PROCEDURE: PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION STUDIES "POLICIES ON TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT RAISES"
STATUS: Approved by SLIS Faculty, March 22, 1996; Revised 6/19/96 (Editorial revisions requested by College of Arts and Sciences; approved by faculty by email); Revised 11/8/96 and 3/28/97 in response to Provost's requests; Approved by Provost 4/28/97. Revised and reaffirmed by SLIS Faculty, 12/12/08; Revised in response to A&S Dean 8/9/2010, Approved by Provost 9/14/10.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

II. Annual Faculty Evaluation
   Calendar
   Procedures for information gathering
   Procedures for the evaluation
   Communication about the evaluation
   Determination of workload distribution
   Recommendations for merit salary increases

III. Annual and Cumulative Review of Progress Toward Tenure
   Annual review
   Third-year review

IV. Reappointment of Probationary Faculty

V. Tenure and Promotion
   Calendar
Procedures for information gathering

Votes on candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor

Votes on candidacy for promotion to professor

Notification to candidate

I. Introduction

This document sets forth the procedures for implementing the University of Oklahoma School of Library and Information Studies "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises," approved by the faculty of the School on 21 April 1995, revised and approved by the faculty of the School on December 10, 2008. These procedures are established within the requirements and framework set forth in the University of Oklahoma Norman Campus Faculty Handbook sections 3.7 and 3.11 and the College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation (February 1, 1995). Should anything in this document be in conflict with either the Norman Campus Faculty Handbook or the Guidelines, those documents will prevail.

Revision of these procedures will be made on an as needed basis. Revisions are the responsibility of Committee A but consideration of revisions may be suggested or requested by any member of the faculty of the School of Library and Information Studies. Revisions also may be suggested or required by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences or by the Senior Vice President and Provost. Any revisions of substance must be approved by the faculty of the School, the Dean, and the Provost before they are implemented.

II. Annual Faculty Evaluation

Calendar

As required by the Faculty Handbook, each full-time faculty member in the School is evaluated annually for the prior calendar year, following the calendars set by the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Annual Faculty Evaluation is summative and based on productivity in a single year, rather than on cumulative achievement. The School's Committee A, which is charged with preparing annual faculty evaluations, at the beginning of each academic year establishes a tentative calendar for the annual evaluation process, later amending the calendar if required in order to meet the deadlines established by the Provost and the Dean. The general time frame for the annual evaluation process is January through February, with the final results provided to the Dean during the first week in March.
Committee A establishes dates for the following deadlines for the evaluation process:

- Date by which individual faculty submit to Committee A the following materials:
  - Faculty Activity Report
  - Copies of all publications for the year under review.
  - Draft faculty mini-vitae
  - Updated full curriculum vitae
  - Course syllabi for the year for the year under review.
  - Peer evaluation of teaching (optional for tenured faculty).

The above listed documents will be made available to any member of the SLIS faculty for consultation and review.

- Date by which faculty evaluations are completed and copies of "Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation" and comparative information to enable interpretation of the relative meaning of the evaluation are delivered to each faculty member and by which each faculty member delivers to Committee A an independent self assessment using the same "Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation" as that used by Committee A.

- Dates for meetings of each faculty member with Committee A to discuss the evaluation and to afford the faculty member an opportunity to respond in writing and to review and revise the mini-vitae as needed. These dates must cover a one-week time period following the date of delivery of faculty evaluations.

- Date by which the Director delivers faculty and unit evaluations to the College.

Procedures for information gathering
The purpose of the annual evaluation is to assess the record as presented and documented by the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to submit a complete and accurate evaluation packet.

Each faculty member submits to Committee A a completed Faculty Activity Report, copies of all publications for the year under review, a copy of the faculty's full curriculum vitae, a draft copy of the faculty's mini-vitae (following the format and instructions issued by the Provost and/or the Dean), and copies of the syllabi for courses taught in the year under review (if such copies are not already available in the School's office). In addition, faculty are invited to submit any other documents that would assist in an accurate and equitable evaluation, including but not limited to the "Sources of evidence" for research, teaching effectiveness, and service that are listed on pages 4, 6-7, 9, and 10 of the School's
"Policies of Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises." Untenured, tenure-track faculty are required, and tenured faculty are encouraged to submit one or more written reports of peer evaluation of delivery of instruction made during the year by either a member of the tenured faculty or an evaluator recommended by the Program for Instructional Innovation.

Committee A also gathers for each faculty member the following additional information:

- copies of the summary and individual course evaluations for all courses taught in the calendar year under evaluation;
- where appropriate, evaluation of the faculty member's contribution to any interdisciplinary program in which the faculty member participates by the head of the program.

Procedures for the evaluation

A summary of activities form reflecting the three categories of research and scholarship, teaching, and service is completed for each faculty member from the Faculty Activity Report, with each Committee A member examining each faculty member's reported activities across categories, to ensure consistency in interpretation of reported items. Next, each member of Committee A individually examines the materials that have been collected on each faculty member and individually evaluates each person's performance in the context of rank and workload distribution using the "Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation" form or other appropriate form as specified by the Provost. Evaluations are conducted working across categories to assure consistent application of the standards that are articulated in the "Policies for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises." Each faculty member's contribution to the School's goals and objectives is assessed.

Committee A then meets and reviews their individual summaries. If there is a difference in interpretation of categories, Committee A contacts or meets with the faculty member to clarify interpretations. Committee A also reviews their individual assessments of each faculty member in the three categories, discusses and reconciles any differences in the evaluative assessments, and prepares the rationale for the evaluative assessment. Each category, research and scholarship, teaching, and service, is assessed for all faculty before the next category is discussed. After this process is completed, Committee A considers each faculty member in turn, in order to determine a composite numerical rating reflecting effort distribution and to prepare the narrative for the composite achievements/contributions.

Performance across the faculty is then compared, and the Committee examines the results against the evaluations of the previous two years in order to maintain
consistency across time in application of the evaluative process and to identify relative changes for each faculty member individually.

**Communication about the evaluation**

Each faculty member is provided with a copy of the "Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation" form (or other specified form) together with a memorandum that lists in random order the numerical assessment of the performances of the faculty in the three areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service as well as the overall performance numerical assessment. At the same time, Committee A is provided with the independent self assessment of each faculty member using the same "Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation" form. During the week following the delivery of this information, each faculty member may schedule a meeting with Committee A to review and discuss the evaluation and the process. During the meeting, the faculty member may request reconsideration of any component of the evaluation. When such reconsideration is requested, Committee A reconvenes and reexamines all relevant evidence, makes the reconsideration, and communicates the decision to the faculty member within a week of the request. If the reconsideration results in any change in the numerical assessment, each faculty member is provided with a memorandum that lists in random order the recalculated numerical assessment of the performances of the faculty in the three areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service as well as the recalculated overall numerical assessment. The evaluation forms must be signed by the individual faculty members and returned to the SLIS office at least one day prior to the deadline established for forwarding materials to the Dean's office.

**Determination of workload distribution**

Under the circumstances in which a faculty member is assigned the usual teaching load of four courses a year, it is assumed that the workload distribution will be 40 percent research and scholarship, 40 percent teaching, and 20 percent service. Individual adjustments are made to this distribution depending on teaching, research, and service assignments, within the limits that no faculty member will have less than 10 percent in any one of the three categories. Except in unusual circumstances, faculty who are in their tenure-earning years are expected to have a workload distribution that includes at least 40 percent research and 40 percent teaching, in order to most effectively develop that individual's tenure portfolio. Should a faculty member wish to have a distribution other than the norm described, the faculty member should schedule a meeting in early Fall to discuss the desired distribution for the coming year with Committee A. Faculty who are scheduled for sabbatical leave during the upcoming year should meet with Committee A to establish an appropriate workload distribution for that year.
**Recommendations for merit salary increases**

Recommendations for merit salary increases that are at the discretion of the unit are based on the results of the annual evaluation of faculty. That portion of salary increases to be determined by merit is recommended on a percentage basis, with the percentages reflecting the relative range that is represented by the range of performance evaluations. In the instance where there have been no merit salary increments in the prior year(s), the annual evaluation ratings for all the years since the last merit raise are averaged for each individual and used as the basis for determination of recommendations for merit salary increases.

**III. Annual and Cumulative Review of Progress Toward Tenure**

**Annual review**

During the spring of each year, following the calendar established by the Dean of the College, the progress toward tenure of each tenure-track faculty member is assessed by Committee A. While Annual Faculty Evaluation is summative and based on performance is a single year, this assessment is based on the cumulative achievements of the faculty member during the time since appointment at the University compared with the requirements for tenure that are set forth in the SLIS "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises." Data gathered in the annual evaluations, plus any additional information on performance since the last annual evaluation, forms the evidentiary basis for this assessment. For any faculty member on sabbatical leave for the year under review, the report on the sabbatical will constitute part of the evidence for the assessment.

A written assessment delineating the faculty member's progress in each of the areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service is prepared; and a concluding overall assessment is made. In the assessment, areas that need strengthening in order for the faculty member to achieve tenure are called to the person's attention, and specific advice is offered.

One copy of the assessment is provided to the faculty member, one is placed in the faculty member's personnel files, and another is forwarded to the Dean. At the request of either the faculty member or Committee A, a meeting may be scheduled to discuss the assessment and to provide further guidance to the individual.

**Third-year review (Cumulative Review of Progress Toward Tenure)**

During the spring of a faculty member's third year of appointment in a tenure-track position, Committee A conducts a more in-depth review of the individual's cumulative progress toward tenure. Committee A establishes the calendar for the review in consultation with the faculty member, following any deadlines set forth by the Dean of the College. Deadlines for the gathering of data for the review are...
set by Committee A. Dates below are based on 2009. Minor adjustments may be made as necessary to accommodate work of the School and annual calendar variations.

**Calendar** (Responsible party indicated in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 20</td>
<td>Notice to individual of impending third year review; request for nominees of external evaluators; request for copies of all publications and the candidate’s statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td>Deadline for nominations for external evaluators (Candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Review of candidate nominations; nomination of external evaluators; choice of external evaluators (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1</td>
<td>Submission of copies of all publications and the candidate’s statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service (Candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15</td>
<td>Letters and information packets sent to external evaluators (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1</td>
<td>Receipt of external evaluators’ reports (Director) Submission of complete dossier and supporting materials (Candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 16-Feb. 20</td>
<td>Review of complete dossier (Tenured Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 23</td>
<td>Submission of written independent evaluations (Tenured Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 24 - 27</td>
<td>Review of written independent evaluations and dossier (Tenured Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>Meeting for purposes of discussion (Tenured Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>Transmission of draft third-year review letter to candidate and tenured faculty (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss draft third-year review letter (Candidate, Tenured Faculty, Committee A)/ Submission of recommendation letter for dossier (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>Transmission of final third-year review letter to candidate and Dean of Arts and Sciences (Committee A/Director)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures for Information Gathering
This review incorporates consideration of the following elements:

1. a statement prepared and submitted by the faculty member setting forth the individual's research agenda and self-assessment of progress to date; the faculty member's teaching agenda, philosophy, and goals and how these have been implemented in the activities of the individual; the service philosophy and activities of the faculty member; the integration of the three areas; and the relationship of the individual's research, teaching, and service activities to the mission, goals, and objectives of the School;

2. evidence of the recognition of the individual's research and scholarship; such evidence may include, if necessary for full evaluation or at the specific request of the faculty member, the assessment by external reviewers, with the need for external assessment to be determined by Committee A in consultation with the faculty member. If external reviewers are to be part of the process, relevant procedures described in the Tenure and Promotion section of this document will be followed, with the exception that the Director requests nominations by the candidate of three individuals and Committee A nominates three individuals. No external approval is required. Committee A selects three individuals representing a mix of candidate and Committee A nominees, from the list who will be contacted and asked to serve as external evaluators.

3. reports of peer evaluation of delivery of instruction by either members of the tenured faculty or evaluators recommended by Instructional Development;

4. all evidence gathered to date in relation to the annual faculty evaluation of the individual, including the annual summary evaluations and the annual faculty activity reports;

5. written evaluations made by each member of the tenured faculty that compare the individual's achievements to date with the requirements for tenure; assess the fit of the individual's work and performance with the mission, goals, objectives, and directions of the School; and identify the progress needed for a positive tenure decision to be made at the appropriate time for that decision. (These written evaluations are provided to the other members of the tenured faculty for consideration during discussion and for the use of Committee A but are not transmitted to the candidate and are not part of the formal record.)

Items included in 1 – 4 are made available to the tenured faculty for examination for a one-week period for their review and preparation of written independent evaluations. These written evaluations are made available to all tenured faculty
for a period of at least three work days, after which the tenured faculty meets to
discuss the progress of the individual and to provide advice to Committee A on
the areas in which the faculty member needs to make additional progress.
Following this meeting, Committee A prepares a draft document that assesses the
candidate's progress to date in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service;
identifies areas where additional progress must be made in order for a positive
tenure decision to be made; and considers the relationship of the faculty member's
activities to the mission, goals, and objectives of the School.

The third-year review draft document is transmitted to the faculty member and to
the tenured members of the faculty. A meeting to discuss the assessment is
scheduled between the individual, Committee A, and the tenured members of the
faculty approximately one week following the transmission of the document.
Committee A revises the draft document and transmits the final version of the
third-year review document to the individual and the Dean of the College.

IV. Reappointment of Probationary Faculty

Committee A considers the reappointment of probationary faculty following the
calendar specified by the Provost and the Dean and makes recommendations for
either continuation for the next year or termination. Evidence on which the
decision is based includes all previous annual evaluations and cumulative
progress toward tenure evaluations of the faculty member; the mission, goals, and
objectives of the School; and the availability of funds and supporting resources
for the position. The recommendation is forwarded to the Dean by the appropriate
deadline. When a decision is made not to recommend continuation, Committee A
prepares and submits to the Dean a letter detailing the reasons for its decision.

The reappointment decision is communicated to the faculty member by copy of
the recommendation sent to the Dean.

V. Tenure and Promotion

The procedures for consideration of faculty for tenure and promotion to Associate
Professor and promotion to Professor are governed by the procedures specified
annually by the Provost and supplemented by the Dean of the College. This
document describes the procedures at the unit level that are not prescribed by
either the annual instructions from the Provost, the supplemental instructions from
the Dean, or the Faculty Handbook.

Calendar (Responsible party indicated in parentheses.)

The calendar for consideration of a faculty member for tenure and/or promotion is
established by Committee A, in articulation with the calendars specified by the
Provost. The process is initiated in the spring semester of the year prior to the
academic year in which the dossier for tenure and/or promotion will be forwarded
and proceeds according to the following schedule, which is adjusted as needed to comply with University or College deadlines. Dates below are based on 2009. Minor adjustments may be made as necessary to accommodate work of the School and annual calendar variations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>Notice to candidates for tenure and/or promotion of impending review; request for nominees of external evaluators; request for vita, copies of all publications, and the candidate’s statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Deadline for nominations for external evaluators (Candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Review of candidate’s nominations and nomination of external evaluators (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Submission of nominated evaluators to the Dean of Arts and Sciences (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Choice of external evaluators (Committee A) Submission of vita, copies of all publications and the candidate’s statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service (Candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Letters and information packets sent to external evaluators (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
<td>Receipt of external evaluators’ reports (Director) Submission of complete dossier and supporting materials (Candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 28-Oct. 6</td>
<td>Review of complete dossier (Tenured Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 12</td>
<td>Meeting for purposes of discussion vote due by 5 p.m. (Tenured Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 13</td>
<td>Tally and recording of faculty vote; Meeting and vote (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20</td>
<td>Submission of recommendation letter for dossier (Committee A)/Submission of recommendation letter for dossier (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20</td>
<td>Notification to candidate of vote of faculty and recommendations of Committee A and Director (Committee A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20 – Oct. 27</td>
<td>Dossier reproduced and assembled (Committee A/staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 3</td>
<td>All materials delivered to Dean of Arts and Sciences (Director)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The academic year for consideration of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is specified in the initial letter of appointment of the individual. Unless there have been subsequent negotiations between the candidate and the Director and Committee A of the School and between the Director and the Dean, with approval by the Provost, that alter the designated probationary period,
the process for consideration proceeds as specified. Any change in the designated year for consideration is normally made only in recognition of alterations of the terms of appointment and workload distribution or for leaves of absence (see Norman Campus Faculty Handbook 3.7.3). Such changes are made at the time of alteration of appointment or at the time a leave is granted.

Consideration of a tenured faculty member for promotion from associate professor to professor may occur in any academic year following the year in which the individual achieved the rank of associate professor. Any tenured faculty member who is at the rank of associate professor may request that Committee A initiate formal promotion consideration procedures. In addition, such consideration may be required by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences or the Senior Vice President and Provost (see Norman Campus Faculty Handbook 3.11.3.(B)(2)).

**Procedures for information gathering**

In March of the academic year preceding the one in which the review will occur, the Director of the School, on behalf of Committee A, notifies the candidate for tenure and/or promotion that the review will take place and the calendar for the review. In addition, the Director requests nominations by the candidate of six individuals who are qualified to serve as external evaluators, following guidelines for such individuals established by the Provost and by the College of Arts and Sciences "Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation," and requests copies of the candidate's statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service and copies of all the candidate's publications.

Committee A reviews the individuals nominated by the candidate for conformance with the Provost's criteria. In the case where one or more of the nominees do not meet the criteria, the candidate is notified and requested to submit additional nomination(s). Committee A also nominates six individuals to serve as external evaluators and who are qualified to make an accurate assessment of the research and scholarship of the candidate. The names submitted by the candidate and those nominated by Committee A, together with information on the qualifications of each, are submitted to the Dean for approval. When approval has been received, Committee A selects eight individuals from the list who will be contacted and asked to serve as external evaluators.

The external evaluators are sent a packet of information about the candidate that includes the following items, plus any additional materials required by University policy as directed by instructions from the Provost:

- full curriculum vitae;
- the candidate's statement on research and scholarship, teaching, and service;
c. copies of the candidate's publications and any manuscripts accepted for publication since appointment to the University in the case of tenure and promotion to associate professor or since appointment to the rank of associate professor in the case of promotion to professor;

- any other information that the candidate requests to have included;
- the School of Library and Information Studies "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises."

The external evaluators are requested

- to assess the research and scholarship of the candidate;
- to provide any comments on the teaching and service of the candidate that they feel qualified to make;
- to evaluate the candidate's work in light of the criteria for tenure and/or promotion of the School of Library and Information Studies;
- to comment on the degree to which the candidate meets performance expectations in schools that are comparable to the University of Oklahoma School of Library and Information Studies.

The candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor, in consultation with the Director and Committee A, assembles for review tenure and/or promotion dossier items:

- a complete curriculum vitae;
- copies of the original letter of appointment, each annual progress toward tenure letter, and each Summary Report of Annual Evaluation;
- a list of each course taught at the University, including the course number, title, and enrollment in the course;
- a list of all thesis and dissertation committees on which the candidate has served;
- copies of the syllabi for all courses taught at the University;
- copies of all summary and individual course evaluations for courses taught at the University;
- copies of reports of peer evaluation of instruction;
- a list of all publications and paper presentations made since appointment to the University, with a separate list of manuscripts in press or submitted but not yet accepted;
- copies of all publications and accepted manuscripts published or accepted since appointment to the University;
- a list of all grants and contracts received while at the University, including title, sponsor, amount, and time period of the grant, as well as the official designation of responsibility for the grant project;
- a list of all outside employment since appointment to the University faculty, with dates, employers, and work done;
- a list of all university service activities, including dates and assignments held;
- a list of all professional service activities, including dates and positions held;
- a list of all public service activities performed that are based on professional expertise;
- any additional information that the candidate wishes to have reviewed in support of the candidacy for tenure and/or promotion, including but not limited to the sources of evidence identified in the "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises" in the categories of research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

The candidate for promotion to professor assembles the same materials.

**Votes on candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor**

In the case of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the tenured faculty and members of Committee A are provided a minimum of a two-week period to review the above listed dossier materials and to review the reports from the external evaluators. Following this period of examination, the tenured faculty meet for the purpose of discussing the candidate's qualifications. At the close of the meeting, ballots are distributed that provide for a vote of *grant, deny,* or *abstain* on the recommendation for tenure and a vote of *promote, not promote,* or *abstain* on the recommendation for promotion. The ballots are marked and returned to a ballot box in the School office by a time specified for the close of the voting. The votes are counted by the Director and verified by the other members of Committee A.

Following the meeting of the tenured faculty, Committee A holds a meeting to take the votes of Committee A on the recommendation for tenure and the recommendation for promotion.

**Votes on candidacy for promotion to professor**

In the case of a candidate for promotion to professor, the same procedure is followed, with the exception that only the members of the tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor review the materials and meet to discuss the candidate. All members of Committee A, regardless of rank, participate in the review of materials and the vote of Committee A on the candidate.

**Notification to candidate**

The recommendations of the tenured faculty, the recommendation of Committee A, and the recommendation of the Director are communicated in writing to the candidate not later than the date on which the dossier materials are transmitted to the Dean. In the case of a negative recommendation from any one of the three
recommending units on a promotion to professor, the candidate is notified prior to the transmission of materials to the Dean and afforded the opportunity to withdraw from consideration, unless the forwarding of the candidacy has been requested by the Dean or the Provost, in which case the recommendation must be sent forward.
TO: Cecelia Brown, Director School of Library and Information Studies
FROM: Nancy L. Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost
DATE: September 14, 2010
SUBJECT: School of Library and Information Studies
Procedures for Implementation of the School of Library and Information Studies, "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises"

I am pleased to approve your proposed Procedures for Implementation of the School of Library and Information Studies, "Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises," as approved by the faculty on August 9, 2010 and submitted to my office on August 13, 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:      August 13, 2010

SUBJ:      School of Library and Information Studies  
Procedure: Procedures for Implementation of the School of Library and Information Studies “Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises”

I have reviewed the attached Procedures for Implementation of the School of Library and Information Studies “Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Raises.” 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.

[Signature]

Thank you, Kathy Latrobe