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I. Introduction

The School of Library and Information Studies, a unit within the professional programs cluster in the College of Arts and Sciences, offers three programs: the Master of Library and Information Studies, the Master of Science in Knowledge Management, and the Bachelor of Arts in Information Studies. It is the only master's program in library and information studies in the state accredited by the American Library Association Committee on Accreditation. The standards for that accreditation in the area of faculty (American Library Association, Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library & Information Studies 1992, "III. Faculty"), together with the expectations of the University of Oklahoma, as set forth in the Faculty Handbook sections 3.6-3.7, and the requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences form the framework in which the School's guidelines for annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion are cast.

The mission of the School is three-fold: to provide excellence in education for information professionals, to engage in research and creative activities that generate new knowledge and applications for improved practice; and to provide leadership through public and professional service to meet the complex information needs of society. Hence, the general expectations for performance of the faculty of the School fall within the traditional categories of research, teaching, and service. These categories are interpreted within the context of the connection of all three to the intellectual development of the disciplines of library and information studies and knowledge management and to the improvement of professional practice in the service of society. Faculty are expected to develop their abilities in all three areas and to integrate and synthesize their contributions in such a manner as to maximize their ability to further the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the School.

Further, in keeping with the ethics of the fields and the value systems prevalent within the disciplines, there is an expectation that faculty will conduct their work in all three areas within the tradition of collegiality and in a manner that will foster a climate of cooperation. It
is expected that faculty will demonstrate willingness to work with and support other faculty on projects that strengthen the School, and to cooperate with their colleagues toward achievement of faculty approved goals. It is expected that faculty will respond to the changing needs of the School and will be flexible in their individual adaptations of the appropriate balance of research, teaching, and service. In support of the University's ability to meet its overall mission, it is expected that faculty will contribute their expertise to the collective good of the University through University service at School, College, and University levels.

II. Areas of Professional Activity in which Faculty will be Evaluated

Areas to be considered in determining eligibility for promotion and tenure and for purposes of annual evaluation are the areas of teaching, research, professional service, and university service, in conformance with Section 3.7.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*. These four areas will be evaluated against the specific performance criteria that are delineated below for tenure and for promotion. Annual evaluations will indicate assessment of performance levels in each of the areas. For each area, the methods of assessment and sources of evidence are given below. Levels of performance expectations are indicated separately under the sections on Tenure Criteria and Promotion Criteria.

A. Research and Scholarship

Within this category, the School employs a broad definition of scholarship which encompasses research and creative activities that contribute to the intellectual development of the discipline or that generate new applications for the improvement of professional practice. Such activities would include, but are not limited to, the building of theory and creation of explanatory concepts; the development of new methodologies for the collection and analysis of data; field based research that examines practice of the information profession in a variety of environments; and the synthesis, clarification, and reinterpretation of extant knowledge and research.

Research in library and information studies and knowledge management employs methodologies from the social and behavioral sciences, the physical sciences, and the humanities. Results are disseminated in a wide variety of media, including both print and electronic; the School does not assume any value hierarchy among these media based solely on format. Rather than assuming any value hierarchy among methodologies, the School assesses the quality of the research and resulting publication based on the appropriateness of the methodology to the topic under investigation; the rigor with which the research is conducted; the significance of the findings; and the effectiveness, scope, timeliness, and impact of the dissemination vehicle. In evaluation of a faculty member's performance in this area, the overall quality and value of the work to the School and to the disciplines will be given more weight than numerical quantity.

Assessment

Evaluation in this category is assumed to rest on the communication and dissemination of the research and scholarship to members of the disciplines and, as
appropriate, to the fields of practice. Research and works of scholarship, as a rule, will be considered as such only after they have been published, accepted for publication, or publicly disseminated in some other appropriate manner. It is acknowledged that some scholarly activities, such as preparation of a book or a multi-year research grant project, will require a substantial period of time for completion and may not be fully achievable during annual evaluation periods. If there is convincing evidence that substantial advancement has been made for a work in progress and there is convincing reason to believe that it will be completed and published within a reasonable period of time, interim merit recognition may be given. Such evidence might include conference presentations based on the work in progress or a publishing contract.

In keeping with the School's recognition of the value of collaborative approaches to the achievement of the School's mission, the School likewise encourages collaboration in research and scholarship. The School recognizes work that has been conducted with other faculty in the School, faculty in other areas of the University, or faculty in other universities, or with students or practitioners, as demonstration of an enriched approach to the solution of information problems. For this reason, such work is acknowledged on an equal footing with works of single authorship, to the extent that the faculty member contributed to the work.

The following elements will be considered in assessing the level of performance in this area.

1. Quality, as signaled by
   a. dissemination in a refereed medium
   b. publication in journals of international or national disciplinary or professional societies
   c. publication by well regarded disseminators
   d. invited presentation at international or national level conferences or symposia
   e. positive references and citations in other works
   f. favorable reviews of the specific item or inclusion in literature reviews.

2. Importance of the work, as demonstrated through
   a. significance to the discipline, as indicated by
      (1) use as the foundation for future work or for other researchers' work
      (2) association of the faculty member's name with the area of work
   b. potential for/actual impact on the field of practice
c. benefit to the University
d. support of the mission of the School
e. external financial support for the conduct of the research or for the dissemination of the results
f. relevance to the faculty member's individual research and publication agenda
g. range of the audience (regional, national, international) reached by the faculty member's publications.

3. Recognition, as evidenced by
   a. re-dissemination in other distribution vehicles
   b. inclusion in course syllabi or other indications of use as instructional material in other schools of library and information studies
c. requests for copies
d. honors or awards for the works
e. invitations to make presentations at scholarly meetings of work in progress or recently completed.

4. Level of involvement in the work, including
   a. single author
   b. coauthor
c. editor
d. reviser
e. consultant.

5. Quantity of work

Sources of evidence

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the sources listed below.

The primary sources of evidence are the vehicles through which the products of the research and scholarship are disseminated to the members of the discipline or to the field of practice. Such products would include the following types of publications, in order of importance:
- reports on research
- substantive works of a philosophical, theoretical, creative, or critical commentary nature
- edited publications, when the editing represents a major scholarly effort
- other publications that would be considered scholarly in nature, including appropriate consulting reports
- copies of unpublished material presented at scholarly meetings.

For those items that appear in either print or electronic media, the following categories of vehicles for dissemination indicate the order of greatest consideration in assessing performance in this area:

- refereed journals or other refereed or juried vehicles
- journal publications of international or national associations or organizations
- monographs or chapters of books
- publications that reach a wide audience of either members of the discipline or professionals in the field of practice
- publicly disseminated reports generated by consulting activities
- other publications.

Faculty members are required to list the items in the appropriate form for the evaluation period (annual evaluation, tenure, promotion), to indicate for each the level of involvement, and to submit copies for examination. Other sources of evidence include those items delineated in the section on assessment that demonstrate the quality and significance of the work.

For purposes of consideration for tenure and promotion, in addition to those sources of evidence listed above, assessments of research and scholarship are required from at least five (5) external evaluators from comparable universities.

**B. Teaching**

Teaching is defined as instruction in regularly scheduled classes, one-to-one instruction in independent studies, supervision of internships, mentoring activities, participation on thesis and Advanced Certificate committees, participation on external doctoral committees, and design of instructional materials.

It is recognized that instruction in regularly scheduled classes includes (1) content expertise, (2) instructional delivery skills and characteristics, and (3) instructional design skills.

Faculty are expected to develop their abilities in all three areas and to integrate and synthesize their contributions in such a manner as to maximize their ability to further the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the School.
Assessment

The following elements will be considered in assessing the level of performance in teaching.

1. Mastery of subject matter, as indicated by
   a. possession of a broad knowledge of library and information studies and a thorough mastery of knowledge in the faculty member's own area(s) of specialization
   b. ability to relate theory and practice from other disciplines to the subject matter of the courses taught.

2. Curriculum development, as demonstrated through
   a. effective adaptation of existing courses to reflect advances within the field
   b. appropriate modification of existing courses to reflect changes in the School's curriculum structure
   c. new course creation to meet the School's identified needs.

3. Course design, that evidences
   a. ability to organize course materials coherently
   b. effectiveness in clearly defining objectives of a course
   c. incorporation of research findings from the discipline
   d. inclusion of appropriate materials from other disciplines
   e. attention to cultural diversity in course content
   f. incorporation of information technology into course content
   g. ability to redesign instructional materials to incorporate innovative or creative teaching strategies.

4. Development of instructional materials, including
   a. textbooks or other authoring or editing of print media used by others in the discipline
   b. creation of software, such as programs or databases for instructional purposes
   c. other educational or instructional materials.
5. Delivery of instruction, demonstrating
   a. ability to present course materials logically and clearly
   b. adherence to defined objectives throughout the course
   c. ability to convey both abstract and concrete information
   d. ability to stimulate students to read widely, to think critically, and to analyze and synthesize information
   e. enthusiasm for the subject(s) taught and ability to convey this enthusiasm to students
   f. effective adoption of innovative or creative teaching strategies
   g. participation in the full range of delivery modes needed by the School.

6. Mentoring of students, including
   a. advising
   b. supervision of student independent learning experiences
   c. accessibility to students outside of class hours
   d. generation of external support for students
   e. publication and presentation activities with students
   f. other assistance in the professional socialization of students
   g. assistance in professional placement.

Sources of evidence for teaching effectiveness

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the following:

- student evaluations by means of questionnaires
- examples of student performance, such as student papers, theses, or published works
- letters from students
- student comments from course evaluations
- student papers accepted or published that were generated from work with faculty
- student participation in professional associations, workshops, and conferences
- amount of external funding to support students and number of students supported
• syllabi and related instructional materials, including revised syllabi for the same course
• course revisions submitted to the Curriculum Committee in accord with the School's identified needs
• new courses proposed to the Curriculum Committee in accord with the School's identified needs
• evidence of methods of assessment of students
• lecture materials
• evidence of incorporation of information technology into the content of the course
• evidence of incorporation of innovative or creative teaching strategies
• evidence of incorporation of cultural diversity into the content of the course
• evidence of incorporation of research findings from the discipline into the content of the course
• evidence of incorporation of materials from other disciplines into the content of the course
• formal peer evaluation of delivery of instruction
• videotapes of instructional activities
• documentation of advising, including number and range of students advised and formal program plans
• office hours and other methods of contact with students
• outside evaluations of teaching at other institutions, off-campus workshops, and institutes
• support of instructional activities through grants or contracts
• course schedules
• honors, awards, or special recognitions for teaching
• participation in faculty development activities
• certificates or licenses in an area of practice closely related to the instructional area
• invitations to teach or lecture in other schools and departments in areas of subject expertise
• evidence of assistance in professional placement.

C. Service

The School evaluates two types of service, (1) professional and public service and (2) service in support of School, College, and University governance. Faculty members are expected to contribute in both these service areas, and the relationship of service activities to the School's goals, objectives, and priorities will be considered in weighing the value of a faculty member's service. Service expectations for each area are outlined separately.

Professional and Public Service

SLIS faculty are expected to provide leadership in response to the information needs of information and knowledge management professionals and to society. The degree and quality of professional activity and service at local, state, regional, national, and
international levels will be evaluated. In particular, leadership roles in professional organizations and consulting will be evaluated. Sustained membership in national, state, regional, and international professional associations will be counted as professional service but, in itself, will be given less weight than active service on committees or on boards of directors or as an officer of such associations.

Assessment

The following elements will be considered in assessing the level of performance in this area.

1. Election, appointment, or other leadership in professional organizations, including
   a. visibility of the organization: local, state, regional, national, or international
   b. nature of the service contribution
   c. significance of the contribution
   d. value of the service to the School, especially in the context of the School's strategic plan and areas of emphasis
   e. value in context of the faculty member's professional goals.

2. Presentation or organization of workshops and seminars, including
   a. audience of the workshop/seminar: local, state, regional, national, or international
   b. nature of the contribution (Most weight will be given to the presentation of an invited or refereed paper or lecture, or to invited participation in a symposium.)
   c. significance of the contribution
   d. quality of workshops/seminars
   e. number of workshops/seminars
   f. value of the service to the School, especially in the context of the School's strategic plan and areas of emphasis
   g. value in context of the faculty member's professional goals.

3. Nonresearch-based consulting, including
   a. scope of consulting work: local, state, regional, national, or international
b. significance of the contribution

c. quality of consulting

d. amount of consulting

e. value of the service to the School, especially in the context of the School's strategic plan and areas of emphasis

f. value in context of the faculty member's professional goals.

4. Service publications and presentations

(This category includes items such as nonscholarly works that are of interest to the profession, or that are directed toward the enlightenment of the general public with respect to various aspects of the profession of librarianship.)

a. service publications

b. service presentations

c. reviews of books or other materials.

5. Other professional activities

a. service as editor or on editorial boards

b. article or grant proposal refereeing

c. review of tenure or promotion dossiers

d. membership on accreditation teams

e. mentoring of alumni and others within the profession

f. service on professional boards.
Sources of Evidence

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the following:

- the record as presented by the candidate
  - curriculum vitae
  - documentation of activity and visibility
  - demonstration of relative importance of professional organizations in which the candidate is active
- letters of support from colleagues working with the candidate
- peer evaluations
- service awards or other recognition.

University Service and Service to the School

All faculty, as part of their normal duties, are expected to serve on committees within the School. Inadequate performance of committee work will be negatively weighted, as will habitual delinquency in the completion of routine and other administrative reports required from members of the faculty, but conscientious performance of particularly demanding and time-consuming assignments will be appropriately recognized. Commendable work on College committees and University committees, councils and the like will receive positive recognition. Tenured faculty have a special obligation to undertake service beyond the School level. Tenure-track faculty are expected to maintain an appropriate service balance under the guidance of Committee A.

Assessment

1. Service on School committees, including
   a. nature of service (chair, member, liaison)
   b. quality of work performed
   c. quantity of work performed
   d. timeliness of work performed
   e. significance of service to School.

2. Other administrative assignments within the School, including
   a. nature of service
   b. quality of work performed
   c. quantity of work performed
d. timeliness of work performed

e. significance of service to School.

3. Service at the College level, including
   a. nature of service
   b. quality of work performed
   c. quantity of work performed
   d. significance of service to College.

4. University-wide contributions
   a. nature of service
   b. quality of work performed
   c. quantity of work performed
   d. significance of service to University.

Sources of Evidence

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the following:

- record as presented by the candidate
- documentation of committee activities, such as:
  - charge to committee
  - committee agenda or minutes
  - products of the committee
  - contributions of individual committee member
    for College and University level, assessment by the committee chair
- written description and criteria of special position or other assignment that differs from regular faculty position
- letters of support
- service awards or other recognition.

III. Tenure Criteria

The criteria below set forth the performance expectations for the granting of tenure. However, demonstration that the candidate has met the criteria does not ensure tenure. Recommendations for tenure must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the School and the goals of the University. Any major change in the direction or purpose of the School will affect tenure deliberations.
A candidate at the rank of Assistant Professor or above, to be considered eligible for tenure, must have demonstrated during the probationary period consistent growth and development in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and professional and university service. The candidate's record must indicate performance at a level of special strength in one of the three categories and at least at the level of competence in the other two. The candidate must also demonstrate in at least one category the achievement of national professional recognition in an area within the focus of the school, with the expectation that achievement will continue beyond the tenure decision. In the other two categories, performance must be at the level of competence or better, as defined within the individual categories below.

A. Research and Scholarship

In research and scholarship, for a candidate to be assessed as performing at the level of special strength, the faculty member's disseminated research and works of scholarship must be considered recognizably higher in the combination of quality and quantity than the majority of colleagues at the same rank in schools of library and information studies in comparable universities.

Competence in this area is defined as performance at a level such that the faculty member's published research and works of scholarship compare favorably in the combination of quality and quantity with that of colleagues at the same rank in similar schools. It is expected that a faculty who is competent in this area will publish an average of one article per year in a refereed journal in library and information studies or its equivalent.

The candidate for tenure should demonstrate a continuous record of productivity in research and scholarship during the probationary period. The record should be demonstrably integrated with the candidate's teaching activities, be consistent with the candidate's stated agenda in research and scholarship, and be supportive of the mission, goals, and objectives of the School. In addition to evidencing the quality indicators detailed in section IIA. above, the scholarly work of the candidate during the probationary period should receive favorable peer evaluation by a majority of the external evaluators outside the University who are competent to make such evaluations and who have not been closely associated with the candidate.

B. Teaching

In teaching, for a candidate to be assessed as performing at the level of special strength, the candidate's teaching activities in all areas defined as instruction must be integrated and synthesized in such a manner as to maximize his/her ability to further the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the School. The faculty member's performance in this area must rank with that of the best colleagues in the School incumbent at the time of his/her candidacy.

To be judged competent, the faculty member's performance in this area must compare favorably to colleagues at the same rank in the School incumbent at the time of
his/her candidacy.

The candidate for tenure should demonstrate a continuous record of productivity in teaching activities during the probationary period. The record should be demonstrably related to the candidate's research and scholarship, be consistent with the candidate's formal agenda in teaching, and be supportive of the mission, goals, and objectives of the School. In addition to evidencing the quality indicators detailed in section IIB, above, the teaching activities of the candidate during the probationary period should receive favorable peer evaluation by evaluators within the University who are competent to make such evaluations.

C. Service

In service, for a candidate to be assessed as performing at the level of special strength, the faculty member's work in this area must rank with that of the best colleagues in the School incumbent at the time of his/her candidacy. The candidate's activities in all service areas must be balanced in such a manner as to maximize his/her ability to further the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the School.

Competence in this area is defined as performance at a level that compares favorably to colleagues at the same rank in the School incumbent at the time of his/her candidacy.

The candidate for tenure should demonstrate a continuous record of productive service activities during the probationary period and a pattern of increasingly responsible positions within the School, the University, and the professional community. Professional and public service activities should be demonstrably integrated with the candidate's research and scholarship, and/or with her/his formal teaching agenda, and be supportive of the mission, goals, and objectives of the School. In addition, the service activities of the candidate during the probationary period should meet the quality indicators detailed in section IIC.

IV. Promotion Criteria

The promotion criteria given below describe the general expectations of the School for promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. Where the candidate's approved written assignment of responsibilities dictates emphasis on one or more areas (research and scholarship, teaching, service), it is expected that the designated area(s) of emphasis will be those in which special strength is achieved. (See Faculty Handbook 3.11.3.1, para. 2.)

Associate Professor

To be considered eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must have demonstrated substantial growth during the time in rank and must have reached the
level of competence in all areas with special strength in one or more areas. The candidate must also demonstrate in at least one category the achievement of national professional recognition in an area within the focus of the School. It is expected that the candidate will continue development as a teacher and a scholar and in service to the profession and the university in a manner that will support promotion to Professor in a reasonable period of time.

Professor

To be considered eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must have demonstrated during the time in rank competence in all areas and special strength in two areas. The candidate must also demonstrate the continuation of national professional recognition in an area within the focus of the School. It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate promise for continued contribution as a teacher and a scholar and in service activities that will enhance the image of the School and the University. Further, it is expected that the candidate will evidence ability to mentor other faculty and students in their research and professional activities.
TO:        Cecelia Brown
           School of Library and Information Studies

FROM:      Nancy L. Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost

DATE:      November 30, 2010

SUBJECT:   School of Library and Information Studies
           Policy: Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises

I am pleased to approve your proposed amendment to the School of Library and
Information Studies personnel policies regarding, Policies on Tenure, Promotion and
Merit Raises as revised and reaffirmed by the faculty on August 9, 2010 and submitted
to my office on November 18, 2010.

Development of these policies is an arduous but important task. I extend thanks
to everyone in the department who contributed to the process.

NLM:mrg

cc:  Paul B. Bell Jr, Dean College of Arts and Sciences
TO: Nancy L. Mergler  
Senior Vice President and Provost  

FROM: Paul B. Bell, Jr.  
Dean  

DATE: November 17, 2010  

SUBJ: School of Library and Information Studies  
Policy: Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises  

On September 14, you approved the Procedures for Implementation of the School of Library and Information Studies, “Policies on Tenure, Promotion and Merit Raises.” The attached “Policy: Policies on Tenure, Promotion and Merit Raises” was not included with the submission of the procedures. I have reviewed the “Policy: Policies on Tenure, Promotion and Merit Raises,” and I am forwarding it to you with the recommendation that it be approved as an amendment to their personnel policies. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

PBB:so  
Attachment  
cc: Cecelia Brown  
Kelly Damphousse  
Edward Sankowski
TO: Paul Bell, Dean
    College of Arts and Sciences
FROM: Kathy Latrobe, Director
SUBJECT: University Approval of Revised T&P Documents
DATE: March 16, 2010

In the fall of 2008, the School of Library and Information Studies revised and reaffirmed
(1) Policy: Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises (October 10)
(2) Procedure: Procedures for Implementation of the School of Library and Information
    Studies “Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises” (December 12).
The proposed changes and other possible revisions were discussed in faculty meetings before the
School’s regular faculty voted to reaffirm and to recommend the two revised documents for
approval by the College of Arts and Sciences and the University.

Enclosed are the reaffirmed policy and procedure documents and a version of each that tracks
changes made.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you, Kathy Latrobe