Iowa State University Library

Faculty Promotion and Tenure

Policies and Procedures

July 2016

Approved by Library Faculty
7-14-16

Approved by Dean of Library Services
7-18-16
Iowa State University Library
Faculty Promotion and Tenure
Policies and Procedures
Table of Contents

PART I. POLICIES .................................................................................................................. 1
   I. General Policies on Tenure .......................................................................................... 1
      A. Academic Freedom .................................................................................................... 1
      B. Assessment ............................................................................................................... 2
      C. Eligibility for Tenure at Appointment .................................................................... 2
      D. Probationary Service and Tenure Credit for Prior Service ..................................... 2
   II. Standards for Promotion and Tenure ......................................................................... 2
      A. Introduction .............................................................................................................. 2
      B. Scholarship .............................................................................................................. 3
      C. Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities .................................................... 5
         1. Extension/Professional Practice .......................................................................... 5
         2. Teaching ............................................................................................................. 6
         3. Research/Creative Activities .............................................................................. 7
         4. Institutional Service ........................................................................................... 8
   III. Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure .......................................................... 9
      A. Associate Professor and Tenure ............................................................................. 9
      B. Professor and Tenure ............................................................................................ 9

PART II. REVIEW PROCEDURES .................................................................................. 10
   I. Review Process ......................................................................................................... 10
      A. Promotion .............................................................................................................. 10
      B. Rank and Tenure Recommendations .................................................................... 10
   II. Documentation for Promotion Review ...................................................................... 10
      A. Candidate Responsibilities ..................................................................................... 10
      B. Candidate Updates .............................................................................................. 10
   III. Review Committee .................................................................................................. 10
      A. Responsibilities ................................................................................................... 10
      B. Composition ....................................................................................................... 11
         1. Membership .................................................................................................... 11
         2. Membership Exclusions .................................................................................. 11
         3. Candidate Comments on References or Review Committee Membership .......... 11
         4. Conflict of Interest ......................................................................................... 11
III. Review Committee (continued)
   C. Deliberations ........................................................................................................... 11
      1. Process .................................................................................................................. 11
      2. Voting ............................................................................................................... 12
      3. Reconsideration of a Case ................................................................................. 12
      4. Committee Confidentiality and Review Documentation Access ...................... 12

IV. Department Chair ..................................................................................................... 12
   A. Notification of Review Committee Members ......................................................... 12
   B. Department Chair Assessment ............................................................................ 12
   C. Recommendation for Promotion .......................................................................... 13
   D. Department Promotion Dossier ............................................................................ 13
      1. Department Promotion Dossier Content ............................................................ 13
      2. Candidate’s Review for Factual Accuracy ......................................................... 13
   E. Notification Procedure .......................................................................................... 13

V. Dean ......................................................................................................................... 14
   A. Review and Recommendation ............................................................................. 14
   B. Candidate Notification Procedure .................................................................... 14

VI. University Review .................................................................................................... 14

VII. Amendments .......................................................................................................... 14
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PROMOTION AND TENURE
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

In this document the term “department” is understood to refer to the Library as a whole. Library associate deans function as Department Chairs for their divisions in the promotion and tenure process; they are referred to elsewhere in this document as Department Chairs. In cases when the unit supervisor is not the Department Chair, the Department Chair ensures the participation of the unit supervisor in the administrative assessment and notifies the unit supervisor of all formal actions.

Part I. Policies

I. General Policies on Tenure

A. Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression and to speak or write as a public citizen without institutional discipline or restraint. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of academic duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that the individual is not speaking for the institution in matters of public interest.

Tenure is the keystone for academic freedom; it is essential for safeguarding the right of free expression and for encouraging risk-taking inquiry at the frontiers of knowledge. Both tenure and academic freedom are part of an implicit social compact, which recognizes that tenure serves important public purposes and benefits society. The public is best served when faculty are free to teach, conduct research, provide extension/professional practice services, and engage in institutional service without fear of reprisal or without compromising the pursuit of knowledge and/or the creative process.

In return, faculty have the responsibility of furthering high-quality programs of research, teaching, and extension/professional practice, and are fully accountable for their performance of these responsibilities. Additionally, a well-designed tenure system attracts capable and highly qualified individuals as faculty members, strengthens institutional stability by enhancing faculty members’ institutional loyalty, and encourages academic excellence by retaining and rewarding the most meritorious people. Tenure and promotion imply selectivity and choice; they are granted for scholarly and professional merit. The length and intensity of the review leading to the granting of tenure ensures the retention of only productive faculty; annual evaluations and post tenure reviews ensure the continuance of a commitment to excellence.

The system of academic tenure at Iowa State University emphasizes

1. Recruitment of the most highly qualified candidates available.
2. Creation of an opportunity for scholarly performance in extension/professional practice, teaching, and research/creative activity.
4. The awarding of tenure requires an affirmative decision, based upon an explicit judgment of qualifications resulting from evaluation of the faculty member typically done during the recruitment process and based on the relevant promotion criteria.

5. The awarding of tenure assumes continuous appointment. Except for resignation, retirement, or death of the faculty member, such appointments are terminable only for adequate cause.

B. Assessment
Tenured faculty members undergo annual evaluations, post tenure reviews, and, as requested, reviews for promotion. A tenured faculty member may be dismissed only for adequate cause as defined in the Faculty Handbook’s section “Faculty Dismissal Procedures.” Denial of faculty appointment or reappointment, or removal or suspension from office, or censure, or other penalty must not be based upon any belief, expression, or conduct protected by law or by the principles of academic freedom.

Affirmative action and tenure are compatible concepts. Both seek to ensure the hiring and retention of those who are most qualified. In the appointment process, affirmative action operates to ensure that the most qualified available person is identified and is offered the opportunity to join the faculty. After the initial appointment, the affirmative action program ensures that irrelevant considerations, such as race and gender, play no role in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions.

C. Eligibility for Tenure at Appointment
In the rare circumstance when a Library Faculty appointment is made, it is made at the rank of associate professor or professor with tenure with a full-time A-base appointment. Such appointments are considered and based on administrative position responsibilities that require a faculty appointment. Tenure accompanies appointment to the rank of associate professor or professor unless a probationary period for the new appointee is clearly specified in advance, or unless it is indicated that the appointment does not carry tenure. If an appointment does not include tenure, this is clearly stated in the letter of intent with the probationary period defined.

D. Probationary Service and Tenure Credit for Prior Service
See the Faculty Handbook for current policies and procedures for terms of probationary service, including definition, criteria, extension and tenure credit for prior professional service.

II. Standards for Promotion and Tenure

A. Introduction
Iowa State University is a public land-grant institution where liberal and professional education is merged with basic and applied research in pursuit of advancing society’s potentials and assisting in solving its problems. The university serves the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world through its interrelated programs of teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice.

Evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member’s teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. For promotion, the evaluation is based on the record of the faculty member since the most recent promotion or appointment at Iowa State University. In all areas of professional activity, a faculty member is expected to uphold the values and follow the guidelines in the Statement of Professional Ethics found in “Professional Policies and Procedures.”
A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the position responsibility statement (PRS), which describes the individual’s current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas:

1. Extension/Professional Practice
2. Teaching
3. Research/Creative Activities, and
4. Institutional Service.

The PRS is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance, and scope of the faculty member’s scholarly achievements.

The following sections define and provide examples of scholarship and the four central areas of faculty responsibilities and activities.

B. Scholarship

All Library faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship in their teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice. Scholarship is creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the honest, forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. It builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding. Scholarship is the umbrella under which research falls, but research is just one form of scholarship. Scholarship encompasses creative activities, teaching, and extension/professional practice.

Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product. This product may take the form of a book, journal article, critical review, annotated bibliography, lecture, review of existing research on a topic, or speech synthesizing the thinking on a topic. Also falling under the umbrella of scholarship that would apply to librarians are original materials designed for use with the computer; codes and standards; and scholarly articles published in non-research based periodicals, newspapers, and other publications; etc. In short, scholarship includes materials that are generally called “intellectual property.”

Scholarship generally implies that one has a solid foundation in the professional field addressed and is current with developments in that field. However, it must be noted that significant advances sometimes accrue when a scholar extends her or his scope of topics beyond those traditional to a particular discipline. The production of scholarship demonstrates that a librarian is going beyond the accomplishment of daily work in order to make a difference in the profession and/or the institution.
The following Table 1 describes the broad continuum of scholarship. It is adapted from Conrad J. Weiser, “The Value of a University—Rethinking Scholarship,” draft version; and Ernest L. Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered—Priorities of the Professoriate (Princeton, New York, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

Table 1. The Nature of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of scholarship</th>
<th>Audiences for scholarship</th>
<th>Means of communicating scholarship</th>
<th>Criteria for validating scholarship</th>
<th>Means of documenting scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops and communicates new understanding and insights. Generates, synthesizes, interprets, critically analyzes, and communicates new knowledge, methods, understandings, technologies, materials, uses, insights, beauty and so forth.</td>
<td>Peers, undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral associates, users, patrons, publics, etc.</td>
<td>Teaching materials and methods, classes, curricula; publications, exhibits, performances, patents, copyrights, distribution of materials or programs, etc.</td>
<td>Originality, significance, accuracy, replicability, scope, applicability, breadth, depth and duration of influence, persistence of influence or use, adoption by peers, impact or public benefit, etc.</td>
<td>Present evidence that creative intellectual work was validated by peers; communicated to peers and broader audiences; recognized, accepted, cited, adopted, or used by others. In other words, that it made a difference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 describes the parameters to be used when judging the scholarly nature of a faculty member’s achievements in all evaluation reviews.

The nature of scholarly work at a diverse university necessarily varies. In the promotion and tenure review process, however, evidence that a significant portion of a faculty member’s scholarship has been documented (i.e., communicated to and validated by peers beyond the university) is required of all.

In the library field, refereed journals and monographs are the traditional media for documenting scholarship; in some areas of librarianship, exhibitions are an additional appropriate form. Emerging technologies are creating (and will continue to create) entirely new media which may be used by librarians. Finally, scholarship may be validated and communicated through conference presentations and invited lectures.

Faculty may submit evidence of scholarship that has not been documented by peers in the discipline, even though this evidence alone would not be sufficient to justify promotion and tenure. Evidence regarding both documented and undocumented scholarship provides a holistic portrayal of the candidate’s scholarly work. For example, major in-house reports or manuals in and of themselves do not constitute scholarship. However, if these materials reveal that a librarian “communicates new understandings and insights” (Table 1) effectively to the report or manual users, or “synthesizes, interprets, and communicates new knowledge” (Table 1) for these users, this material may be submitted as supporting evidence of scholarship, even though it may not have been communicated to peers outside the university.

Scholarship often requires teamwork and other collaborative relationships, particularly because of the growth of interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. When work that is a result of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the candidate’s role in the joint effort must be provided.
In the promotion and tenure review process, the emphasis is on the critical evaluation of the scholarly nature of the candidate’s achievements by professional peers, including peers external to the university. Evidence should be presented as to the impact of the scholarship in terms of its depth, duration, and/or persistence of influence or use (e.g., citations, adaptations or use by others), as well as its public and critical appreciation. Table 1 provides the framework for the evaluation.

C. Areas of Position Responsibilities and Activities
In carrying out their responsibilities and activities, faculty will support the university’s commitment to diversity by fostering an environment of mutual respect.

The following sections provide examples of activities that may be documented in each area of faculty responsibility as well as methods by which scholarship within these areas is communicated and evaluated. Teaching, research/creative activities, and extension/professional practice are central to the mission of Iowa State University. Institutional service is an important contribution that faculty members make to ensure effective governance at all levels of the university.

1. Extension/Professional Practice
Extension and professional practice distinguishes Iowa State as a land-grant university. While librarians do not generally engage in extension activities, their primary faculty responsibility in librarianship falls under the category of professional practice. Faculty members engage in professional practice activities by utilizing their professional expertise to disseminate information outside of the traditional classroom to help improve the knowledge and skills of their clientele (i.e., the publics they serve) or the environment in which they live and work. This work is related to the faculty member’s position responsibilities.

Examples of activities that fall within extension/professional practice include:

- Organizing/leading workshops or training sessions
- Preparing informational and instructional materials
- Supervising the operation of units within the library which perform library services and functions
- Acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources
- Engaging in technology transfer
- Consulting
- Serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise
- Serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.
- Serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards
- Demonstrating leadership in professional societies or organizations; e.g., committee service, active task force participation on relevant issues, special appointments to organizations, providing comments that have an impact on issues being considered by societies and organizations, reporting for organizational newsletters.

Since extension/professional practice activities vary greatly among departments, it is the responsibility of the Library Faculty to identify faculty activities that fall under this category and the appropriate evaluation methods.

Faculty who engage in extension/professional practice are knowledgeable about current research and new developments in their discipline and demonstrate an ability to interpret and apply this knowledge to meet their clients’ requirements. When appropriate, they develop and maintain professional
relationships with their clientele in order to identify and serve their needs. They display leadership and initiative, are creative in the practical application of knowledge, and demonstrate a high level of disciplinary expertise, as well as the ability to instruct, inform, and assist clients. In addition, a faculty member’s professional practice reputation may be reflected by leadership in professional societies and organizations or by significant editorial-related activities.

A portfolio format is used to document faculty professional practice activities beyond what is contained in the candidate’s vita. The candidate provides materials such as descriptions of appointment responsibilities in extension/professional practice, representative workshop, seminar, and training materials; book reviews; unpublished reports, studies, etc.; newsletters and brochures; peer evaluations or ratings of extension/professional practice effectiveness; and client assessments.

The effectiveness of the candidate’s extension/professional practice activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in the scholarship section and in Table 1. The scholarship resulting from extension/professional practice activities is documented through means appropriate to the professional specialty, such as peer-reviewed publications, lectures, videos, software, hardware, workbooks, manuals, standards, bibliographies, book reviews, and casebooks. Evaluation of scholarship should consider breadth, depth, and duration of influence or use; public appreciation and benefit; and applicability or adoption by peers.

2. Teaching

Many Library Faculty have teaching responsibilities, and for those with teaching as a position responsibility, the quality of their teaching is an important factor in evaluating their accomplishments and performances. Teaching is a scholarly and dynamic endeavor and covers a broad range of activities. Some examples of teaching activities include:

- Working closely with a teaching faculty member in course-related instruction to integrate information literacy skills into a course. Such work may involve creating handouts to support their research, teaching one or more classes for the course, and/or consulting one-on-one with the students in the course
- Teaching sections of Library 160 and/or otherwise working closely with the Library 160 program
- Working on activities that develop online resources for courses
- Teaching courses in other academic departments
- Presenting resident credit courses, extension and international programs and courses, non-credit seminars and workshops, and continuing-education and distance-learning programs
- Serving on masters and doctoral committees

Particular expressions of effective teaching vary widely, and teachers may demonstrate their pedagogical skills in a variety of ways. Some may display their pedagogical abilities in organized lectures; others may promote collaborative learning or may improvise in the classroom in response to the dynamics of a specific group, while still others may be adept in facilitating group discussion.

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning.
Examples of activities that provide evidence of a Library Faculty member’s particular commitment to effective teaching include:

- Contributions to curricular development, including collaborative courses and programs and service on curriculum committees
- Pedagogical innovation, including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment
- Documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues, and incorporation of this information into the classrooms
- Development of teaching materials
- Pedagogically oriented research
- Involvement in student research projects
- Contributions to professional societies and organizations that seek to improve teaching

A portfolio format is used to document teaching activities beyond what is contained in the candidate’s vita. The candidate provides materials such as teaching philosophy, student ratings of teaching, teaching materials and forms of assessment, peer evaluations based on both classroom observations and review of teaching materials, and evidence of student learning.

The effectiveness of the candidate’s teaching activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in the scholarship section and in Table 1.

The scholarship resulting from teaching is documented through such means as peer-reviewed publications, textbooks, videos, software, workbooks, lab manuals, invited lectures and conference papers. Evaluation of scholarship in teaching considers its originality, significance, and/or impact as evidenced by its influence, use, or adoption by peers.

While production of teaching materials and surveys of student attitudes about classes are valuable indicators of the scholarship of teaching, peer evaluation of both a faculty member’s and her/his students’ performances in classes and in subsequent coursework are also appropriate assessments. Such assessments of performance need not be published or disseminated to publics outside the university.

3. **Research /Creative Activities**

Faculty members who engage in research/creative activities are expected to make original contributions that are appropriate to their chosen area of specialization and that are respected by peers within and outside the university. Some examples of research/creative activity include:

- Conducting experimental research
- Preparing exhibitions, e.g., developing displays or exhibits relating to the impact of libraries and other information issues on society and culture, whether virtual or traditional
- Conceptualizing and theorizing in an original way
- Creating synthesis, criticism, and clarification of extant knowledge and research, e.g., preparing bibliographies, compilations, essays relating to library issues, historical studies, and analyses of library practices
- Conducting innovative collection or analysis of empirical data; e.g., surveys and time-cost studies
- Seeking and obtaining competitive grants and contracts to enhance library services or library-related research; e.g., USAID Grant, Carver Trust Grant, Miller Faculty Fellowship
• Relating research to the solution of practical problems; e.g., utilizing a survey or interactive electronic methods to solve a practical problem within the Library or in the library field
• Demonstrating leadership in professional societies or organizations in areas relating to research

A portfolio format is used to document faculty research/creative activities beyond what is contained in the candidate’s vita. The candidate provides materials such as summaries of completed, current, and future research projects; descriptions of applied use of research; summaries of grants; and exhibition catalogs.

The effectiveness of the candidate’s research/creative activities is determined by evaluating the character of the scholarship of these activities using the criteria described in the scholarship section and in Table 1.

Scholarship is the outcome of research, when it is validated by one’s professional peers. Scholarship resulting from research/creative activities is documented through means appropriate to the specialty, such as peer-reviewed publications, lectures, performances, exhibits, invited lectures, conference papers. Evaluation of scholarship considers its impact as judged by its influence, use, or adoption by peers; and its originality, richness, breadth and/or depth of expression.

4. Institutional Service

Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university at all levels by participating effectively in faculty governance and in the formulation of library, and/or university policies; or by carrying out administrative responsibilities. Therefore, to be promoted and/or tenured, faculty members are expected to have been involved in institutional service. The level and amount of service are expected to be higher for those seeking promotion to the rank of professor. However, institutional service alone shall not serve as the central basis for promotion and/or tenure.

As citizens of the university, faculty members may also make other direct and indirect contributions to the Library, college, and university communities. Service to professional organizations outside the university is considered part of professional practice, teaching or research, whether or not such service results from the faculty member’s reputation.
III. Qualifications for Academic Rank and Tenure

Recommendations for initial appointment and promotion are based on evidence that the individual has met the qualifications for the faculty rank to which he or she is to be appointed or promoted. Assessment is based upon a review of the case as submitted by the candidate and letters of evaluation from qualified evaluators.

A. Associate Professor and Tenure
An associate professor should have a solid academic reputation and show promise of further development and productivity in his or her academic career. The candidate must demonstrate:

- Excellence in scholarship that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for national distinction
- Effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities
- Satisfactory institutional service

Furthermore, a recommendation for appointment to the rank associate professor and granting of tenure must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and has a high likelihood of sustained contributions to the field or profession and to the university.

B. Professor and Tenure
A professor should be recognized by his or her professional peers within the university, as well as nationally and/or internationally, for the quality of the contribution to his or her discipline. The candidate must demonstrate:

- National distinction in scholarship, as evident in candidate’s wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the field or profession
- Effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities
- Significant institutional service

Furthermore, a recommendation for appointment to rank of professor and granting of tenure must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field or profession and to the university.
Part II. Procedures

I. Review Process

A. Promotion Review
Faculty are reviewed for promotion according to the promotion review calendar. Each year the Dean notifies the faculty of the upcoming promotion review process. Faculty eligible for promotion review must petition the Dean if they wish to be considered.

B. Rank and Tenure Recommendations During Recruitment and Hiring Process
Rank and tenure recommendations are part of the recruitment and hiring process if a tenured faculty appointment is being considered. The Dean will arrange faculty peer and administrative reviews of the candidate’s credentials for recommendations as to the potential appointment. The rank criteria is based on the anticipated rank being considered for the appointment.

C. Access to Confidential Review Material
Access to review documentation, during their respective reviews, is limited to current Review Committee members eligible to conduct the review, the Department Chair, Unit Supervisor if not the Department Chair, Head of Library Human Resources (HR), and the Dean.

II. Documentation for Promotion Review

A. Candidate Responsibilities
1. Faculty members must maintain their own promotion files.
2. Each candidate must provide the following documentation for their reviews.
   - Vita
   - Position Responsibility Statement(s)
   - Faculty Portfolio (Portfolio) and Portfolio Appendix
   - Names and contact information for proposed evaluators

B. Candidate Updates
The candidate may submit significant additional information for consideration by the Review Committee during its review of the case. After this review is completed, the candidate may submit only significant changes to activities listed as “in-progress” on the Vita for consideration by the Department Chair and/or Dean, depending on the status of the review process.

III. Review Committee

A. Responsibilities
The Review Committee thoroughly evaluates all promotion cases and reports the results of its findings and its recommendation in the Review Committee Report submitted to the Department Chair. It is not an appellate committee. The Committee’s evaluation of a case should not be a statement of advocacy but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate’s record of performance. It should summarize the primary points made by external evaluators, and should include assessments of the following:
• The candidate’s accomplishments in scholarship
• The candidate’s performance in his or her areas of responsibility
• The candidate’s prospects for future contributions to the field and the library
• The candidate’s role and contributions to the library mission

In addition to the committee’s written evaluation and its recommendations regarding promotion, the Review Committee Report includes the signed vote count and all documentation on which the review was based. The Committee should frame any negative recommendation in as constructive a manner as possible and, when appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the criteria for promotion.

B. Composition

1. Membership
The Review Committee is composed of all members of the Library Faculty holding the rank of full professor. At minimum, the Committee must consist of three eligible full professors. If the minimum size is not met, the Library Faculty will elect, for one-year term(s), as many eligible associate professor(s) as necessary to meet the minimum three-member quorum.

2. Membership Exclusions
• Faculty members under review for promotion
• Candidate’s Unit Supervisor, if not the Department Chair
• Associate deans and Library Dean
• Spouses, blood relatives, or relatives by marriage of faculty members under review for promotion.

3. Candidate Comments on References or Review Committee Membership
The candidate may forward to the Review Committee written comments regarding potential references, or potential conflicts of interest with committee members according to the Promotion Review calendar. The Committee will give the candidate's comments full consideration and place the comments with the committee review materials.

4. Conflict of Interest
Any member of the Review Committee who has a conflict of interest with respect to a candidate shall not participate in the consideration of that individual or have access to review materials. A conflict of interest may exist if the Committee member has a relationship with a candidate that would hinder an objective review of the case. The chair may, after consultation with the Committee, remove a member from consideration of a case if it is determined that a conflict of interest exists.

C. Deliberations

1. Process
The Review Committee will select its own chair, who serves as the point of contact with the Department Chair. A quorum will be a majority of members eligible to consider a case. For each case, the Committee will examines all documentation submitted by the candidate, letters of evaluation, and all other relevant information. The Committee has access to either the latest post tenure review report / administrative review report or the most recent Review Committee report that concerns the promotion being considered
whichever report is the most recent. Requests by the committee for information are made in writing. Correspondence is sent to the Committee chair.

2. Voting
A quorum is required for voting. All voting will be by signed, written ballot. Votes will be recorded and the names of those voting will be noted in the Review Committee Report. No abstentions from those eligible to vote is allowed. An affirmative vote of the Review Committee will be more yes than no votes.

3. Reconsideration of a Case
Occasionally, the Department Chair may ask the Review Committee to reconsider a case following submittal of the Review Committee Report. This can occur in those rare situations when activities in-progress and listed on the candidate’s Vita have changed significantly and hold enough importance to potentially affect the candidate’s review (e.g., successful completion of a major project which was in progress during the committee review process, or acceptance of an article already submitted). The committee’s reconsideration of the case will be limited to review of these identified activities and their impact on the overall case. Reconsideration can result in a new vote by the committee.

4. Committee Confidentiality and Review Documentation Access
Deliberations of the Review Committee are privileged and kept in strict confidence. Committee members eligible to conduct the review have access to the review documentation only during the committee review process. Draft reports are treated as confidential material in the creation and discard process.

IV. Department Chair
Library associate deans serve as Department Chairs for their divisions and upon request by the Dean in other promotion reviews. In a case where the associate dean is under review, the Dean will select another associate dean or, if necessary, a Library Faculty member to serve as Department Chair.

A. Notification of Review Committee Members
Based on information received from the chair of the Review Committee, the Department Chair notifies in writing each candidate, Head of Library HR, and the Dean of the Review Committee members who will conduct the promotion review.

B. Department Chair Assessment
The Department Chair is responsible for fully and independently evaluating each case according to the library criteria, and forwarding the Department Review Dossier to the Dean.

If the Unit Supervisor is not the Department Chair, the Unit Supervisor submits a Supervisor Review Letter to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair takes into consideration his or her own knowledge; all materials considered by the Review Committee; the Review Committee Report; additional administrative, supervisory, and/or peer assessment; and any new significant information that the candidate has submitted to the Department Chair. If
this new information is important enough that it could significantly change the candidate’s case, the Department Chair may return the case to the Review Committee.

The Department Chair’s evaluation of a case should not be a statement of advocacy but should address both the strengths and relative weaknesses in the candidate’s record of performance. It summarizes the primary points made by evaluators, both internal and external, and should include assessments of the following:

- The candidate’s accomplishments in scholarship
- The candidate’s performance in his or her areas of responsibility
- The candidate’s prospects for future contributions to the field and the library
- The candidate’s role and contributions to the library mission

C. Recommendation for Promotion

The Department Chair prepares a Department Promotion Dossier for each person whom the Review Committee has recommended for promotion. The Department Chair may prepare a Department Promotion Dossier for a candidate whom the review committee has not recommended for promotion. A Department Promotion Dossier is completed for all promotion cases except when the recommendations of the Review Committee and Department Chair are both negative. In such cases, a statement from the Department Chair indicating the reasons for his or her recommendation is sufficient to forward to the Dean.

D. Department Promotion Dossier

The Department Chair prepares a dossier for each case, forwards it to the Dean, and informs the Review Committee of his or her recommendation.

1. The Department Promotion Dossier Content

- Candidate’s Vita, PRS(s), Portfolio, and Portfolio Appendix
- Review Committee Report
- Department Chair Review Letter to the Dean
- Copies of all other reports and letters of evaluation
- Log of External Letters: Includes summary of each letter of evaluation covering both positive and negative remarks and a statement regarding the significance of the evaluators’ credentials
- Other required material

2. Candidate’s Review for Factual Accuracy

Before forwarding the Department Promotion Dossier, the Department Chair requests the candidate to review its factual record, which only includes the Vita, Position Responsibility Statement(s), and Portfolio. The candidate reviews the factual record and notifies the Department Chair in writing of the result of this review, and provides any recommended revisions related to factual accuracy.

E. Candidate Notification Procedure

The Department Chair informs in writing each candidate whether a recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean, and, if so, the nature of the recommendation. The Department Chair informs in writing any candidate not recommended by either the Review Committee or the Department Chair, or both, as to the reasons for the non-recommendation. The Department Chair should frame this in as constructive a manner as possible and, when appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the criteria for promotion.
V. Dean

A. Review and Recommendation
The Dean conducts an independent review of each candidate, writes the Dean Review Letter, and forwards the required Library Promotion Dossier to the Provost.

B. Notification Procedure
The Dean informs in writing the candidate and the Department Chair of the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost. If the Dean’s recommendation is different from the Review Committee and/or the Department Chair, the Dean will also include a summary of his or her written reasons for the recommendation.

The Department Chair informs the Review Committee and Unit Supervisor, if there is one that participated in the review, of the Dean’s decision.

VI. University Review

Review for promotion and/or tenure concludes at the university level with final approval by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

VII. Amendments

Amendments to this document may be initiated by the Review Committee, an ad hoc committee appointed by the Dean, or other Library Faculty members. Those wishing to recommend amendments should present them to the Chair of the Librarian Assembly. Amendments must maintain compatibility between library and university promotion and tenure documents.

Amendments are sent to the faculty two weeks in advance of a vote. The Librarian Assembly officers conduct the vote and count the ballots. Approval will be by a majority of those voting. Amendments approved by the Library Faculty shall be forwarded to the Dean for action.

The Dean will review the amendments and announce his/her final action to the Library Faculty. As appropriate, the Dean sends the amended document to the Provost for final approval.