

Contract Renewal and Promotion Procedures for Library Faculty

(Approved by LFOA May 7, 2015)

Approved by the office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: August 13, 2016

This document is a guide for contract renewal and promotion for all library faculty. For union-represented faculty, this document addresses this topic in accordance with Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Article 19: Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Review and Promotion, Section 2: Policies and Procedures. For more about professional responsibilities, including professional role, service, and professional contributions, see ***UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*** at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 19 of the CBA. To the extent there are any discrepancies or inconsistencies, CBA Article 19 controls for represented faculty.

This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

If review or promotion procedures change during the course of a faculty member's employment, he or she may elect between current criteria and those in effect during the six years prior to the initiation of a given review or promotion process.

For NTTF holding joint appointments, a memorandum will be completed at the time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion review and identifying how the promotion process will be handled among the units.

For NTTF holding multiple Career appointments, a memorandum will be completed at the time of the second or subsequent hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion review and identifying how the promotion process will be handled among the units.

0. Contents

1. Roles and Responsibilities
2. Overview of the Process
3. Types of Contracts
4. Criteria for Promotion and Contract Renewal
5. Pre-Sixth Year Annual Evaluation and Contract Renewal
6. Sixth Year Review for Promotion to Associate Librarian
7. Post-Sixth Year Contract Renewal
8. Review for Promotion to Senior Librarian
9. Post-Promotion to Senior Librarian Contract Renewal
10. Notice of Non-Renewal
11. Peer Institutions
12. Revision History

1. Roles and Responsibilities

This section provides an overview of the roles and responsibilities of participants in the contract renewal and promotion process.

1.1 *Candidates*

Candidates for contract renewal or promotion are Career NTTF Librarians, who are responsible for completing in a timely manner the documentation delineated in Sections 5 (Pre-Sixth Year Annual Evaluation and Contract Renewal), 6 (Sixth Year Review for Promotion to Associate Librarian), 7 (Post-Sixth Year Contract Renewal), 8 (Review for Promotion to Senior Librarian), or 9 (Post-Promotion to Senior Librarian Contract Renewal) as determined by type of contract (see 3 below).

1.2 *Human Resources Librarian (HRL)*

The HRL coordinates the contract review process and the completion of review files. The HRL prepares the annual calendar to identify deadlines for the review process. On behalf of the Dean of Libraries (hereinafter, the dean), the HRL initiates the review process by compiling lists of candidates for contract renewal or promotion and by notifying the candidates and their supervisors of the documentation required for review files. The HRL also provides notification, as appropriate, to the dean, the Associate Dean (AD), and the Library Faculty Personnel Committee (LFPC). On behalf of the dean, the HRL notifies the Office of the Provost of promotion review cases each year by June 30. The HRL assembles files and makes them digitally available to the LFPC.

The HRL coordinates the assignment of mentors to candidates, as requested. The HRL solicits names of recommended referees from candidates and supervisors and submits that list to the dean for final approval. The HRL issues a formal request to referees, which includes a cover letter from the dean, promotion criteria, and review file documents provided by the candidate.

The HRL manages the review files and coordinates submission of promotion files to the Office of the Provost. The HRL is responsible for managing records in keeping with UO policies and procedures.

1.3 *Library Human Resources*

Library Human Resources houses official faculty personnel files, which include documentation of annual evaluations, contract renewals, and promotion reviews. The HRL may make those relevant materials available to LFPC members as needed or requested. For more information regarding access to faculty personnel files, see 2014 UO collective bargaining agreement (CBA), Article 8 or <http://library.uoregon.edu/records/schedule/166-475-0095.html>.

1.4 *Mentor*

A mentor is an NTTF member who has completed promotion to Associate Librarian or Senior Librarian, has served on the LFPC, and is from outside the individual's home department. A

mentor counsels the candidate in the preparation and presentation of the review file.

1.5 *Supervisor*

For all NTTF who report to him/her, a supervisor writes an assessment of a candidate's performance that includes a recommendation on contract renewal or promotion. The supervisor must discuss this assessment of performance with the candidate, have the candidate sign it to acknowledge that they have read it, and then submit this assigned assessment to the HRL for inclusion in the review file. For promotion cases the supervisor submits a list of six referees to the HRL. A supervisor reviews a candidate's review file, as received from the HRL, prior to writing an assessment. For more detailed information on how/where supervisors identify potential referees, see <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/4261> and <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/5805>.

1.6 *Associate Dean (AD)*

The AD writes a contract renewal assessment of all candidates who are within his or her reporting structure and that are either pre-sixth year review or are under direct supervision of the AD. In addition, the AD writes an assessment of all candidates who are within his or her reporting structure and that are up and opting for promotion.

1.7 *Library Faculty Personnel Committee (LFPC)*

The LFPC is an elected, standing committee of the Library Faculty, as authorized and defined in the Library Faculty and Officers of Administration (LFOA) Bylaws. Following written criteria developed by the Library Faculty, the LFPC considers the files of candidates under review for promotion and provides the dean with a letter of review. In certain cases, as described below in Section 7.4.3, the LFPC also considers the files of candidates under review for contract renewal and provides the dean with a letter of review. Upon request the LFPC provides a written summary of referees' letters to candidates who have waived their right of access to these letters. The LFPC may request additional information from the HRL to clarify a candidate's or supervisor's statement as needed.

1.8 *Referees*

Referees are individuals who do not work at the UO Libraries and who agree to review the candidate's promotion review file and write a letter with a recommendation regarding promotion. Candidates and supervisors recommend referees. The dean selects referees. Candidates and supervisors are encouraged to recommend referees at peer institutions who have six or more years of experience in the candidate's area of expertise. Recommended referees may include as many as two referees from the UO who are not employed by UO Libraries, particularly if the candidate has subject specialist responsibilities. **Recommended referees must include some who do not have a professional relationship with the candidate, meaning referees who may have knowledge of or acquaintance with a candidate but do not currently work with the candidate in the context of their professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUO; or professional contributions.** For more information on referees, see 1.2; 6.4.1.c and 6.4.2.a; 8.4.1.c and 8.4.2.a; and 11.

1.9 *Dean of Libraries*

The dean reviews lists of suggested referees for candidates undergoing promotion review. The dean makes the final selection of six referees for promotion review cases, not necessarily from lists of referees compiled by the candidate or supervisor. The dean solicits additional comments as necessary.

The dean evaluates contract renewal reviews and makes the final decision regarding that renewal, notifying candidates by the May 1 CBA deadline. If non-renewal of a candidate's contract is being considered, the dean works closely with the Office of the Provost to notify the candidate by the appropriate deadline.

The dean evaluates promotion review files and submits final recommendation letters to the Office of the Provost by April 15.

1.10 *Office of the Provost*

The Office of the Provost reviews candidates' promotion review files, including the dean's recommendations, makes the final decision concerning promotion cases, and notifies the candidate accordingly.

2. Overview of the Process

A calendar identifying deadlines for the review process is prepared annually by the HRL. See the LFPC web site (<https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/375>), for the current calendar of events and many useful forms. The paragraphs below provide a general chronological overview.

All candidates required to undergo mandatory review (Sixth Year Review) or opting for elective promotion review in the coming academic year must notify the HRL by **June 29** with a Promotion Election Form, found on the LFPC website (above). The HRL notifies the dean and relevant supervisors, and submits a final list of promotion candidates for the coming year to the Office of the Provost by **June 30**.

2.1 *Summer Term*

The HRL compiles the list of candidates for contract renewal or promotion and notifies them, their supervisors, and as appropriate, the AD, of the documentation required for review files. The HRL coordinates the assignment of mentors to candidates who opt for that service. Candidates prepare documentation required for review files and submit it to the HRL in first weeks of fall term.

2.2 *Fall Term*

During fall term, the dean identifies referees for candidates for promotion review, taking into consideration recommendations provided by the candidate and supervisor. The HRL contacts referees to solicit participation, sends them promotion review file documents, and adds referees' letters of evaluation to the review files. Supervisors complete letters of evaluation and submit them to the HRL. ADs complete evaluations of individuals within their reporting

structure and submit them to the HRL.

2.3 *Winter Term*

At the end of fall term, and throughout winter term, the LFPC reviews contract review and promotion review files and solicits additional documentation as necessary via the HRL. The LFPC writes letters of recommendation to the dean and submits these letters to the HRL for inclusion in the review files.

2.4 *Spring Term*

At the end of winter term and the beginning of spring term, the dean reviews the completed contract review and promotion review files and writes letters of recommendation which the HRL adds to the review files. During spring term, the HRL submits on behalf of the dean the completed promotion review files to the Office of the Provost by April 15. The dean shall provide notice of renewal or non-renewal of an appointment that is not funding contingent to bargaining unit members no later than May 1 of the last year of the member's current appointment (CBA, Article 16, Section 9). The provost subsequently notifies candidates of promotion decisions and of the appeal process.

3. Types of Contracts

The dean identifies contract conditions when making an offer of appointment to a new faculty member. A contract period ends with the fiscal year and may be less than two years in duration depending on the time of appointment. The initial contract and rank determine which contract renewal and promotion process will be undertaken. Upon hire, the HRL provides written details of contract terms agreed upon with the dean's offer to the newly hired faculty member (if applicable, also see CBA, Article 16, Section 1).

3.1 *Two-Year Contract*

Recent graduates with no or minimal relevant library experience are normally appointed with a two-year contract. Initial appointment is at the rank of assistant librarian.

Providing satisfactory performance, the two-year contract may be renewed twice for early career librarians, allowing employment of six years. During the sixth year of employment, the evaluation process determines whether the individual is promoted and moves to a three-year contract or whether the individual's employment is terminated. If promotion is denied, the librarian will receive a two-year contract, and must come up for promotion again in the second year. If promotion is denied a second time, the librarian will receive a one-year terminal appointment (CBA, Article 19, Section 6).

3.2 *Two-Year Contract with Credit*

Early career professionals may be appointed with a two-year contract with credit toward an early sixth year review. The initial contract indicates the amount of credit and the date that the individual may be considered for sixth year review. Some determining factors for credit may include length of service at other institutions, rank held in previous appointments, and professional contributions. (Also see CBA, Article 19, Section 8).

3.3 *Three-Year Contract*

Library NTTF who have undergone a successful sixth year review receive three-year contracts. Senior administrators such as department heads may be appointed to an initial three-year contract at the associate librarian rank with possible credit towards early eligibility for promotion to senior librarian. Individuals appointed at associate librarian do not undergo the sixth year review, as they most likely have experienced a similar review at other institutions. Some determining factors for credit or rank may include length of service at other institutions, rank held in previous appointments, and professional contributions.

4. Criteria for Promotion and Contract Renewal

4.1 *Criteria for Pre-Sixth Year Contract Renewal*

A candidate for pre-sixth year contract renewal is expected:

- a. To have demonstrated achievement in his or her professional role in the Libraries, as identified in his or her position description, and to have contributed to the Libraries' strategic agenda.
- b. To have sought out opportunities for service in the Libraries, university, and community. Any community service should relate to professional expertise or position.
 - (1) Service with the UAUO also counts as service to the Libraries and university, if that service is: a) provided in a defined or formal capacity, e.g., as steward, as an elected member of the union council, etc.; b) related to the UO's business or concerns, and c) not already compensated with release time as described in the CBA.
- c. To have worked toward making professional contributions expected for promotion, e.g. through strengthening her or his involvement in publication, conference presentations, or other professionally acknowledged venues.

4.2 *Criteria for Promotion to Associate Librarian*

A candidate for promotion from assistant librarian to associate librarian is expected:

- a. To have made significant achievements in his or her professional role in the Libraries, as identified in his or her position description, and to have contributed to the Libraries' strategic agenda.
- b. To have provided service to the Libraries, university, and community. Any community service should relate to professional expertise or position.
 - (1) Service with the UAUO also counts as service to the Libraries and university, if that service is: a) provided in a defined or formal capacity, e.g., as steward, as an elected member of the union council, etc.; b) related to the UO's business or concerns, and c) not already compensated with release time as described in the CBA.
- c. To have made significant professional contributions through acknowledged channels, including some or all of the following:
 - o Scholarship disseminated through publication
 - o Papers delivered/presented
 - o Manuscripts prepared

- Works in progress
- Participation in professional or scholarly organizations that is appropriate to their responsibilities

Contributions must have a clear, positive impact on the profession beyond the university, and indicate a growing expertise and professional reputation, in the judgment of his or her professional peers.

4.3 *Criteria for Post-Sixth Year Contract Renewal*

A candidate for post-sixth year contract renewal is expected:

- a. To have demonstrated achievement in his or her professional role in the Libraries, as identified in his or her position description, and to have contributed to the Libraries' strategic agenda.
- b. To have demonstrated continued service to the Libraries, university, and/or community. Any community service should relate to professional expertise or position.
 - (1) Service with the UAUCO also counts as service to the Libraries and university, if that service is: a) provided in a defined or formal capacity, e.g., as steward, as an elected member of the union council, etc.; b) related to the UO's business or concerns, and c) not already compensated with release time as described in the CBA.
- c. To have made professional contributions, e.g. through involvement in publication, conference presentations, or other professionally acknowledged venues.

4.4 *Criteria for Promotion to Senior Librarian*

A candidate who has held the rank of associate librarian for six or more years, or sooner, if initial contract indicates credit toward an earlier review (see 3.3), may consider promotion review to senior librarian in any year. A candidate considering promotion to senior librarian must meet a set of standards that are more rigorous and qualitatively higher than those for promotion to associate librarian. This rank is awarded only upon the achievement of high professional stature, accomplishment, and service that is widely recognized within the profession and the university community. In this review, a candidate must show a coherent record of achievement characterized by mature development and qualitative progress beyond the work that earned the promotion to associate librarian. A candidate for promotion to senior librarian is expected:

- a. To have established a record of solid, lasting accomplishment in his or her professional role in the Libraries, as identified in his or her position description, and to have contributed to the Libraries' strategic agenda.
- b. To have provided service to the Libraries, university, and community that is characterized by successful leadership, produces a strong positive impact, or results in public credit to the library and to the university. Any community service should relate to professional expertise or position.
 - (1) Service with the UAUCO also counts as service to the Libraries and university, if that service is: a) provided in a defined or formal capacity, e.g., as steward, as an elected member of the union council, etc.; b) related to the UO's business or concerns, and c) not already compensated with release time as described in the CBA.
- c. To have made outstanding professional contributions through acknowledged channels,

including some or all of the following:

- Scholarship disseminated through publication
- Papers delivered/presented
- Manuscripts prepared
- Works in progress
- Participation in professional or scholarly organizations that is appropriate to their areas of responsibility

Contributions must be widely regarded as having a clear, positive, far-reaching impact on the profession, and indicate wide recognition by his or her professional peers as an expert and leader in his or her areas of competence.

4.5 *Criteria for Post-Promotion to Senior Librarian Contract Renewal*

A candidate for post-promotion to senior librarian contract renewal is expected:

- a. To have demonstrated achievement in her or his professional role in the Libraries, as identified in her or his position description, and to have contributed to the Libraries' strategic agenda.
- b. To have demonstrated continued service to the Libraries, university, and/or community. Any community service should relate to professional expertise or position.
 - (1) Service with the UAUO also counts as service to the Libraries and university, if that service is: a) provided in a defined or formal capacity, e.g., as steward, as an elected member of the union council, etc.; b) related to the UO's business or concerns, and c) not already compensated with release time as described in the CBA.
- c. To have made professional contributions, e.g. through involvement in publication, conference presentations, or other professionally acknowledged venues.

5. Pre-Sixth Year Annual Evaluation and Contract Renewal

5.1 *Criteria for Promotion to Associate Librarian*

See 4.2 for criteria.

5.2 *Preparation for Pre-Sixth Year Contract Renewal*

In non-contract renewal years, the faculty member should meet with his or her supervisor, consistent with current annual review practice in the faculty member's home department, to review professional responsibilities and goals to ensure that they align with the library's strategic agenda. Such meetings also ensure the individual is provided sufficient guidance prior to sixth-year review.

5.3 *Description of Process for Contract Renewal*

See 2, Overview of the Process.

The candidate is given the option of having a mentor for his/her first renewal (see 1.4).

5.4 *Documentation for Contract Review File*

5.4.1 *Documentation Required from Candidate*

- a. Curriculum vitae (<https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/4843>)
- b. Position description
- c. Candidate statement

The candidate writes a statement [CBA suggests 2-6 pages] that describes his or her accomplishments and their impact as well as including discussion of any contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (Article 19, section 11). The statement should address accomplishments, since initial professional appointment or previous contract renewal, in the areas of professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUC; and professional contributions. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see “*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*” at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The quality and impact of an individual’s accomplishments are most important.

In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the review will consider the availability of professional development funds, opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member’s efforts to secure funding (CBA, Article 19, section 4, (h)).

The statement should be engaging and understandable to those unfamiliar with the candidate’s work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. Descriptions of committee service should include the committee’s charge and the candidate’s involvement. The *UO Style*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

- d. Course evaluations summary

A candidate who has taught a credit class submits a summary of the course evaluations for the review file.

- e. Letters of appreciation (Optional)

A candidate may submit for the review file letters of appreciation from those with whom he or she has worked in a professional capacity.

- f. Other material (Optional)

Unsolicited statements may be received for the candidate undergoing review and placed in the review file. The HRL notifies the candidate when such material is received.

5.4.2 Documentation Required from Candidate's Supervisor

a. Supervisor statement

The supervisor writes a statement that provides a qualitative assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and performance of all professional responsibilities since initial professional appointment or previous contract renewal. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The assessment should address how accomplishments and performance align with the library's strategic agenda. The statement should conclude with a recommendation regarding contract renewal. Before submitting the supervisor statement, the supervisor must discuss the assessment with the candidate and have the statement signed by the candidate to acknowledge this discussion.

The supervisor should be mindful that the statement will be reviewed by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues

b. Statement on subject specialist responsibilities (from AD or other)

For a candidate with subject specialist responsibilities, e.g. collection development responsibilities, the supervisor requests an assessment of performance of these responsibilities from one or more of the following: AD for Research Services, appropriate Collection Fund Manager, academic department liaison, or an academic department faculty. This statement, which may be brief, should be referenced in the supervisor statement.

5.4.3 Documentation Required from Candidate's AD

a. Letter of evaluation

The AD writes a brief letter based on review of the contract renewal review file of a candidate within his or her reporting structure and concludes with a recommendation regarding contract renewal.

5.4.4 Documentation Required from LFPC

a. Letter of review

The LFPC writes a letter of review based on its consideration of the candidate's review file. The letter may be brief and should focus on the candidate's progress toward promotion.

5.4.5 Documentation Required from Dean

- a. Letter of recommendation regarding contract renewal

The dean writes a letter based on review of the candidate's renewal file and concludes with a final recommendation regarding contract renewal.

6. Sixth Year Review for Promotion to Associate Librarian

6.1 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Librarian

See 4.2 for criteria.

6.2 Description of the Process

- a. The sixth year review is a mandatory up-or-out review for library faculty conducted after accumulating six years of service of initial employment (per CBA, Article 19, Section 6) or earlier, if indicated in an initial contract (see 3.2). It includes submission of letters by referees from outside the UO Libraries, including referees who do not have a professional relationship with the candidate. Sixth year review, if successfully completed, generates three-year contracts from that point on, and results in promotion in rank to associate librarian with an associated salary increase. If promotion is denied, the librarian will receive a two-year contract, and must come up for promotion again in the second year. If promotion is denied a second time, the librarian will receive a one-year terminal appointment (CBA, Article 19, Section 6).
- b. Exception: The timing of the sixth year review may be extended because of pregnancy, childbirth, or adoption of a new baby. This applies to both mothers and fathers. For more information see university policy, <http://policies.uoregon.edu/policy/by/1/03000-human-resources/extension-tenure-probationary-period-because-new-baby-or-childbirth>, and CBA, Article 32, Section 13.
- c. The candidate is strongly encouraged to work with a mentor for the promotion process (see 1.4). Mentors can provide advice on waiver options and file preparation.
- d. The candidate receives notification from the HRL that the promotion review file has been sent to the Office of the Provost. The candidate also receives copies of recommendation letters, unless right of access has been waived. The candidate receives a letter from the provost indicating final disposition. The successful candidate also receives a new three-year contract and an appropriate salary increase of at least 8% (CBA, Article 26, Section 5). In unsuccessful cases, see (a) above.

6.3 Action Items for Review File

- a. Each referee reviews the documentation in the promotion review file provided by the HRL and writes a letter with a recommendation regarding promotion.
- b. The HRL notifies the dean if referees are unable to complete letters and the dean identifies alternate referees.
- c. The candidate's supervisor reviews the promotion review file, including referees' letters, and writes a supervisor statement
- d. The AD for that candidate's division reviews the promotion review file and writes a

- letter of evaluation.
- e. The LFPC writes a letter of review with a recommendation for or against promotion based on its consideration of the completed review file.
 - f. The dean writes a letter of recommendation taking into consideration the LFPC assessment.
 - g. The provost or his or her designee makes the final determination for the case.

6.4 *Documentation Required for Review File*

6.4.1 *Documentation Required from Candidate*

- a. Election of promotion review form

A candidate for whom sixth year review is optional because of receiving prior credit in rank upon initial appointment as described in 3.2, must complete and return an election of promotion review form to the HRL by June 29. Once the review becomes mandatory, the form is no longer required.

- b. Waiver option form

A candidate completes the appropriate waiver option form to waive or retain legal right of access to review file material, as described below.

Option #1: Non-Waiver

The candidate retains the right of access to all material in the promotion review file.

Option #2: Full Waiver

The candidate waives the right of access to all material in the promotion review file. The candidate may request from the LFPC a written summary of referees' letters. The summary should not identify the referees or provide information from which the referees may be identified.

Option #3: Partial Waiver

The candidate waives the right of access to non-UO affiliated referees' letters and retains the right of access to other material in the promotion review file.

The candidate may request from the LFPC a written summary of non-UO affiliated referees' letters. The summary should not identify the non-UO affiliated referees or provide information from which these referees may be identified.

- c. List of Referees

The candidate submits a list of six possible referees. The list includes each referee's name, title, mailing address, and email address, as well as a brief explanation of why the referee was selected. The list must include some referees who do not have a

professional relationship with the candidate, meaning referees who may have knowledge of or acquaintance with a candidate but do not currently work with the candidate in the context of their professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUC; or professional contributions. Referees should be able to evaluate the strength and impact of the candidate's professional activities in their area of expertise. A candidate is encouraged to suggest referees at peer institutions (see 11), as determined by the dean and supervisor, who have six or more years of experience in the candidate's area of expertise. The list may include as many as two referees from the UO who are not employed by UO Libraries, particularly if the candidate has subject liaison responsibilities.

d. Candidate Statement

The candidate writes a statement [CBA suggests 2-6 pages] that describes his or her accomplishments and their impact as well as including discussion of any contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (Article 19, Section 11). The statement should address accomplishments since initial professional appointment in the areas of professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUC; and professional contributions. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see *"UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy"* at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The quality and impact of an individual's accomplishments are most important.

In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the review will consider the availability of professional development funds, opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member's efforts to secure funding (CBA, Article 19, section 4, (h)).

The statement should be engaging and understandable to those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. Descriptions of committee service should include the committee's charge and the candidate's involvement. The *The UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

e. Position Description

f. Curriculum Vitae (for examples, see: <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/4843>)

g. Course Evaluations Summary

A candidate who has taught a credit class submits a summary of the course evaluations for the review file.

h. Letters of appreciation (Optional)

The candidate may submit for the review file letters of appreciation from those with

whom he or she has worked in a professional capacity.

i. Other material (Optional)

Unsolicited statements may be received for the candidate undergoing review and placed in the review file. The HRL notifies the candidate when such material is received.

6.4.2 Documentation Required from Supervisor

a. List of Referees

The supervisor submits a list of six possible referees. The list includes each referee's name, title, mailing address, and email address, as well as a brief explanation of why the referee was selected. The list must include some referees who do not have a professional relationship with the candidate, meaning referees who may have knowledge of or acquaintance with a candidate but do not currently work with the candidate in the context of their professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUC; or professional contributions. Referees should be able to evaluate the strength and impact of the candidate's professional activities in their area of expertise. The supervisor is encouraged to suggest referees at peer institutions (see 11) who have six or more years of experience in the candidate's area of expertise.

b. Supervisor Statement

Upon review of the promotion file, including referees' letters, the supervisor writes a statement that provides a qualitative assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and performance of all professional responsibilities since initial professional appointment. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The assessment should address how accomplishments and performance align with the library's strategic agenda. The statement should conclude with a recommendation for promotion or non-promotion. Before submitting the supervisor statement, the supervisor must discuss the assessment with the candidate and have the statement signed by the candidate to acknowledge this discussion.

The supervisor should be mindful that the statement will be reviewed by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

c. Statement on Subject Specialist Responsibilities (from AD or other)

For a candidate with subject specialist responsibilities, e.g. collection development responsibilities, the supervisor requests an assessment of performance of these

responsibilities from one or more of the following: AD for Research Services, appropriate Collection Fund Manager, academic department liaison, or an academic department faculty. This statement, which may be brief, should be referenced in the supervisor statement.

6.4.3 *Documentation Required from Referees*

- a. Letter of Review

Each referee writes a letter based on review of promotion review file documentation provided by the HRL and concludes with a recommendation regarding promotion.

6.4.4 *Documentation Required from AD*

- a. Letter of Evaluation

The AD writes a letter based on review of the promotion review file of a candidate within his or her reporting structure and concludes with a recommendation regarding promotion.

6.4.5 *Documentation Required from LFPC*

- a. Letter of Review

The LFPC writes a letter of review based on its consideration of the candidate's review file. In the letter the LFPC evaluates the candidate's performance in relation to the criteria for promotion and provides a recommendation regarding promotion.

6.4.6 *Documentation Required from Dean*

- a. Final List of Referees

The final list of referees is determined by the dean and may include individuals other than those recommended by the candidate or the supervisor. If any of the referees appear not to be submitting letters in a timely manner, the HRL notifies the dean, who finds alternate referees.

- b. Letter of Recommendation Regarding Promotion

The dean writes a letter based on review of the candidate's promotion review file and concludes with a recommendation regarding promotion.

7. Post-Sixth Year Contract Renewal

7.1 *Criteria for Post-Sixth Year Review Contract Renewal*

See 4.3 for criteria.

7.2 *Preparation for Post-Sixth Year Contract Renewal*

In non-contract renewal years, the faculty member should meet with his or her supervisor, consistent with current annual review practice in the faculty member's home department, to review professional responsibilities and goals to ensure that they align with the library's strategic agenda. Such meetings also ensure the individual is provided sufficient guidance for future contract renewals and possible candidacy for promotion.

7.3 Description of Process

See 2, Overview of the Process.

7.4 Documentation Required for Review File

7.4.1 Documentation Required from Candidate

- a. Curriculum Vitae (for examples, see: <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/4843>)
- b. Position Description
- c. Candidate Statement

The candidate writes a statement [CBA suggests 3-6 pages] that describes his or her accomplishments and their impact as well as including discussion of any contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (Article 19, section 11). It should address accomplishments since previous contract renewal in the areas of professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUC; and professional contributions. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The quality and impact of an individual's accomplishments are most important.

In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the review will consider the availability of professional development funds, opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member's efforts to secure funding (CBA, Article 19, section 4, (h)).

The statement should be engaging and understandable to those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. Descriptions of committee service should describe the committee's charge and the candidate's involvement. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

- d. Course evaluations summary

A candidate who has taught a credit class submits a summary of the course evaluations for the review file.

e. Letters of appreciation (Optional)

The candidate may submit for the review file letters of appreciation from those with whom he or she has worked in a professional capacity.

f. Other material (Optional)

Unsolicited statements may be received for the candidate undergoing review and placed in the review file. The HRL notifies the candidate when such material is received.

7.4.2 Documentation Required from Candidate's Supervisor

a. Supervisor Statement

The supervisor writes a statement that provides a qualitative assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and performance of all professional responsibilities since previous contract renewal. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The assessment should address how accomplishments and performance align with the library's strategic agenda. The statement should conclude with a recommendation regarding contract renewal. Before submitting the supervisor statement, the supervisor must discuss the assessment with the candidate and have the statement signed by the candidate to acknowledge this discussion.

The supervisor should be mindful that the statement will be reviewed by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

b. Statement on Subject Specialist Responsibilities (from AD or other)

For a candidate with subject specialist responsibilities, e.g. collection development responsibilities, the supervisor requests an assessment of performance of these responsibilities from one or more of the following: AD for Research Services, appropriate Collection Fund Manager, academic department liaison, or an academic department faculty. This statement, which may be brief, should be referenced in the supervisor statement.

7.4.3 Documentation Required from LFPC

a. Letter of Review

For a candidate's first contract renewal after promotion to associate librarian and alternate contract renewals thereafter (i.e. every sixth year), the LFPC does not review

the candidate's review file or write a letter of review.

For a candidate's second contract renewal after promotion to associate librarian and alternate contract renewals thereafter, the LFPC writes a letter of review based on its consideration of the candidate's review file. In the letter the LFPC evaluates the candidate's performance in relation to the criteria for contract renewal and assesses the candidate's progress toward promotion.

7.4.4 *Documentation Required from Dean*

- a. Letter of recommendation regarding contract renewal

The dean writes a letter based on review of the candidate's renewal file and concludes with a final recommendation regarding contract renewal.

8. Review for Promotion to Senior Librarian

8.1 *Criteria for Promotion to Senior Librarian*

See 4.4 for criteria.

8.2 *Description of the Process*

- a. Review for promotion to senior librarian is optional and may be initiated after six years in the rank of associate librarian, or sooner, if initial contract indicates credit toward an earlier review (see 3.3).
- b. An individual who is considering promotion review should consult regularly with his or her immediate supervisor in order to determine readiness for promotion review.
- c. The candidate is strongly encouraged to work with a mentor for the promotion process (see 1.4). Mentors can provide advice on waiver options and file preparation.
- d. The candidate receives notification from the HRL that the promotion review file has been sent to the Office of the Provost. The candidate may request copies of recommendation letters, unless right of access has been waived. A successful candidate receives a letter from the provost, with a new three-year contract that specifies a promotion in rank to senior librarian and the related salary increase. Failure to achieve promotion does not in and of itself jeopardize one's employment or existing contract and does not preclude future attempts at promotion.

8.3 *Action Items for Review File*

- a. Each referee reviews the documentation in the promotion review file provided by the HRL and writes a letter with a recommendation regarding promotion.
- b. The HRL notifies the dean if referees are unable to complete letters and the dean identifies alternate referees.

- c. The candidate's supervisor reviews the promotion review file, including referees' letters, and writes a supervisor statement.
- d. The AD for that candidate's division reviews the promotion review file and writes a letter of evaluation.
- e. The LFPC writes a letter of review with a recommendation for or against promotion based on its consideration of the candidate's review file.
- f. The dean writes a letter of recommendation taking into consideration the LFPC assessment.
- g. The provost or his or her designee makes the final determination for the case.

8.4 *Documentation Required for Review File*

8.4.1 *Documentation Required from Candidate*

- a. Election of promotion review form.

A candidate for review for promotion to senior librarian must complete and return an election of promotion review form to the HRL by June 29.

If a candidate elects not to undergo this review, and his or her contract is not due to expire the following June 30, no further action is required. A candidate may elect to be considered for promotion review at the same time the following year.

- b. Waiver option form.

A candidate completes the appropriate waiver option form to waive or retain legal right of access to review file material, as described below.

Option #1: Non-Waiver

The candidate retains the right of access to all material in the promotion review file.

Option #2: Full Waiver

The candidate waives the right of access to all material in the promotion review file. The candidate may request from the LFPC a written summary of referees' letters. The summary should not identify the referees or provide information from which the referees may be identified.

Option #3: Partial Waiver

The candidate waives the right of access to non-UO affiliated referees' letters and retains the right of access to other material in the promotion review file.

The candidate may request from the LFPC a written summary of non-UO affiliated referees' letters. The summary should not identify the non-UO affiliated referees or provide information from which these referees may be identified.

c. List of referees

The candidate submits a list of six possible referees. The list includes each referee's name, title, mailing address, and email address, as well as a brief explanation of why the referee was selected. The list must include some referees who do not have a professional relationship with the candidate, meaning referees who may have knowledge of or acquaintance with a candidate but do not currently work with the candidate in the context of their professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUO; or professional contributions. Referees should be able to evaluate the strength and impact of the candidate's professional activities in their area of expertise. A candidate is encouraged to suggest referees at peer institutions (see 11), as determined by the dean and supervisor, who have six or more years of experience in the candidate's area of expertise. The list may include up to two names of referees from the UO who are not employed by UO Libraries, particularly if the candidate has subject liaison responsibilities.

d. Candidate statement

The candidate writes a statement [CBA suggests 2-6 pages] that describes her or his accomplishments and their impact as well as including discussion of any contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (Article 19, section 11). The statement should address major accomplishments since initial professional appointment here or elsewhere or since last promotion in the areas of professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUO; and professional contributions. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. Quality and impact of an individual's accomplishments are most important.

In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the review will consider the availability of professional development funds, opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member's efforts to secure funding (CBA, Article 19, section 4, (h)).

The statement should be written to engage and be understood by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. Descriptions of committee service should describe the committee's charge and the candidate's involvement. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

e. Position

f. Curriculum Vitae (for examples, see: <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/4843>)

g. Course evaluations summaries

A candidate who has taught a credit class submits a summary of the course evaluations for the review file.

h. Letters of appreciation (Optional)

The candidate may submit for the review file letters of appreciation from those with whom he or she has worked in a professional capacity.

i. Other material (Optional)

Unsolicited statements may be received for the candidate undergoing review and placed in the review file. The HRL notifies the candidate when such material is received.

8.4.2 Documentation Required from Supervisor

a. List of referees

The supervisor submits a list of six possible referees. The list includes each referee's name, title, mailing address, and email address, as well as a brief explanation of why the referee was selected. The list must include some referees who do not have a professional relationship with the candidate, meaning referees who may have knowledge of or acquaintance with a candidate but do not currently work with the candidate in the context of their professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUC; or professional contributions. Referees should be able to evaluate the strength and impact of the candidate's professional activities in their area of expertise. The supervisor is encouraged to suggest referees at peer institutions (see 11) who have six or more years of experience in the candidate's area of expertise.

b. Supervisor statement

Upon review of the promotion file, including referees' letters, the supervisor writes a statement that provides a qualitative assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and performance of all professional responsibilities since initial professional appointment here or elsewhere, or since last promotion. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see *"UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy"* at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The assessment should address how accomplishments and performance align with the library's strategic agenda. The statement should conclude with a recommendation regarding promotion. Before submitting the supervisor statement, the supervisor must discuss the assessment with the candidate and have the statement signed by the candidate to acknowledge this discussion.

The supervisor should be mindful that the statement will be reviewed by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

- c. Statement on subject specialist responsibilities (from AD or other)

For a candidate with subject specialist responsibilities, e.g. collection development responsibilities, the supervisor requests an assessment of performance of these responsibilities from one or more of the following: AD for Research Services, appropriate Collection Fund Manager, academic department liaison, or an academic department faculty. This statement, which may be brief, should be referenced in the supervisor statement.

8.4.3 Documentation Required from Referees

- a. Letter of review

Each referee writes a letter based on review of promotion review file documentation provided by the HRL and concludes with a recommendation regarding promotion.

8.4.4 Documentation Required from AD

- a. Letter of evaluation

The AD writes a letter based on examination of the promotion review file of a candidate within his or her reporting structure and concludes with a recommendation regarding promotion.

8.4.5 Documentation Required from LFPC

- a. Letter of review

The LFPC writes a letter of review based on its consideration of the candidate's promotion review file. In the letter the LFPC evaluates the candidate's performance in relation to the criteria for promotion and provides a recommendation regarding promotion.

8.4.6 Documentation Required from Dean

- a. Final list of referees

The final list of referees is determined by the dean and may include individuals other than those recommended by the candidate or the supervisor. If any of the referees appear not to be submitting letters in a timely manner, the HRL notifies the dean, who suggests alternate referees.

- b. Letter of recommendation regarding promotion

The dean writes a letter based on examination of candidate's review file and concludes with a recommendation regarding promotion.

9. Post-Promotion to Senior Librarian Contract Renewal

9.1 *Criteria for Post-Promotion to Senior Librarian Contract Renewal*

See 4.5 for criteria.

9.2 *Preparation for Post-Promotion to Senior Librarian Contract Renewal*

In non-contract renewal years, the faculty member should meet with his or her supervisor, consistent with current annual review practice in the faculty member's home department, to review professional responsibilities and goals to ensure that they align with the library's strategic agenda. Such meetings also ensure the individual is provided sufficient guidance for future contract renewals.

9.3 *Description of the Process*

See 2, Overview of the Process

9.4 *Documentation Required for Review File*

9.4.1 *Documentation Required from Candidate*

- a. Curriculum Vitae (for examples, see: <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/4843>)
- b. Position Description
- c. Candidate Statement

The candidate writes a statement [CBA suggests 3-6 pages] that describes his or her accomplishments and their impact as well as including discussion of any contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (Article 19, section 11). The statement should address accomplishments since previous contract renewal in the areas of professional role in the Libraries; service to the Libraries, university, community, and/or UAUO; and professional contributions. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. Quality and impact of an individual's accomplishments are most important.

In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the review will consider the availability of professional development funds, opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member's

efforts to secure funding (CBA, Article 19, section 4, (h)).

The statement should be written to engage and be understood by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. Descriptions of committee service should describe the committee's charge and the candidate's involvement. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

d. Course evaluations summaries

A candidate who has taught a credit class submits a summary of the course evaluations for the review file.

e. Letters of appreciation (Optional)

The candidate may submit for the review file letters of appreciation from those with whom he or she has worked in a professional capacity.

f. Other material (Optional)

Unsolicited statements may be received for the candidate undergoing review and placed in the review file. The HRL notifies the candidate when such material is received.

9.4.2 Documentation Required from Candidate's Supervisor

a. Supervisor statement

The supervisor writes a statement that provides a qualitative assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and performance of all professional responsibilities since previous contract renewal. For more information on the areas of work performed by Library NTTF, and the typical breakdown in percentages, see "*UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy*" at <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/library>. The assessment should address how accomplishments and performance align with the library's strategic agenda. The statement should conclude with a recommendation regarding contract renewal. Before submitting the supervisor statement, the supervisor must discuss the assessment with the candidate and have the statement signed by the candidate to acknowledge this discussion.

The supervisor should be mindful that the statement will be reviewed by those unfamiliar with the candidate's work and responsibilities. Acronyms should be spelled out. The *UO Style Guide*, <http://des.uoregon.edu/uo-style-guide>, should be used as the authority for capitalization, proper names, punctuation, and other style and grammar issues.

9.4.3 Documentation Required from LFPC

a. Letter of review

For a candidate's first contract renewal after promotion to associate librarian and alternate contract renewals thereafter, the LFPC does not review the candidate's review file or write a letter of review.

For a candidate's second contract renewal after promotion to associate librarian and alternate contract renewals thereafter, the LFPC writes a letter of review based on its consideration of the candidate's review file. In the letter the LFPC evaluates the candidate's performance in relation to the criteria for contract renewal, with particular emphasis on criterion (c), contributions in professionally acknowledged venues.

9.4.4 Documentation Required from Dean

a. Letter of recommendation regarding contract renewal

The dean writes a letter based on review of the candidate's renewal file and concludes with a final recommendation regarding contract renewal.

10. Notice of Non-Renewal

Except as set forth in the CBA, the University shall provide notice of renewal or nonrenewal of an appointment that is not funding contingent to bargaining unit members, other than those in the classifications of Adjunct or Acting Assistant Professor, no later than May 1st of the last year of the member's current appointment (CBA, Article 16, section 9). A Career NTTF who receives a notice of non-renewal shall be provided a written statement documenting the reasons for non-renewal at the time of notice (CBA, Article 16, section 10).

11. Peer Institutions

The University of Oregon Libraries has identified the libraries of the following institutions as peer institutions from which candidates and supervisors are encouraged to recommend referees:

1. [University of Arizona](#)
2. [University of California, Berkeley](#)
3. [University of California, Davis](#)
4. [University of California, Irvine](#)
5. [University of California, Los Angeles](#)
6. [University of California, San Diego](#)
7. [University of California, Santa Barbara](#)
8. [University of Colorado](#)
9. [University of Florida](#)
10. [University of Illinois, Urbana](#)
11. [Indiana University](#)
12. [University of Iowa](#)
13. [Iowa State University](#)
14. [University of Kansas, Lawrence](#)
15. [University of Maryland](#)

16. [University of Michigan](#)
17. [Michigan State University](#)
18. [University of Minnesota](#)
19. [University of Missouri, Columbia](#)
20. [University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill](#)
21. [Ohio State University](#)
22. [Pennsylvania State University](#)
23. [University of Pittsburgh](#)
24. [Purdue University](#)
25. [Rutgers University](#)
26. [SUNY - Buffalo](#)
27. [SUNY - Stony Brook](#)
28. [University of Texas](#)
29. [Texas A&M University](#)
30. [University of Virginia](#)
31. [University of Washington](#)
32. [University of Wisconsin, Madison](#)

12. Revision History

This document was further revised in April, 2015 by the 20 14-2015 LFPC (Dean Walton (LFPC Chair) Angus Nesbit, Nathan Georgitis, Karen Munro, and Kelley McGrath) in collaboration with the Dean of Libraries (Adriene Lim), Human Resources Librarian (Laine Stambaugh, and NTTF members of LFOA, to reflect the new *“UO Libraries Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Professional Responsibilities/Workload Policy,”* adopted with revisions by NTTF members at the LFOA meeting on May 7, 2015, with minor edits by Laine Stambaugh.

This document was revised in July 2014 by Laine Stambaugh (HRL) and by the 2014-2015 LFPC (Dean Walton (LFPC Chair) Angus Nesbit, Nathan Georgitis, Karen Munro, and Kelley McGrath) to align with the CBA and other campus practices for NTTF, following ratification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement in October 2013.

This document was previously revised in summer 2011 by an ad-hoc committee appointed by the Dean of Libraries whose members included: Bruce Tabb (chair), Heather Briston, Paul Frantz, Nathan Georgitis, Mary Greci, and Ed Teague.

Initial revisions were instigated in September 2009 by an ad-hoc committee appointed by the Dean of Libraries, whose members included: Laine Stambaugh, Joni Herbst, Paul Frantz, and Tom Stave.

Further historical documents in relation to these procedures and processes are available in other formats, or see “NTTF Librarians: History and Background” at: <https://iris.uoregon.edu/cms/node/6093>. Please consult Laine Stambaugh (ext. 6-1895 or lastamba@uoregon.edu).