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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.

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

DRAFT March 2011
Keith Russell served as the ad hoc dossier review committee representative, meeting early in September with two candidates going up for promotion to full librarian and their supervisors to provide a preliminary review of the dossier organization and completeness.

On Oct. 13th, Keith Russell and Judith Emde (both representing Dean Haricombe) met with UCPT to present the Libraries’ discipline expectations and answer any questions.

After Oct. 3rd, when the files had been submitted, LCPT members read the files, discussed the content in comparison to the Libraries’ criteria and discipline expectations, wrote and re-wrote drafts. At the beginning of December, final recommendations were forwarded to Dean Haricombe for her review and subsequent forwarding to UCPT. Later in Spring 2012, announcements were received that both librarians were promoted to full librarian.

On November 30th, an open meeting on the PTTR process was held.

Keith Russell met with one PTTR candidate, her supervisor and mentor in January for the ad hoc dossier review. LCPT reviewed the file in February and submitted documentation to Dean Haricombe at the end of the month.

The required annual meeting that LCPT holds for all library faculty was held on May 2nd and repeated on May 4th to assure that all candidates, supervisors, and mentors participating in the fall 2012 review would be able to attend. The P&T and PTTR process was outlined as well as the year’s activities. The calendar for 2012-13 was presented by Mike Broadwell. The 2nd half of the meeting was specifically tailored for candidates, supervisors and mentors in preparation for a fall 2012 submission. Changes to the P&T forms were highlighted, guidelines for external evaluations were emphasized, and requirements on the forms were reviewed.

LCPT didn’t conduct an in-depth review of the criteria and discipline expectations documents but did propose some editing as provided below under recommendations.

**Special Charges:**

- Review and make recommendations to LFPA Exec on the three issues identified in the LCPT Final Report 2010-11, Ad Hoc Dossier Review Report, June 2011, prepared by Sherry Williams for LCPT:
  - Adequacy of the signature form developed last fiscal year;
  - Additional form attached to file specifying whether a person was being reviewed for: tenure, promotion, or, tenure with promotion;
  - Inclusion of more explanation about individual research products that you don’t normally see in a CV.

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

- LCPT discussed the issues raised last year. 1) The confirmation form currently does not require a signature of the LCPT member. 2) What the candidate is applying for is clearly understood by the Committee. 3) The new format for the CV dictated by the Provost’s office requires the additional research information and directions seem to be adequate.
Progress on Previous Year’s Recommendations (if applicable, please describe any progress or work towards last year’s committee recommendations):

No recommendations were provided from the 2010-11 committee.

Other Activities or Accomplishments:

- Representative LCPT members met with candidates interviewing for the e-sciences librarian for engineering position.

- After a careful reading of the Provost’s P&T documents, the Committee realized we were not in compliance with University guidelines as indicated in the following statements on General Instructions under “Confidentiality of the File/Dossier”:

  The Promotion and Tenure Form and supporting materials become a confidential file after the candidate has reviewed and forwarded the dossier to the department committee or designated individual for inclusion of evaluative information. Only individuals who are eligible to vote on the promotion and tenure decision can have access to the dossier or be present during the promotion and tenure deliberations of committees at all levels.

According to the LFPA Code:

  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.....

  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.....

  For files for promotion to associate, full, or just tenure, ALL members currently read the files, discuss, and prepare documentation. Associate librarians only vote on files for associate promotions or tenure due to 3.3.4.7 but they are actively involved in all other proceedings. This is contrary to the University guidelines. (FSRR 6.3.3.3) Only those members who are eligible to vote can read, discuss, and prepare documentation.

Recommendations:

- With more files submitted for promotion to full librarian, LCPT recommends that applicants identify a mentor to assist in interpreting procedures and to review content. Careful attention is provided to pre-tenure librarians with lots of information consistently presented but associate librarians may not be involved in the process for a number of years and are not fully aware of requirements.

- Strongly urge supervisors and mentors, particularly for librarians applying for full librarian, to attend all informational meetings. Accentuate the guidelines for external reviews, emphasizing identifying evaluators from comparable institutions and individuals not closely familiar with the candidate.
o **Potential Charges for Future Committees:**

- Conduct a more in-depth review of the *Criteria for Academic Ranks of Librarians, Discipline Expectations for Library Faculty at KU*, and the *Overview Document*. (already on LFPA Exec's list of charges for 2012-13)

  o Suggested change to footnote for clarification on the Discipline Expectations document, page 5.

    **Current wording:** “Depending on the depth, length and rigor of the scholarly contribution, the book review may be considered a minor scholarly work. Otherwise consider it to be service.”

    **Suggested edit for clarification:** “Consider book reviews to be service unless they are shown to be more lengthy and rigorous scholarly contributions in their own right.”

- LFPA Exec needs to appoint a committee to determine how to adjust the participation and voting of LCPT members to be in compliance with University rules and regulations. In the meantime, only the three librarians will participate in all deliberations for promotion files to full librarian fall 2012. Considering the number of faculty in the Libraries, three members voting doesn’t seem adequate. University guidelines do not prevent associate librarians from participating in the process for files to full librarians. Our code currently prevents them from voting, thus making them ineligible to participate at all.

**Prepared By: Judith Emde**

I want to thank the LCPT members for their dedicated participation this year. All members take this responsibility very seriously and closely follow the Libraries’ criteria and expectations when reviewing files. A special thanks to Mike Broadwell and Jill Mignacca for answering our questions and preparing the files for our review.