Committee Name: Library Committee on Promotion and Tenure (LCPT)

Committee Chair: Fran Devlin (Fall 2010), Keith Russell (Spring 2011)

Members (with terms): Fran Devlin, Associate Librarian Rep, 2008-2011 (resigned from the Committee December 31, 2010); Scott McEathron (elected to finish Fran’s term), Associate Librarian Rep, Spring 2011; Deborah Dandridge, Secretary, Associate Librarian Rep, 2009-2012; Sherry Williams, Librarian Rep, 2008-2011; Keith Russell, Librarian Rep, 2009-2012; Judith Emde, Librarian Rep, 2010-2013. Erin Ellis served as the LFPA Exec Liaison. Mike Broadwell and his staff continued to provide support to LCPT and to P&T and PTTR candidates.

Fiscal Year: 2010-2011

Standing Charges:

3.3.4.1 The Committee on Promotion and Tenure (LCPT) is the committee required by Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI. It shall review the qualifications and performance of all members of the Library Faculty who are to be considered for promotion, award of tenure, or non-reappointment, and make recommendation to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure in accordance with the guidelines accepted by the University of Kansas for granting promotions and tenure for librarians. Its recommendations, together with those of the Dean of Libraries, shall be forwarded to the Office of the Provost for consideration by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

3.3.4.2 The Committee on Promotion and Tenure also acts as the Libraries’ Progress toward Tenure Review (PTTR) committee. It shall review the qualifications and performance of all members of the Library Faculty who are scheduled to be evaluated in their progress toward tenure. Once the Committee completes its review, the complete files with the Committee’s recommendations will be sent to the Dean of Libraries.

3.3.4.3 The Committee shall review annually the criteria established by the University Libraries in accordance with the aforesaid guidelines and recommend to the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly revisions of these criteria, as necessary. It shall also recommend the procedures used for the preparation of dossiers for librarians under review for progress toward tenure and consideration
for promotion and/or tenure. The Committee shall present its recommendations to the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly for approval.

3.3.4.4 The first meeting of the Committee each year shall be called by the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly Executive Committee no later than the first week of August; the first order of business shall be to select a presiding officer and a recording secretary.

3.3.4.5 The Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall be composed of five tenured library faculty members with a minimum of three librarians from the Librarian rank, – all to be elected by members of the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly eligible to vote (see 2.2.1 supra). Members of the Committee shall ordinarily serve three years with overlapping terms to provide continuity. Members may not ordinarily succeed themselves without one year intervening. Should there be a vacancy that will impact the Committee’s work, qualified members of the Library Faculty (including someone who has just served on LCPT) will be nominated by LFPA Executive Committee for a special election to serve the remainder of the term.

3.3.4.5.1 A librarian who is seeking promotion may not stand for election or serve on the Committee during the year in which he or she will be reviewed for promotion.

3.3.4.5.2 A librarian who has a domestic or familial relationship to the librarian being reviewed for progress toward tenure or being considered for tenure or promotion may not serve on the Committee during that year.

3.3.4.5.3 A unit head or supervisor of a librarian being considered for promotion or tenure may not serve on the Committee during the year.

3.3.4.5.4 No librarian may serve simultaneously on the Library Committee on Promotion and Tenure and the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

3.3.4.6 The Committee shall function as a unit with all members present. Each shall have the full privilege of voice and shall vote in all proceedings except those in which the vote is specifically denied by Section 3.3.4.5.2 or Section 3.3.4.5.3, or when by a majority vote, the Committee disqualifies a member from discussion, voting, or both because his or her relationship to the matter under discussion is judged prejudicial by the Committee.

3.3.4.7 Regarding the membership required to review a file, only those tenured members, at or above, the rank for which the candidate is being nominated shall vote. If, due to unanticipated circumstances, (e.g. a recusal) there are fewer than three available members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure qualified to vote in an individual case, the Library Faculty Executive Committee will appoint a
qualified member of the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly to review and vote on that particular case (see 3.2.1 of the Bylaws).

3.3.4.8 The Committee shall promptly notify the Dean in writing of its recommendation regarding progress toward tenure, promotion or tenure.

3.3.4.9 The deliberations on individual cases involving non-reappointment, progress toward tenure, tenure, and promotion shall be held in strict confidence; discussion of such cases by Committee members shall be restricted to meetings of the Committee formally convened for the purpose.

Standing Charges Progress Summary (please include progress and/or accomplishments related to Standing Charges):

The year 2010-2011 was a fairly typical year for LCPT, and it included the following activities.

--Early in the fall semester each year a representative from the Committee and a representative of Libraries administration meet with UCPT to discuss the Libraries’ discipline expectations and to answer any questions UCPT might have. For this fiscal year, Sherry Williams participated as the representative for administration, and George Gibbs (a past chair of LCPT) as the representative for LCPT.

--During the fall the Committee met numerous times to plan its calendar, prepare for the four P&T cases to be reviewed, and to actually review the files that came forward. The work was completed on schedule and the files, with the assessment of LCPT, were sent to the Dean for her independent review and subsequent transmittal to UCPT via the Provost.

--During the spring the Committee met several times to review three PTTR files. The Committee forwarded the files, with its comments, to the Dean ahead of schedule. The Dean then reviewed the files and the Committee comments, and met with each of the PTTR candidates.

--On May 9 the Committee held its annual open meeting for all Libraries faculty. The Committee discussed its activities for the 2010-2011 year, the relatively minor changes during the year that resulted from Provost Office changes (primarily to forms and the start of electronic submission of files), and anticipated changes for next year. In addition, the Committee made recommendations for future files, and answered questions.

--Members of LCPT met with all candidates interviewed for Libraries faculty positions during the year. The purpose of these sessions is to make sure all candidates have a good overview of promotion and tenure policy and procedures at KU and in the Libraries.

--Members of the Committee worked to ensure that brief notes of LCPT meetings were posted to the Committee web site in a timely fashion, and that other information was kept up to date.

--LCPT continued to work closely with Mike Broadwell, Libraries Director of Human Resources, on procedural issues relating to the P&T process, including changes such as the gradual move toward electronic submission of files.

--As noted below under Special Charge #1, the Committee implemented the first year of the new ad hoc draft dossier review process.
Special Charges 2010-2011:

1. Upon completion of the ad hoc draft dossier review meetings, the Committee will prepare a brief report for LFPA Exec commenting on any outcomes, challenges, and suggestions for future ad hoc draft dossier review committees.

2. Review the committee webpage, including links to annual reports, minutes, and membership, on the LFPA Intranet. Provide any suggested new information, links, and updates to the Secretary of LFPA Executive Committee. The website is the way this committee communicates to the full LFPA and should provide current and complete information.

Special Charges Progress Summary (please include progress and/or accomplishments related to Special Charges):

Special charge #1. Sherry Williams was the LCPT member who volunteered to participate in the ad hoc draft dossier review process. After each round (Fall P&T files, Spring PTTR files), she discussed her experiences with the process with the rest of LCPT. She prepared an overall report, which has been approved by the committee as a whole, and is appended at the end of this LFPA Committee Final Report as Appendix A.

Special charge #2. Revisions to the website have been submitted periodically throughout the year. As the year ends the Committee is submitting a couple more changes.

Progress on Previous Year’s Recommendations (if applicable, please describe any progress or work towards last year’s committee recommendations):

Both recommendations from last year’s report have been accomplished. These include (a) working with the Libraries Human Resource Director to ensure a smooth transition to the electronic submission of files, and (b) work into the processes needed for the ad hoc draft dossier review process.

Other Activities or Accomplishments:

All activities and accomplishments are covered in other parts of this report.

Recommendations:

The Committee has no recommendations at this time.

Potential Charges for Future Committees:

LCPT has been through several changes in the past two years, and these changes (e.g., in discipline expectations, P&T forms and procedures, electronic submission of files) have been handled smoothly. The Committee has no further potential charges to make for future Committees at this time.

Acknowledgments for 2010-2011:

Both chairs of LCPT for the year thank all members of the Committee for their conscientious and dedicated service. In addition, the entire Committee acknowledges the tremendous and
consistent support provided by the Dean and by Mike Broadwell for the work of LCPT. Mike, with assistance from Rita Wilson, especially, and others in the Libraries Office on occasion, enabled the Committee on a day-to-day basis to accomplish its work.

Prepared By: Keith Russell, Chair, LCPT (Spring 2011), June 30, 2011

Appendix A

Ad Hoc Dossier Review Report
June 2011, prepared by Sherry Williams for LCPT

This year was the first time LCPT provided an ad hoc dossier review process for candidates going up for promotion and tenure, and for pre tenure review. As provided for by vote of the LFPA, LCPT selected one member to serve on an ad hoc advisory committee for each candidate. Sherry Williams served in this inaugural activity, and prepared this report.

Make Up of Each Committee
Each ad hoc advisory review committee was comprised of the candidate, the candidate’s supervisor, mentor, and Sherry. Each candidate going up for promotion and or tenure, and pre tenure review, was given the option of participating in the ad hoc review. All four promotion and /or tenure candidates elected to participate in the process, as did all three pre tenure candidates.

Review Process
The promotion and tenure files were made available to Sherry several weeks in advance of the official deadline in September. The internal deadline was determined by working with Mike Broadwell. Sherry spent one week reviewing all files, and preparing her comments, and the following week met with each review committee to discuss and share her observations, which were not specific as to the evaluation of the content of the files, but related to the organization and completeness of the dossiers. The same process was followed in the spring for the pre tenure review process. Sherry found one week to be sufficient for reviewing four files, but more files would probably require more time to review.

Reading the Files
Sherry reviewed the files in paper form (in Watson Conference Room B), as printed out by Mike Broadwell, at her request. The following were available for her to review:

- Job description written by candidate’s supervisor
- Candidate’s CV
- Candidates statement on professional performance and research/scholarship/creative activity
- Candidate verification and list of supporting materials
- Candidate checklist
- Retention and destruction of p and t dossier form (candidate signs this indicating whether or not to keep the dossier beyond the required 7 years
- Supporting materials

Letters of review submitted for candidates, reviews of research by external reviewers, or the review of performance by the supervisor are not part of the file at this stage.

Suggestions for organizing the reading of the dossiers
- Read and review one file completely before starting another
• Have in front of the reviewer directions from the Provost’s website as to the directions provided to candidates for the CV, job description, candidate’s statement on professional performance/research/creative activity, and supplemental files
• Take notes on each section of the file following the organizational structure provided by the Provost’s Office
• Review a second time separately after all files have been read
• Organize notes to present (verbally) to candidates during the review meeting

Review each dossier for
• Clarity
• Length
• Organization
• Ease in finding information (such as links to supporting materials)
• Adherence to instructions
• Editorial suggestions

Meeting with each Candidate
Meetings were held with each candidate and their review committee the following week from review of the file, leaving some time for candidate’s to make changes before the official deadline. Comments were shared verbally. Sherry began each session by stating the following:

• This is a new procedure for LCPT as well as for candidates
• All are working with new required forms form the Provost’s office and electronic submission of part of the file for the first time
• Comments shared were suggestions, based on previous experience in reviewing files, and others might see things differently
• The candidate can decide to follow, or not, the suggestions offered, in consultation with their mentor and supervisor.
• This initial dossier review process is meant to be constructive and helpful
• An explanation of the process followed in reviewing the dossiers, and how comments are organized
• Thanked them for their hard work
• Unaddressed issues/questions the candidate has about the dossier

After the review meeting
• Each candidate took their file away with them to work on
• Mike prepared a form for Sherry and each candidate to sign stating that the LCPT member had met with each candidate, shared comments, and they removed their file

Issues
• Is the form we developed for signing adequate? I was not willing to sign the form that Mike originally drafted, but he based it on something passed by LFPA
• In the process previous to this year there was a form that preceded each file that specified whether a person was being reviewed for tenure, p and t or promotion. That
form does not exist, and I asked Mike, in a year with a lot of candidates, how we would know who was going up for what, and, even more importantly how does UCPT know? He has done some checking on this.

- Our candidates are using the CV as a place to provide more explanation about their individual research products that you don’t normally see in a CV. Nothing prohibits this – yet is this OK? I raised it with each, but indicated that I understood what they were doing – the new forms do not really provide any place for this – we may want to talk about this more for next year

**Conclusion**
The ad hoc review process, as evidenced through the first year of application, produced positive results, and helped in providing some extra assurance for candidates going up for promotion/tenure, or pre tenure review that they have put their “best foot forward.” All the candidates expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to go through this process. I think it was helpful for them to hear from someone who had reviewed a lot of files, and the process strengthens an environment of support that we all wish to provide.