is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose. Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Candidates are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in the narrative they provide for review.

Specific examples of collegiality in service, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:
- Collaboration within the School, College, and University committees.
- Respect for peers (initiating routine communication, responding in a timely manner, etc.).
- Volunteer to participate or lead on School committees or activities.

Engagement Statement: Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. Examples in engagement in research are as follows:
- Participates in and/or leads committees in ways that support the University's, College's, and School's mission and goals.
- Attends and participates in faculty meetings.
- Engages in the community as appropriate.

Fails to Meet Expectations
- Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, College, and University level at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Does not consistently attend committee meetings to represent the unit.
- Does not report on committee meetings during faculty meetings.
- Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and research as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.

Exceeds Expectations
- Serves on appointed/elected committees at the School, College, and University level at a rate exceeding the standard performance level within the unit; attends meetings, completes a leadership role for the committee or sub-committee.
- Contributes to their identified field of study through membership, participation in, and committee service on professional organizations, publications, activities within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide, exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Facilitates growth of the University/College/School through active participation in University campus activities and community service related to their profession exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and research, and undergraduate honors theses, etc. exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.

3.2 Annual Evaluation: Teaching Track
Teaching and student learning are central to the mission of the School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences. Teaching Professors, Instructors, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers contribute to the mission of the School through teaching and service. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising, mentoring, and other forms of student engagement.

3.2.1 Annual Evaluation: Teaching
Within the School, Instructors/Lecturers/Teaching Professors are responsible for preparing students to work in various types of libraries or other information repositories. Knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for successful professional practice are developed through coursework and practicum experiences. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising, mentoring, and other forms of student engagement.

Meets Expectations
Instructors/Lecturers/Teaching Professors are expected to have demonstrated excellence in

teaching and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. Therefore, teaching effectiveness should be examined holistically based on an overall pattern of exemplary teaching evaluations rather than on evaluations received from any single course or section.
Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include:

- Student evaluations for each course taught (copies of the actual evaluations for every class for no less than the last three years, reflecting a pattern of positive evaluations).
- Teaching e-portfolio has all required components.
- Peer evaluations show meets expectations.

Collegiality Statement: Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality as a requirement for tenure is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose. Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Candidates are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in the narrative they provide for review.

Specific examples of collegiality in teaching, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:

- Collaboration within the School, College, and University.
- Respect for School peers (initiating routine communication regarding course and program preferences, changes, logistics of teaching, etc.).
- Personal and academic integrity.
- Volunteering in order to contribute to equity of departmental workload.
- Respect for students→ Providing timely feedback; Appropriate interpersonal interactions and awareness of professional boundaries per University standards and policies; Attendance at student presentations (particularly as a committee member).
- A commitment to the sharing of departmental resources and course resources.

Engagement Statement: Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. Examples in engagement in teaching are as follows:

- Consistently available to meet with students when needed.
- Consistently respond to students in a timely manner.
- Works to learn ensure that learning experiences show student engagement, retention, and completion.
- Carries equitable load of teaching responsivities and masters' research projects.

- Participates in appropriate teaching development opportunities.

Fails to Meet Expectations:
Meets expectations criteria are not met in regards to teaching, collegiality, and engagement. Examples include the following:
- Teaching evaluations conducted by students do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Teaching e-portfolio is missing one or more of the required items and/or one or more of the items are not current.
- Peer evaluation indicates meets expectations are not met.

Exceeds Expectations:
Exceeds the meets expectations in regards to teaching, collegiality, and engagement.

Examples of Documentation:
Examples include, but not limited to, the following:
- Nature of courses typically taught.
- Number of different course and new course preparations.
- Contribution to develop and/or update syllabi, lecture notes and updated reading materials. Considerations would include:
    - Vehicle of delivery, face to face, online synchronous and online asynchronous;
    - Student level, undergraduate or graduate.
- Development or significant revision of programs and courses.
- Collaboration and cooperation in multiple-section courses.
- Creation or utilization of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study.
- Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service-learning and outreach courses at home or abroad.
- Academic advising activity.
- Student mentoring activity.
- Number of mentored student research projects, indicating number completed.
- Number of external thesis or doctoral committees as member, indicating number completed.
- Number of practicum supervisions and independent studies directed.
- Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including mentored publications, projects, presentations, etc.
- Letters of support or commendation by colleagues or administration.
- Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching.
- Grants related to instruction.
- Receipt of grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities.
- Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs.
- Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness as appropriate.

3.2.2 Annual Evaluation: Research/Scholarship

We recognize that the research expectations for instructors/lecturers/teaching faculty should differ significantly from those for tenure-track faculty.

Meets Expectations
Teaching Professors and Instructors pursue scholarship through curriculum development and instructional improvement; program evaluation; the dissemination of knowledge beyond the classroom to community through professional or academic articles or other published contributions like book chapters, book reviews, etc. in reputable sources and through presentations in university, conference, or professional settings (minimum two publications/presentations—with .50 annually) and through community-based service-learning and internship processes. For example, research may take two years and result in a presentation or publication at the end of the 2nd year or beginning of the third year. This includes engagement in program evaluation, research in the areas of teaching, pedagogy, and student success.

Collegiality Statement: Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality as a requirement for tenure is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose. Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Candidates are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in the narrative they provide for review.

Specific examples of collegiality in research, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:
- Collaboration within or support of the unit in program, department, College, and university on research, publications, and presentations.
- Respect for department peers (initiating routine communication regarding course and program preferences, changes, logistics of teaching, etc.).
- Personal and academic integrity.

Engagement Statement: Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. Examples in engagement in research are as follows:
- Uses current research-supported content.
- Involved in as necessary and supports peers in research/professional development.
- Seeks internal and external grants that support or enhance teaching.

Fails to Meet Expectations

Teaching Professors and Instructors who do not pursue scholarship through curriculum development and instructional improvement; program evaluation; the dissemination of knowledge beyond the classroom to community through professional or academic articles or other published contributions like book chapters, book reviews, etc. in reputable sources and through presentations in university, conference, or professional settings; and through community-based service-learning and internship processes will fail to meet the expectations. Failure to be engaged in program evaluation, research in the areas of teaching, pedagogy, and student success also indicate failure to meet expectations.

Exceed Expectations
Exceeding expectations includes but is not limited to exceeding the minimum for published contributions and presentation and taking a leadership role in program evaluation. Efforts to secure internal/external funding that support or promote student success, quality instruction, and/or field-based instructional or service-learning placements will be looked upon favorably but is not a requirement for promotion.

3.2.3 Annual Evaluation: Service
The School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences value service to society, the University, and to the School disciplines and professions. For teaching-track faculty, service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in School, College or University curriculum, teaching, accreditation, student success committee work, and advising/mentoring students. Developing, implementing and evaluating teaching, advising and student success initiatives are also recognized as acceptable service. All faculty members within the School are expected to participate in faculty meetings and to support the SLIS mission and strategic plan.

A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of promotion if any of the following conditions are met and deemed appropriate by SLIS:
1. Utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. Direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. Ultimate purpose for the public or common good.
4. New knowledge generated for the discipline and/or the community.
5. Clear relationship between the program/activities and the mission of SLIS.

Meets Expectations
Serves on appointed/elected committees at the School, College, and University level as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit; attends meetings, meets deadlines, and contributes to the needs of the committee. Reports on the committee work at faculty meetings.

1. University/academic service to include University, College, and/or School level service with preference for those activities that focus on curriculum, recruitment, advisement, accreditation, and student success initiatives.
2. Professional Service to include service to the profession and membership in professional organizations.

3. Community Service to include community education/ outreach and consultation if connected to the instructional and/or field-based or service-learning activities associated with the position.

Collegiality Statement: Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality as a requirement for tenure is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose. Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Candidates are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in the narrative they provide for review.

Specific examples of collegiality in service, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:
- Collaboration within the unit in School, College, and University committees.
- Respect for department peers (initiating routine communication, responding in a timely manner, etc.).
- Volunteer to participate or lead on School committees or activities.

Engagement Statement: Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. Examples in engagement in research are as follows:
- Participates in and/or leads committees in ways that support the University's, College's, and School's mission and goals.
- Attends and participates in faculty meetings.
- Engages in the community as appropriate.

Fails to Meet Expectations
- Serves on appointed/elected committees at the School, College, and University level at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Does not attend committee meetings to represent the unit.
- Does not report on committee meetings at scheduled faculty meetings.
- Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and research as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. at a rate

lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.

Exceeds Expectations
- Serves on appointed/elected committees at the School, College, and University level at a rate exceeding the standard performance level within the unit; attends meetings, completes a leadership role for the committee or sub-committee.
- Contributes to their identified field of study through membership, participation in, and committee service on professional organizations, publications, activities within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide, exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Facilitates growth of the University/College/School through active participation in University campus activities and community service related to their profession exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.
- Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student to committees to include graduate examinations and research, and undergraduate honors theses, etc. exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.

3.3 Goals for the Next Evaluation Period
Faculty are expected to develop goals in each of the areas of Research (tenured; tenure-track faculty) or Scholarship/Professional Development (teaching & clinical track faculty), Teaching, and Service. Goals should address deficits in previous evaluation periods and articulate a clear connection to the School, College, and University mission and strategic plans.

IV. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The School has established tenure and promotion guidelines for both tenure-track and teaching-track faculty. These guidelines are voted on by all faculty and approved by the Dean and Provost. School tenure and promotion guidelines must meet the minimum expectations established by the university and are used by personnel committees to make decisions regarding both tenure and promotion. Additional details regarding Tenure and Promotion Committees can be found in the Faculty Handbook.

Promotion and Tenure Processes

School Promotion & Tenure Committees

The purpose of the School Promotion and School Tenure Committees shall be to review the dossiers submitted by faculty for pre-tenure review and for consideration of tenure and/or promotion. The membership of the School Promotion Committee shall include all school faculty holding rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered (only tenure-track faculty serve on tenure-track promotion committees, whereas both teaching-track and tenure-track faculty who

have been promoted may serve on teaching-track promotion committees). The membership of the School Tenure Committee shall include a minimum of three tenured faculty in the school (teaching-track faculty do not serve on tenure committees). If the School does not have three eligible faculty to serve on such a committee, the School, in conjunction with the Dean, must invite faculty from a discipline related to that of the faculty under review to serve on the School Promotion and Tenure Committee. Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, the School Director and School faculty also serving in certain upper-level University administrative positions are not members of School Promotion and/or Tenure Committees.

The committee is a standing committee for the School and is activated for each candidate to be considered for pre-tenure review, tenure, and/or promotion. Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, the chair of each committee shall be determined by majority vote of the committee. It is recommended that the chair of this committee be selected from among those members who have at least one year of experience with tenure and promotion deliberations and adhere to the school timeline listed below. Faculty in the School of Library and Information Science seek approval for tenure and promotion to associate professor concurrently. The same person will chair the committees for both tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Two separate letters (one for tenure; one for promotion) will be submitted by the committee chair.

Applicants participating in the tenure and promotion review process should be advised that faculty are required to detail both percent contribution and acceptance percentage or impact factor for each publication. See https://www.usm.edu/sites/default/files/groups/office-provost/pdf/tp_directive_revision8-28-15.pdf. Faculty are encouraged to adhere to the timelines posted in the Faculty Handbook and should only seek exceptions to these timelines in rare circumstances.

Responsibilities of Committee Chairs:
Consistent with Faculty Handbook guidelines, committee Chairs are selected by the tenure/ promotion committee and take responsibility for supporting the applicant through the process by reviewing application materials, contacting external reviewers (when applicable), scheduling and convening committee meetings, and the development of the tenure/ promotion report. One committee chair will be given responsibility for uploading all materials to Digital Measures. Specific tasks are as follows:
- Assist applicant with the dossier to ensure accuracy and completeness of the application materials—this includes feedback on the cover letter and selection of reviewers prior to distributing these materials to the committee.
- Securing electronic materials needed for external review (e.g., list of 10 reviewers, CV, cover letter, sample publications).
- Convening the committee to review the list of 10 reviewers and determine an appropriate plan for contacting reviewers—communicating with reviewers and obtaining letters from reviewers.
- Developing a draft tenure and promotion letter (or promotion only for promotion to Professor)-that highlights the applicants' strengths.
- Scheduling tenure and promotion committee meetings and vote, revising the report as needed to reflect input from committee and reviewers, obtaining signatures from all voting members.

- Uploading committee recommendation letters for promotion and tenure (2 separate letters) into Digital Measures Workflow and routing to the Director's office by the deadlines posted on the Provost's website.
- For teaching-track promotion committees, the same procedures are followed, with the exception of seeking external reviewers.

Timeline
- Faculty planning to engage in pre-tenure review should plan to notify the school Director by October 1 of the year they plan to apply. Faculty planning to engage in tenure or promotion should make their intention clear to the school Director no later than June 1st of the year they plan to apply.
- The school Director will prompt the appropriate committee to determine a chair for the committee no later than June 15th. It is recommended that Committee chairs be selected from among those with at least one year of experience with the tenure/ promotion committee processes.
- Applicants for Tenure/Promotion are required to electronically submit the following materials to the Chair of the committee by July 1st: Cover letter; CV; Sample Publications (2-3); List of possible external reviewers (see below for details).
- Committee Chairs will review the documents, provide feedback to the applicant on cover letter and external reviewer list, and then solicit feedback from the committee on acceptability of external reviewer list by July 15th.
- External reviewers will be contacted no later than August 1st with the understanding that at least three letters should be received by mid-September in order to allow the committee time for deliberation and review and to comply with the Provost's timelines.
- Applicants will compile and enter their promotion and tenure dossier into Digital Measures Workflow by the deadline posted on the Provost's website (typically late August). The portal typically opens in mid-July. Detailed instructions on electronic dossier preparation and submission timelines, as well as links to workshops and training, are provided on the Provost's website.
- Committee Chairs will upload external reviewer letters into the Digital Measures Workflow portal upon receipt and in advance of the committee meeting. All committee members will be given access to applicants' electronic dossiers in Digital Measures prior to convening the meeting.
- Committee Chairs will submit final signed recommendation letters for promotion and tenure into the Digital Measures Workflow portal and route to the School Director by the deadlines posted on the Provost's website.

College Tenure Committee
College-level evaluation is mandatory for tenure-track faculty, including interdisciplinary faculty. Because the tenure and promotion processes often coincide, the make-up of the committees may be similar, but all processes must be viewed as separate. Therefore, College Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of at least five members, including at least one tenured faculty member from each school within the college with an applicant for tenure or promotion. Further, all members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee must have already achieved tenure. For the evaluation of interdisciplinary candidates, the committee shall have a tenured reviewer from each of the schools (internal as well as

external to the college) with which the candidate interacts. Further details regarding the specific composition of College Promotion and Tenure Committees shall be at the discretion of each college.

University Promotion and Tenure Committee
University-level evaluation is mandatory for the tenure of faculty, including interdisciplinary faculty. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee must receive from the Provost the dossiers of applicants for tenure, as well as the written documents prepared by unit and college committees, school directors, deans, and external reviewers. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews and evaluates all materials and then votes, the chair of the committee tendering written recommendations and rationale for the vote to the Provost. The chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee will simultaneously forward to the applicant a copy of the committee's letter to the Provost.

Pre-tenure Review
Deliberations of the School Promotion and/or Tenure Committees will follow University guidelines (see Faculty Handbook). Pre-tenure review will include all materials needed for a tenure and promotion dossier with the exception of requiring external reviewers. The committee chair for pre-tenure review is expected to connect with the applicant, review materials, and make recommendations prior to the submission date established by the Director. Then, following submission of the materials, the chair of this committee will facilitate a meeting whereby the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service are reviewed and discussed. The committee votes by secret ballot. The committee chair then drafts a letter, which is then signed by all tenured faculty in attendance and submitted by the deadline to the School Director. This letter is submitted in conjunction with the steps outlined in the Faculty Handbook. A principal task of the school promotion and tenure committee is to identify areas in which the candidate needs to improve to eventually merit tenure and to help the candidate identify strategies to improve. These strategies must be closely associated with the annual evaluation process so that candidates can monitor their progress in areas that were deficient, and additional strategies can be developed to improve.

4.1 Promotion for Tenure-Track Faculty (from Assistant to Associate)
Promotion functions to recognize talented faculty members for their records of achievement within their respective disciplines or in interdisciplinary settings. Thus, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is a necessary condition for tenure at The University of Southern Mississippi. There are inherently different criteria for tenure, such as an individual's potential for long-term contributions to the university.

The following guidelines take into account the need for uniform policies throughout the University, but also recognize that disciplinary variations necessitate a certain level of autonomy within schools.

Evaluation Criteria
Essential to the University's mission is the recruitment, recognition, and retention of faculty

members who contribute to the overall success and vision of the University through excellence in teaching, service, research and scholarship. The purpose of these proposed guidelines is to establish a unified University framework for deciding matters of promotion while acknowledging the need for discipline-specific variation.

4.1.1 Teaching

Teaching and student learning are central to the mission of the School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences. All faculty members seeking promotion and are expected to have demonstrated teaching competency in assigned courses, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising and mentoring of students.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include:
• Student evaluations for each course for no less than the last three years, reflecting a pattern of positive evaluations.
• Consistent annual evaluations of "meets expectations."
• Teaching e-portfolio.
• Annual Director/personnel committee evaluations.
• Third-year review letters from all levels of review.

Further evidence may include, but is not limited to, any combination of the sources listed below:
• Nature of courses typically taught.
• Number of different course and new course preparations.

Documentation
• Contribution to develop and/or update syllabi, lecture notes and updated reading materials. Considerations would include delivery, student level, course content, service learning, etc.
• Development or significant revision of programs and courses.
• Collaboration and cooperation in multiple-section courses.
• Creation or utilization of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study.
• Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service- learning and outreach courses at home or abroad, where research and new knowledge are integrated.
• Academic advising activity.
• Student mentoring activity.
• Number of mentored student research projects, indicating number completed.
• Number of external thesis or doctoral committees as member, indicating number completed.
• Number of practicum supervisions and independent studies directed.
• Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including mentored publications, projects, presentations, etc.
• Letters of support by colleagues/supervisors who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, have team-taught with the candidate, used instructional materials designed by the candidate, or have taught the candidate's students in subsequent courses.
• Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching.
• Grants related to instruction—receipt of grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching

activities.
- Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness as appropriate.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness is necessary for promotion in rank to *Associate Professor.*

4.1.2 Service

Service refers to the function of applying academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences in support of SLIS, College, and University missions. The School of Library and Information Science values service to society as well as to the University, College, School, and to professional disciplines and organizations. Service may include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management, and technical assistance. SLIS recognizes that service activities may be limited during the probationary period in order for the faculty member to meet teaching and research obligations.

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in School, College or University committees, developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects. All faculty members within the School are expected to participate in faculty meetings and to support the SLIS strategic plan.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for national, regional, or state professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional associations and learned societies' publications; and review of grants applications.

A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of promotion if any of the following conditions are met and deemed appropriate by SLIS:
- Utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
- Direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
- Ultimate purpose for the public or common good.
- New knowledge generated for the discipline and/or the community.
- Clear relationship between the program/activities and the mission of SLIS

Evidence of earning at least "meets expectation" each year under consideration is necessary for promotion to *Associate Professor*.

4.1.3 Research and Scholarship

In accordance with the mission of this Carnegie R1 very high research university, the School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences acknowledges that scholarship and the creation and production of research are crucial to the advancement of knowledge. To be considered for promotion, a faculty member must be an active and productive researcher/scholar. Scholarship is multifaceted and scholarly activity must be assessed in diverse ways. The following proposed common College standards are for

demonstrating research/scholarly productivity.

    A. Maintenance of an active program of research.
    B. Publications. Only work published while at USM will be considered, with the exception that if a candidate has been granted credit toward tenure or promotion, then any accomplishments from that time period should also be included. For example, if a candidate is granted two or three years' credit toward tenure, his/her accomplishments from that specific period of time should also be considered.
    C. Appropriate efforts to secure internal and external funding.

Research expectations for promotion in rank to Associate Professor are to have an established and documented record of success in publishing, presenting, and/or obtaining funding. The approximate research expectations for receiving promotion in rank to Associate Professor consist of the following:

- Candidate has documented seven (7) significant contributions.
- Of the seven (7) significant contributions, <u>four (4) must be refereed journal articles</u> deemed appropriate to the range of our discipline. Significant contributions may also include national or international invited publications, books, book chapters, juried/refereed conference papers published in proceedings, and/or funded external proposals. An academic book/monograph that presents original research/scholarship, is peer-reviewed, contracted, and published via a recognized university or private academic press that engages in rigorous professional/peer review may carry more weight than a single publication in a refereed journal. An authored scholarly/academic book may be given greater weight than a book that is an edited collection of articles/chapters or a textbook. Edited books and textbooks will be judged by scope, size, and impact of the text upon the academic field. Tenured faculty members within the School of Library and Information Science will review the published book and determine the number/weight of scholarly items the book represents.
- Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate success in providing refereed or juried presentations to professional organizations and/or audiences appropriate to their disciplines.

Evidence of earning at least "meets expectation" each year under consideration is necessary for promotion to *Associate Professor*.

Probationary Period for Promotion in the Tenure Track
In keeping with current University and IHL policy, the minimum five-year probationary period will remain in place for promotion from Assistant to Associate professor, with the normal University process being that tenure-track faculty proceed to candidacy for promotion and tenure in their sixth year. Although it may be possible for an individual with qualifications far exceeding school guidelines to receive consideration for early promotion, any exemptions from the five-year probationary period should be considered the exception. In the sixth year of service at USM, unless credit for service prior to joining USM was awarded at the time of hire, the candidate must apply for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.

Extension of Probationary Period. Applicants may request an extension of the probationary period by one year for personal circumstances that are not under the control of the University. Details can be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#) (5.7).

4.1.4 Promotion to Full Professor

Evidence of <u>sustained</u> teaching effectiveness is necessary for promotion in rank to Full Professor. Annual evaluations should indicate not only "meets expectations" but exceeds expectations" on occasion.

The research expectations for promotion in rank to Full Professor are a consistent record of success in publishing, presenting, and/or obtaining external funding. The approximate research expectations for receiving promotion in rank to Full Professor consist of the following:
• Contributions utilized for promotion to Associate Professor will be included in the total number of contributions necessary for promotion to Full Professor.
• Fourteen (14) significant contributions of which at least eight (8) must be refereed journal articles deemed appropriate to the range of our discipline.
• Significant contributions may also include national or international invited publications and/or funded external proposals.

Evidence of research or scholarly activities may include, but is not limited to:
•Research and/or scholarly publications. Faculty should publish their research in nationally recognized competitive, refereed journals or other refereed works such as subject encyclopedia articles. In addition, discipline-specific publications (e.g., training manuals, handbooks, etc.), articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, refereed research or scholarly posters, research notes, published reports and bulletins will be considered.
• Grants and other project applications, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.
• Presentation of research papers before technical and professional meetings or scholarly conferences.
• Honors or awards for research or scholarship.
• Application of research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional associations, or educational institutions.
• Other evidence of research or scholarly accomplishments as appropriate.

Evidence of <u>sustained</u> service with leadership roles is necessary for promotion in rank to Full Professor. Annual evaluations should indicate not only "meets expectations" but exceeds expectations" on occasion.

Outside Evaluators for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

External evaluators are required for evaluation of promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor. Letters of support from three external reviewers should provide evidence that the applicant's work in the areas of teaching, research, and service has made a positive impact on the

candidate's profession/discipline.

    i. **Eligibility to Serve as an External Evaluator:**
The external reviewers need to indicate that they a) are well-versed in the applicant's scholarly area, b) are willing and able to make a professional judgment about the quality of the scholarly activities in the applicant's packet, and c) have no conflict of interest. The external referees cannot have a personal or mentor-mentee relationship with the applicant. The external reviewers must have tenure and the rank of Professor at their respective institutions that have comparable programs.

    ii. Size and Composition of the Set of External Evaluators:
The candidate and Director should work together to compile a list of a minimum of six potential qualified reviewers. The Director will then select three reviewers to evaluate the candidate on the criteria listed above (teaching, research, and service).

Early Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
The standard probationary period for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is five years. In the sixth year of service at rank, the candidate may apply for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. To encourage, stimulate, and aspire to excellence at the national and international level, early promotion may be considered once excellence in achievement is established in the areas of research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/librarianship, and service, beyond the record of achievement established during the promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Generally, eligibility for early promotion may be granted in the fifth year at rank.

Unsuccessful Applications for Promotion
In the event of an unsuccessful application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the applicant shall not be eligible to immediately reapply for promotion in the following year. The applicant will be eligible to reapply once this year has passed. Exemptions may apply in exceptional circumstances identified by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee or by the School Director during the annual evaluations process.

4.2 Teaching Track
General Statement
For promotion in rank to Senior Lecturer/Full Teaching Professor, evidence of sustained exemplary service related to quality instruction, recruitment, and student success is necessary.

Probationary Period for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor, or from Instructor to Lecturer
A five-year probationary period for a new Assistant Teaching Professor or Instructor provides adequate time to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service. A notable exception to this probationary period applies to candidates whose initial appointment gave them credit for service prior to joining USM. Individuals with qualifications far exceeding guidelines may receive consideration for early promotion. However, non-tenure-track faculty do not have any mandate to move towards promotion unless that candidate so desires. Given the nature of non-tenured positions, promotion should be considered a

desirable goal rather than a mandate. In particular, non-tenure-track promotable faculty at the University of Southern Mississippi are allowed to remain at the University even if there is no promotion from Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor or from Instructor to Lecturer.

Promotion for Teaching-Track Faculty
4.2.1 General Statement on Teaching
The School Library and Information Science recognizes that the transmission of knowledge is one of the primary missions of the university. All faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are expected to have demonstrated teaching competency in assigned courses, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students; All non-tenure track, teaching track faculty members seeking promotion are expected to have demonstrated excellence in teaching, which should include formal classroom instruction, advising and mentoring of students. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising and mentoring of students. What follows are indicators that are used to evaluate teaching. This is not an exhaustive list.

Instructors/Lecturers/Teaching Professors Teaching Expectations
The expectation for promotion is that the applicant provides evidence of a pattern of exceptional teaching to include such indicators as peer observations of teaching which note exceptional performance, course evaluations that exceed the departmental average, supervision evaluations noting exceptional performance, letters of support from School colleagues with familiarity with your teaching/ supervision, recordings of exceptional teaching examples, teaching awards received (or nominations), teaching grants received (or submitted), evidence of successful contributions in the area of curriculum development, examples of how one has incorporated technology in the classroom in some exceptional way, evidence that one has met or exceeded best practices with regards to syllabi, and/or evidence of exceptional efforts toward student mentorship.

Evidence of exceptional teaching is necessary for promotion in rank to *Lecturer* or *Associate Teaching Professor*.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include:
- University-mandated student evaluations for each course taught (copies of the actual evaluations for every class for no less than the last three years, reflecting a pattern of positive evaluations).
- Consistent annual evaluations of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations."
- Annual School Director/FEC committee evaluations.
- Letters or emails from students or faculty.

Further evidence may include, but is not limited to, any combination of the sources listed below:

A. Evaluation of Classroom Instruction
- Syllabi and course content are current and thorough in coverage.
- Evidence of high academic standards (e.g., strategies to encourage critical thinking, writing assignments, including original sources among the required readings, etc.).

- Peer classroom observations.
- Student comments and course ratings from the faculty member's own evaluation instruments (if available).
- Unsolicited letters of evaluation or commendations for teaching.
- Teaching awards.
- Responsiveness to student needs (e.g., available for student conferences, appropriate office hours, sensitive to needs of students with disabilities).

B. Contributions to Student Mentorship
- Practicum Supervision.
- Research mentorship of undergraduates.
- Research mentorship of graduates (Assistant Teaching faculty only).
- Undergraduate student advisement.
- Graduate student advisement (Assistant Teaching faculty only).

C. Evaluation of Instructional Contributions to the mission of the School
- Large lecture course responsibilities or multiple sections.
- Time intensive courses.
- Preparation of new course or an extensive overhaul of an existing course.
- Number of new preps.
- Number of different courses taught.

D. Evaluation of Professional Contributions in the area of Teaching
- Published textbooks, lecture notes, or laboratory manuals.
- Membership on panels or testimony concerned with teaching.
- Presentations or publications relevant to the teaching of library and information science.

4.2.2 Service
General Statement on Service
The School of Library & Information Science realizes that in order for schools, colleges, universities, professional organizations, and communities to thrive, individuals must give of their time, energy, and expertise in ways that serve to sustain and promote those organizations. We value service-related activities and recognize that some level of service within our organization is necessary in order to be a contributing citizen in the community of this university. Non-tenure track teaching faculty are expected to engage in service-related activities that are tied to clinical activities, curriculum development, quality instruction, and student success initiatives.

Teaching-Track Service Expectations
What follows are indicators of service-related activities. This is not an exhaustive list of contributions in the area of service, and faculty members are not expected to contribute in all of the areas listed. Credit for university service does not follow the assumption that university-level service is more valuable than college service, which is more valuable than school service. Credit

for service is determined by how time-consuming and essential the task is. This list is not exhaustive.

We recognize that service is not simply committee membership and that credit for service should take into account the quality of participation, including the ability to work collaboratively with others. Teaching and tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate professionalism in their interactions with colleagues, students, and staff. This includes regular attendance at meetings, working to ensure tasks are distributed equitably across faculty, prompt and respectful engagement with students, colleagues, and staff, and a commitment to the goals of the School, College, and University.

1. University/academic service includes directing or serving on university, college, or school-level committees, program administration, school-related service (e.g., arranging educational colloquia, recruitment and retention initiatives), graduate and undergraduate program service (e.g., admissions, coordinating externships, serving on committees). For teaching-track faculty, preference should be given to activities that focus on curriculum and student success initiatives. For Teaching Track faculty at all ranks, credit for service is determined by the impact on instructional quality and student success.
2. Professional Service to include service to the profession, leadership roles, and assisting with conference development. Tenure-track faculty may show evidence of editorial service by serving as ad hoc reviewers, editorial board members, or editors/ associate editors. Professional service associated with accreditation or serving on review boards for external funding agencies is also considered in this domain. For teaching-track faculty, these activities should be tied to the instructional and/or supervision activities associated with the position.
3. Community Service to include community education/ outreach and consultation. For teaching-track faculty, this should be connected to the instructional and supervision activities associated with the position.

Evidence "meets expectations" of service related to quality instruction and/or student success is necessary for promotion in rank to *Lecturer* or *Associate Teaching Professor*.

4.2.3 Research
General Statement on Research
Teaching Professors and Instructors pursue scholarship through curriculum development and instructional improvement; program evaluation; the dissemination of knowledge beyond the classroom to community through professional or academic articles or other published contributions like book chapters, book reviews, etc. in reputable sources and through presentations in university, conference, or professional settings (minimum two publications/presentations) and through community-based service-learning and internship processes. This includes engagement in program evaluation, research in the areas of teaching, pedagogy, and student success.

Instructors/Lecturers/Teaching Professors Research Expectations
Evidence
Evidence of teaching research effectiveness must include:

- New class development based on research or trends in the field.
- Participant in program evaluation for ALA Accreditation and/or WEAVE.
- Two of the following: professional or academic articles, book chapters, book reviews, other written publications, or presentations in university, conference, or professional settings.

Early Promotion from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor or for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer for Promotable Non- Tenure-Track Faculty

The standard probationary period for promotion from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor is five years. In the sixth year of service at rank, the candidate may apply for promotion. Exceptional teaching and or service may warrant early promotion to Teaching Professor/Senior Lecturer and may be considered for teaching faculty who exhibit exceptional teaching and service as qualified by annual evaluations. Generally, eligibility for early promotion may be granted in the fifth year at rank.

Promotion to Teaching Professor or Senior Lecturer

Evidence of sustained teaching effectiveness with a pattern of exceptional teaching to include such indicators as peer observations of teaching which note exceptional performance, course evaluations that exceed the departmental average, supervision evaluations noting exceptional performance, letters of support from School colleagues with familiarity with your teaching/ supervision, recordings of exceptional teaching examples, teaching awards received (or nominations), teaching grants received, etc. is necessary for promotion in rank and annual evaluations should indicate not only "meets expectations" but exceeds expectations" on occasion.

The expectation for promotion is that the applicant provides evidence (or submitted), evidence of successful contributions in the area of curriculum development, examples of how one has incorporated technology in the classroom in some exceptional way, evidence that one has met or exceeded best practices with regards to syllabi, and/or evidence of exceptional efforts toward student mentorship.

The research expectations for promotion in rank include an additional publications in professional or academic articles or other published contributions like book chapters, book reviews, etc. in reputable sources and through presentations in university, conference, or professional settings and through community-based service-learning and internship processes (minimum 2).

Evidence of sustained service with leadership roles is necessary for promotion in rank to Teaching Professor and Senior Lecturer. Annual evaluations should indicate not only "meets expectations" but exceeds expectations" on occasion.

Unsuccessful Applications for Promotion for Promotable Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
In the event of an unsuccessful application for promotion, the candidate is *not* required to

leave the University. Although promotion is desirable, it can be appropriate to maintain faculty at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor/Instructor beyond the five-year probationary period. In the event of an unsuccessful promotion, the applicant is not allowed to apply for promotion in the following year with exceptions determined by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee or School Director in annual evaluations.

4.3 Tenure
Introduction and Rationale

Although tenure and promotion bear a close relationship with each other, the processes serve distinct purposes. Tenure and promotion both function to recognize talented faculty members for their records of achievement within their respective disciplines. However, tenure extends an additional level of protection to the faculty member in furtherance of the mutual desire for a long-term academic appointment. More broadly, by granting tenure, the University exercises its belief in academic freedom and recognizes that a faculty member has the knowledge, skills, and professionalism required to make continuing, positive contributions to the discipline, school, and academic community that advance the institution's goals - in short, tenure is critical to the University's mission. The ties between the University and tenured faculty are the strongest that exist in the corps of instruction and provide the maximum protection for faculty to carry out their roles without undue influence or external pressures. Thus, ensuring the fidelity of the tenure process is essential to the University. Because promotion is viewed as a reflection of the disciplinary competence necessary for tenure, the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition, for tenure at The University of Southern Mississippi. There are inherently different criteria for the latter, such as an individual's potential for long-term contributions to the University. The processes outlined below seek to clarify this point.

The tenure guidelines that follow recognize that disciplinary variations necessitate a certain level of autonomy at the school level. This is particularly the case for interdisciplinary faculty who may have responsibilities to more than one school. To ensure that such faculty meet the same expectations and criteria for both tenure and promotion, it is all the more essential to distinguish between tenure and promotion and establish uniform procedures for both. To this end, units must establish equitable and clear guidelines for the evaluation of faculty whose appointments are funded by multiple schools. Ideally, a letter of agreement should be signed upon the candidate's initial appointment to an interdisciplinary position, which will set forth the expectations of all relevant units with a clear breakdown of proportional obligations and objectives.

These guidelines aim to provide a unified framework for tenure while improving the University's ability to attract talented faculty through increased transparency, consistency, and fairness. Moreover, by establishing the additional recommendation of external evaluations, these processes will improve the reputation of the University as the research-based institution we aspire to be.

Evaluation Criteria
Essential to the University's mission is the recruitment, recognition, and retention of faculty

members who contribute to the overall success and vision of the University through excellence in teaching/librarianship, service, and research/scholarship/creative activities. The purpose of these guidelines is to establish a unified University framework for deciding matters of tenure, while acknowledging the need for discipline-specific variation. Although this section specifically addresses the tenure process, there must be a strong nexus between the annual evaluation process and a faculty member's progress towards tenure. To that end, many of the criteria for evaluation set forth must be synchronized with the criteria used in annual evaluations and promotion.

4.3.1 Teaching

Teaching and student learning are central to the mission of the School of Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences. All faculty members seeking tenure are expected to have demonstrated teaching competency in assigned courses, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising and mentoring of students.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include:
- Student evaluations for each course for no less than the last three years, reflecting a pattern of positive evaluations.
- Teaching e-portfolio.
- Annual faculty evaluations that "meet expectations" or "exceed expectations.'
- Positive peer review.
- Third-year review letters from all levels of review.

Further evidence may include, but is not limited to, the sources listed below:
- Nature of courses typically taught.
- Number of different course and new course preparations.

Documentation
- Contribution to develop and/or update syllabi, lecture notes and updated reading materials. Considerations would include delivery, student level, service learning, etc.
- Development or significant revision of programs and courses.
- Collaboration and cooperation in multiple-section courses.
- Creation or utilization of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study.
- Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service-learning and outreach courses at home or abroad, where research and new knowledge are integrated.
- Academic advising activity.
- Student mentoring activity.
- Number of mentored student research projects, indicating number completed.
- Number of external thesis or doctoral committees as member, indicating number completed.
- Number of practicum supervisions and independent studies directed.

- Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including mentored publications, projects, presentations, etc.
- Letters of support by colleagues/supervisors who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, have team-taught with the candidate, used instructional materials designed by the candidate, or have taught the candidate's students in subsequent courses.
- Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching.
- Grants related to instruction to fund innovative teaching activities.
- Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness as appropriate.

4.3.2 Service
Service refers to the function of applying academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences in support of SLIS, College, and University missions. The School of Library and Information Science values service to society as well as to the University, College, School, and to professional disciplines and organizations. Service may include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management, and technical assistance. SLIS recognizes that service activities may be limited during the probationary period in order for the faculty member to meet teaching and research obligations.

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in School, College or University committees, developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects. All faculty members within the School are expected to participate in faculty meetings and to support the SLIS strategic plan.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for national, regional, or state professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional associations and learned societies' publications; and review of grants applications.

A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of tenure if any of the following conditions are met and deemed appropriate by SLIS:
1. Utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. Direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. Ultimate purpose for the public or common good.
4. New knowledge generated for the discipline and/or the community.
5. Clear relationship between the program/activities and the mission of SLIS

Annual evaluations that consistently indicate "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" are required for tenure.

4.3.3 Research/Scholarship
In accordance with the mission of this Carnegie R1 very high research university, the School of

Library and Information Science and the College of Education and Human Sciences acknowledges that scholarship and the creation and production of research are crucial to the advancement of knowledge. To be considered for tenure, a faculty member must be an active and productive researcher/scholar. Scholarship is multifaceted and scholarly activity must be assessed in diverse ways. The following proposed common College standards are for demonstrating research/scholarly productivity.

        A. Maintenance of an active program of research.
        B. Publications. Only work published while at USM will be considered, with the exception that if a candidate has been granted credit toward tenure, then any accomplishments from that time period should also be included. For example, if a candidate is granted two or three years' credit toward tenure, his/her accomplishments from that specific period of time should also be considered.
        C. Appropriate efforts to secure internal and external funding.

Research expectations for tenure are to have an established and documented record of success in publishing, presenting, and/or obtaining funding. The approximate research expectations for receiving tenure consist of the following:

- Candidate has documented seven (7) significant contributions.
- Of the seven (7) significant contributions, four (4) must be publications in refereed journals deemed appropriate to the range of our discipline. Significant contributions may also include national or international invited publications, books, book chapters, juried/refereed conference papers published in proceedings, and/or funded external proposals. An academic book/monograph that presents original research/scholarship, is peer-reviewed, contracted, and published via a recognized university or private academic press that engages in rigorous professional/peer review may carry more weight than a single publication in a refereed journal. An authored scholarly/academic book may be given greater weight than a book that is an edited collection of articles/chapters or a textbook. Edited books and textbooks will be judged by scope, size, and impact of the text upon the academic field. Tenured faculty members within the School of Library and Information Science will review the published book and determine the number/weight of scholarly items the book represents.
- Candidates for tenure are expected to demonstrate success in providing refereed or juried presentations to professional organizations and/or audiences appropriate to their disciplines.

Evidence of research or scholarly activities may include, but is not limited to:

- Research and/or scholarly publications. Faculty should publish their research in nationally recognized competitive, refereed journals or other refereed works such as subject encyclopedia articles. In addition, discipline-specific publications (e.g., training manuals, handbooks, etc.), articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, refereed research or scholarly posters, research notes, published reports and bulletins will be considered.

- Grants and other project applications, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.
- Presentation of research papers before technical and professional meetings or scholarly conferences.
- Honors or awards for research or scholarship.
- Application of research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional associations, or educational institutions.
- Other evidence of research or scholarly accomplishments as appropriate.

Annual evaluations that consistently indicate "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" are required for tenure.

Collegiality and Professional Behavior
Because they aim to become part of the cadre of faculty that will shape the long-term future of the institution, candidates for tenure must exhibit a clear sense of shared responsibility for the excellence of the University; this includes collegiality. Collegiality, although distinct from the other criteria for tenure, is interlinked with them, and its evaluation should be in those contexts. Accordingly, the separate category of "collegiality" *should not be added* to the traditional three areas of faculty performance.

Schools and colleges will instead focus on developing clear definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service in which the virtues of collegiality are reflected (SLIS Annual Evaluation Guidelines, p. 13). Academic freedom does not protect legal or policy violations, including disrespectful speech to students, colleagues, or superiors; classroom speech that is not germane to the course subject; harassment of colleagues or students; research or scholarship misconduct; nonperformance of assigned tasks; or refusal to follow rules and policies. Collegiality is also not to be construed as promoting non-work-related social gatherings or to limiting robust discussion and conversation among faculty regarding topics important to the institution or the academy. Therefore, any concerns regarding a faculty member's collegiality or professional behavior must be shared in writing with said faculty member as soon as any concerns arise. At a minimum, any concerns about collegiality or professional behavior should be articulated in the faculty member's annual evaluation review as well as in the pre-tenure review (if applicable).

Tenure Framework
As tenure is an award granted by IHL upon nomination by the Institutional Executive Officer, which is built around contributions by a faculty member to their discipline and the institution, the framework for tenure has to be one that allows for input at all levels of the institution and that simultaneously allows flexibility across schools. This flexibility is particularly essential in the case of interdisciplinary faculty who may have responsibility to more than one unit. Additionally, although research/scholarship is a significant component of the University's identity, and although it is central to advancement in many fields, the idea that tenure can or should be awarded solely on the basis of outstanding research/scholarship is one that does not mesh with the necessity that candidates for tenure

contribute to *all* parts of the mission of the University and show the potential for continued long-term contributions. Thus, the process for tenure attempts to balance the needs across schools, the needs within disciplines, and effective academic citizenship within the University. Additionally, although tenure is a separate process from promotion, it is important that the tenure process is informed by the annual evaluation process so that probationary faculty members are not caught unaware if there are concerns regarding any of the evaluative elements within the tenure process. The criteria for tenure, therefore, are determined in the typical areas of assessment (teaching, service, research/scholarship) with additional considerations of collegiality (SLIS Annual Evaluation Guidelines, p. 13). Academic and potential for long-term contributions to the University. These are outlined more completely in Section 3.1.4.

Probationary Period for Tenure Application
Because the award of tenure implies a long-term commitment on the part of the University, there shall be a probationary period of six years with an application for the award of tenure a happening within the sixth year; exceptions are made for faculty who are awarded time towards tenure in their original hire negotiations. Additionally, tenure *may* be awarded, pursuant to IHL policy, at the time of hire. This option should be used with care. This option *may* be more frequently appropriate for hires with administrative duties. Regardless, the School Promotion and Tenure Committee for the potential hire shall be consulted regarding the awarding of tenure at the time of hire with adequate time to review the applicant's qualifications. This ensures that individuals will not be placed in the position of evaluating those who have input in probationary faculty's tenure application and maintains the integrity of tenure at the University.

Length of Probationary Period for Tenure Application
In keeping with current University and IHL policy, there shall be a probationary period of six years with the tenure application to be filed in year six of the appointment. This provides adequate time for faculty to demonstrate their ongoing impact within their respective disciplines but equally allows for the University to assess (and, where applicable, assist faculty in improving) collegiality and potential for long-term contributions to the institution. In keeping with the University's goal of maintaining and improving the quality of the faculty, outside of cases in which credit for time served at another institution has been awarded in the hiring process, faculty must apply for tenure in their 6th year. Although this will most often coincide with the promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, these are separate processes, and the evaluation for promotion and tenure should be independent.

Extension of Probationary Period. Applicants may request an extension of the probationary period by one year for personal circumstances that are not under the control of the University. Details can be found in the [Faculty Handbook](#) (5.7).

Process for Extending the Probationary Period
Any request to extend the probationary period shall be made in writing, with attached justification, to the appropriate school director in the semester before the tenure application is due. The school director may support or decline this extension in a letter and will submit

the application and the director's letter to the dean of the appropriate college. The dean may also support or decline this extension in a letter and will submit the application and the letters from director and dean to the Provost for a final decision on the extension.

Waiver of Probationary Period for Tenure
The University has a vested interest in attracting the best candidates to all levels of the University. Given that some of these candidates may be tenured at other institutions and in keeping with IHL policy 403.0101, the privilege of tenure *may* be granted to individuals who have held tenure at their previous institution. *There is no automatic course of action,* however, and care should be used in the case of the award of tenure upon hire. Any institutional appointments with tenure must be approved by the candidate's school during the hiring/negotiation process, and, again consistent with IHL policy, tenure for these faculty must be recommended by the President and approved by the Board.

If Tenure is Denied
As tenure is granted by the IHL upon nomination by the Institutional Executive Officer on the basis of both impact within the discipline as well as institutional considerations, in the event that tenure is denied, a final one-year non-renewable contract at the candidate's rank is to be issued to the candidate.

Associate Professor Requirement
Satisfaction of the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor should be a requirement for the award of tenure. Therefore, Assistant Professors cannot apply for tenure before or without simultaneously applying for promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty appointed at ranks above Assistant Professor may apply for tenure without applying for promotion.

Credit for Prior Accomplishments

Credit for prior accomplishments may be awarded up to a maximum of five years towards the probationary period for prior service at other institutions of higher learning if specified in the faculty member's contract at the time of employment. Such credit is granted only to an individual who possesses exceptional professional qualifications and achievements. Generally, that credit is limited to two years for faculty appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor, three to five years for faculty appointed at the rank of Associate Professor, and five years for those faculty appointed at the rank of Professor.

Consistent with the idea that credit can be awarded for time served at another institution of higher learning, for the tenure review, it must be permissible to give credit for accomplishments generated while serving at another institution of higher learning. Accomplishments, however, must be part of a continuous record that immediately precedes the appointment at USM.

Evaluative Bodies for Tenure Review
Review must be performed at each level of the institution to grant tenure. Thus, peer review of applications for tenure should always include the faculty member's School

Promotion and Tenure Committee, the School Director (or a joint letter from school directors in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean of the college in which the faculty's school resides (or a joint letter from deans from all affected colleges in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, Provost, and President.

Use of External Evaluators for Tenure Review
For SLIS, letters from external evaluators are required for all applications for promotion to the rank of Full Professor but not required for applications for promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure.

See the [Faculty Handbook](#) for Amending/Updating Application Materials; Evaluative Bodies' Roles and Responsibilities; Advisory Role of Evaluative Bodies; Written Recommendation; Confidentiality of Review Proceedings

4.5 Post-tenure Review
Post-tenure Review (PTR)
Provided there are no substantially mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness), PTR is initiated when, in the annual review process, faculty do not meet expectations in any one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years.

A formal development plan for improvement is initiated by the School Director and/or FEC after a faculty member receives: (i) their second consecutive assignment of "Does Not Meet Expectations" in one of the three categories of faculty workload (teaching, research/creative activities, service) or (ii) assignment of "Does Not Meet Expectations" in at least two categories in the same year. Please see the [Faculty Handbook](#) (4.5.4) for details on this process.

EVALUATION RUBRICS (APPENDIX A)

TEACHING				
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Comments
Coursework	Coursework (development, materials, and assessments) does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate University groups (e.g., online steering committee). Exhibits and unwillingness to teach assigned courses.	Coursework (development, materials, and assessments) reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate University groups (e.g., online steering committee). Shares course shells with other faculty.	Coursework reflects innovative development, which may include service learning, active learning, honors theses, SPUR projects, etc. consistent with school directives and exceeding the unit expectations. Shares course shells with other faculty & works with new faculty teaching the course.	
Course delivery	Course delivery (attendance, course load, syllabi, grading deadlines, etc.) is not performed according to the University calendar or School guidelines. Exhibits and unwillingness to teach at needed times.	Course delivery (attendance, course load, syllabi, grading deadlines, etc.) is performed according to the University calendar and guidelines.	Course delivery exceeds unit and University guidelines by the addition of independent studies, thesis or dissertation coursework, etc., added to existing load.	
Student engagement, retention, completion	Course is poorly structured without sequential modules or clear due dates or discussions requiring response. Syllabi do not contain the important dates.	Course is structured for student success with modules, deadlines/due dates, discussions requiring responses, etc. Syllabi contain important dates and reminders.	In addition to course structure, students are given an early graded assignment and the ability to readdress it after feedback. Faculty uses reminders, announcements, and other tools to aid in retention and completion.	

Student teaching evaluations	Teaching evaluations conducted by students do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit. Indicate incivility or general unavailability.	Teaching evaluations conducted by students reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit. Indicate professional interactions and responsiveness.	Teaching evaluations conducted by students exceed the standard level of performance level identified within the unit. Faculty engage in additional evaluations—like mid-semester checks.	
Teaching e-Portfolio	Teaching e-portfolio is missing one or more of the required items and/or one or more of the items are not current.	Teaching e-portfolio includes all the required elements: instructor image & teaching philosophy on main page, links to updated vita (pdf), course info or syllabi.	Teaching e-portfolio has excellent design and exceeds the requirements to include other relevant items such as an image gallery.	
Innovative teaching	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews reflect a lack of change or inclusion of relevant material in the course experience.	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews reflect the use of new materials, new approaches to engage students.	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews show engaged learning based on innovative teaching methods.	
TOTAL SCORE: 3/5 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations 3/5 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Definitions and additional examples of Collegiality and Engagement are found at the end of this document.				

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES				
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Comments
Participation in research/ scholarly activities	Participates or demonstrates continuous effort in research/scholarly activities at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified	Participates in research/ scholarly activities by initiating new activity and/or demonstrating continuous effort on existing activity as	Participates in research/scholarly activities by initiating new collaborative interdisciplinary activity and/or demonstrating continuous effort on existing	

	within the unit. Does not exhibit academic integrity within research.	reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit. Exhibits academic integrity within research.	interdisciplinary activity exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit. Exhibits academic integrity within research.	
Dissemination of research/ scholarly activities	Disseminates work through unit-identified channels (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books, presentations, etc.) at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Disseminates work through unit-identified channels (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books, presentations, etc.) as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Disseminates work through unit-identified channels (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books, presentations, etc.) at a rate that exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Collabora-tion in research/scholarly activities	Does not support or does not involve peers in research/professional development and creative activities as appropriate.	Supports peers in research/professional development and creative activities as appropriate.	Involves peers in research/professional development and creative activities as appropriate.	
Applications for internal/ external funding	Submits application for internal/external funding of research/ scholarly activities at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Submits application for internal/external funding of research/scholarly activities as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit. (e.g., unit may define expectations as annual, bi-annual, tri-annual submissions, etc.)	Procures internal/external funding of research/scholarly activities exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
TOTAL SCORE: 2/3 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations 2/3 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Definitions and additional examples of Collegiality and Engagement are found at the end of this document.				

SERVICE			
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Comments
Institutional committees	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, college, and University level at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit or does not attend committee meetings to represent the unit.	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, college, and University level as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit; attends meetings and contributes to the needs of the committee.	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the department, college, and University level at a rate exceeding the standard performance level within the unit; attends meetings, completes a leadership role for the committee or sub-committee.	
Professional organizations	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership, participation in, and committee service on professional organizations, publications, activities within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide, exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Campus activities and community service	Facilitates growth of the University/college/ school through active participation in University campus activities and community service related to their profession at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit. Does not	Facilitates growth of the University/college/ school through active participation in University campus activities and community service related to their profession as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the	Facilitates growth of the University/college/ School through active participation in University campus activities and community service related to their profession exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	

	participate in community events that support the values and missions of the University, College, and School.	unit. Participates in community events that support the values and missions of the University, College, and School.	Creates community events that support the values and missions of the University, College, and School.	
Student mentorship	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and research as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit. Does not participate equitable share of masters' projects. Does not provide feedback to assist students in publication.	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and research as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit. Participates equitable share of masters' projects. Encourages students to publish through feedback.	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student to committees to include graduate examinations and research, and undergraduate honors theses, etc. exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit. Participates in a more than equitable share of masters' projects. Co-publishes with students.	
TOTAL SCORE: 3/4 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations 3/4 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Collegiality is defined, and examples of collegiality in service are listed below. Engagement is defined, and examples of engagement in service are listed below.				

COLLEGIALITY

Collegiality implies active participation within the unit and a willingness to work with colleagues in a collaborative and cooperative manner while respecting their academic freedom. Collegiality does not mandate unanimity but does demand loyalty to the institution and civil treatment of colleagues (Hall, 2005). The expectation for collegiality applies equally to all members of an academic unit, tenured and untenured alike. Collegiality as a requirement for tenure is a component of professional conduct and is not intended to be discriminatory, as a way of silencing individuals nor avoiding controversial issues and discussions, but instead is intended to reduce unprofessional behaviors that result in purposeful division or disruption of the unit. Collegiality does not always equate to pleasantness nor does it simply imply positive relationships with administrators and senior faculty.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate *a continuing pattern of respecting and working well with peers, students, staff, and the unit's common purpose.* Collegiality will be evaluated by the presence of a variety of positive indicators and the absence of negative indicators. Candidates are encouraged to address the issue of collegiality in the narrative they provide for review.

Specific examples of collegiality, which are not exhaustive, may include such positive indicators as:
- Collaboration within the unit in program, department, college, and university
- Regular attendance and engagement at meetings
- Respect for department peers (initiating routine communication regarding course and program preferences, changes, logistics of teaching, etc.)
- Personal and academic integrity
- Volunteering in order to contribute to equity of departmental workload
- Agreeing to take leadership roles
- Respect for students
    - Providing timely feedback
    - Appropriate interpersonal interactions and awareness of professional boundaries per University standards and policies
    - Attendance at student presentations (particularly as a committee member)
- Demonstrated interest and involvement in general departmental, college, and university welfare
- Demonstrating professionalism and respect to the department, college, and university (for example, maintaining confidentiality as appropriate, advocating for departmental needs)
- A commitment to the sharing of departmental resources.

Examples of negative indicators of collegiality:
- General unavailability
- Routine unwillingness to serve on student committees
- Pattern of non-attendance at
    - Departmental meetings
    - College/university meetings

        o   Student committee meetings
- A pattern of unwillingness to serve on or chair program, department, college, and university committees
- Inadequate performance as a committee member or chair of a committee
- Uncooperativeness including a pattern of unwillingness to agree to teaching assignments (to team teach, to teach specific courses, to prepare new courses, or teach in needed format) as appropriate to the faculty member's experience/expertise
- Failure to adhere to ethical academic practice
- Violations of academic integrity (e.g., misrepresentation of productivity)
- Repeated incivility.

ENGAGEMENT

Engagement is an essential dimension of institutional health, growth and well-being. All stakeholders – students, faculty staff, and administration – are expected to engage in actions that maintain and, when possible and appropriate, advance the mission and goals of the University. This guide for crafting a rubric is particular to one group of stakeholders, University faculty. The guide is presented as a table to be edited and/or modified and further developed into a rubric by school faculty so that it can be used to assess engagement of faculty members within the school (and other academic units) and university community.

The guide is not intended to be prescriptive or inflexible. Rather, each school/unit should further develop and customize its own rubric to fairly and reasonably consider a faculty member's engagement as appropriate to the faculty member's discipline/field in relation to the school's agreed-upon mission and goals. Because the table below presents varied examples of faculty engagement, some of the ideas presented below will be incongruous or inappropriate for the school/discipline and should be deleted. Likewise, some items below will need to be revised and/or relevant new examples may need to be added at the discretion of the school faculty.
It is essential that the process of developing the rubric include the full school faculty and other stakeholders. The rubric developed is suitable as a starting point for discussion and must only be applicable to faculty during their contract period.

Engagement Examples for Faculty
- Engages as a school citizen in ways that support the University's mission and goals.
- Abides by the school's stated, agreed-upon values.
- Carries equitable share of the school's teaching, research, creative, and service responsibilities, as negotiated with the school director.
- Responds in a timely manner to requests and correspondence from students, peers, staff, and administrators at the university.
- Carries out their yearly workload as negotiated with the school director.
- Maintains a University presence, both physical and virtual, as negotiated with the school director.
- Remains current in their discipline.
- Engages with the community through teaching, research, and/or service, as appropriate.
- Engages in professional development on a consistent basis.

- Works to ensure that learning experiences promote student engagement, retention, and completion.
- Is available to meet with students when needed. Responds to student questions and correspondence in a timely manner.
- Is available for meetings with advisees (F2F or virtual as appropriate). Has reasonable availability during and after advising week.
- Involves or supports students in research/professional development and creative activities as appropriate.
- Chairs and serves on equitable share of master's, specialist, and/or doctoral research/capstone/ dissertation committees.
- Maintains an active research program and/or creative activities program, as appropriate.
- Contributes to knowledge creation in the discipline.
- Involves or supports peers in research/professional development and creative activities as appropriate.
- Shows initiative and engages with the research process. Does not piggyback or take advantage of a colleague's assistance.
- Engages community partners in research, as appropriate.
- Secures internal and external grants to sponsor research.
- Translation of new knowledge generated by the university to the public through the commercialization of discoveries (e.g., technology transfer, licenses, copyrights, and some forms of economic development).
- Participates on and/or leads school committees in ways that support the school's mission and goals.
- Attends and participates in faculty and committee meetings.
- Responds to faculty correspondence.
- Advances the school's mission and goals in off-campus activities as appropriate.
- Provides university-based knowledge or other scholarly advice through direct interaction with non-university clients who have requested assistance to address an issue or solve a problem.