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Preliminary Remarks

These guidelines document the criteria for Promotion and Tenure or Promotion in Rank, and the procedures specific to each, for OSULP academic faculty. These guidelines also address Post-Tenure Review. These guidelines are based on the OSU guidelines (http://academicaffairs.oregonstate.edu/faculty-handbook/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#criteria), but address specific OSULP needs. OSULP academic faculty members are either eligible for Promotion and Tenure (those with professorial ranks) or are eligible for Promotion in Rank (those with Instructor or Faculty Research Assistant rank). All OSULP academic faculty are responsible for:

- Being well informed about the formal criteria, procedures, and timetables outlined in the OSU Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (http://academicaffairs.oregonstate.edu/faculty-handbook/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#criteria);
- Being well informed about current OSULP criteria and procedures relating to promotion and tenure or promotions in rank found in the remainder of this document;
- Preparing and submitting appropriate dossier materials according to the guidelines set forth in the OSU Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (http://academicaffairs.oregonstate.edu/faculty-handbook/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier) and this document. There is a template for the dossier document on the Shared Drive (\Shared\P & T\Blank Template for Dossiers\Blank Template.docx) which follows the OSU guidelines. It is also helpful to review the example dossiers which have been made available on the Shared Drive (\Shared\P & T\Tips_and_Samples\Sample_Dossiers)
As part of the review process, review letters will be solicited from students and external reviewers. All faculty members have a right to view any reviewer’s evaluations submitted in connection with the faculty member's proposed promotion and tenure or promotion in rank. However some faculty prefer to waive the right to view evaluation materials requested from on-campus and off-campus reviewers. Faculty may execute the waiver if they choose to do so. However, it is not required, though faculty must still sign to indicate their choice. For more details, please see the "Waiver of Access" section of the OSU Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (see link above). In practice, "viewing" or "accessing" students’ or reviewers’ evaluations means reading those documents in the office of the Library Administration Executive Assistant. Candidates do receive a complete digital copy of their dossier (including external and student review letters if waiver not executed) when dossier goes to Senior Review Panel.

These guidelines should be reviewed annually by the OSULP Promotion & Tenure Committee to ensure compliance with OSU guidelines and to make necessary and timely revisions. Updates should be approved by LFA by May 30 of each year to be in effect for the next cycle of dossier preparation and review.

General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure or Promotion in Rank

General Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Professorial Faculty

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and awarding of tenure; is based upon evidence of the candidate’s:

- demonstrated effectiveness in teaching (see specific Teaching criteria), advising, service, and other assigned duties;
- achievement in scholarship and creative activity that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction (see specific Scholarship criteria);
- appropriate balance of institutional and professional service (see specific Service criteria).

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor; is based upon evidence of the candidate's:

- distinction in librarianship, as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in areas such as new and innovative teaching (see specific Teaching criteria), curricular development, innovative tools and applications, or new programs and initiatives
- distinction in scholarship and should produce a body of scholarship that demonstrates a consistent commitment to research (see specific Scholarship criteria). This body of work should extend the faculty member's research program to reflect collaboration beyond the OSU Libraries, a recognized reputation for expertise, significant impact on scholarship and practice in the relevant fields, and a willingness to tackle challenging topics. All the pieces should form a cohesive picture of the faculty member as a librarian and a researcher.
- exemplary leadership in institutional and professional service, and an appropriate balance between the two (see specific Service criteria).

NOTE: Approved January 6, 2016

NOTE: If a faculty member goes up for full professor, but is not granted the promotion, there is no penalty. The associate professor may try again after a suitable amount of time, if they so choose.

General Promotion in Rank Criteria for Instructor Faculty

Promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor I; the candidate must:

- have a graduate degree appropriate to the assigned duties, or comparable educational or professional experience;
- have special skills or experience needed in the unit;
- have an exceptional record of achievement in the assigned duties (including teaching; see specific Teaching Criteria).

Promotion from Senior Instructor I to Senior Instructor II; the candidate must:

- have a sustained record of exceptional achievement and evidence of professional growth and innovation in assigned duties (including teaching; see specific Teaching criteria).

General Promotion in Rank Criteria for Faculty Research Assistant

Promotion from Faculty Research Assistant to Senior Faculty Research Assistant I; the candidate must:

- have a graduate degree appropriate to the field in which the research activities are performed, or comparable educational or professional experience;
• demonstrate a high level of competence, achievement, and potential in research, or serve effectively in a position requiring high individual responsibility or special professional expertise;
• demonstrate a high degree of initiative in research and leadership among research colleagues in the department, as documented in authorship, management responsibilities, and creative approaches to research.
• If the duties include teaching, see specific Teaching criteria.

Promotion from Senior Faculty Research Assistant I to Senior Faculty Research Assistant II; the candidate must:
• have a sustained record of exceptional achievement and evidence of professional growth and innovation in assigned duties.
• If the duties include teaching, see specific Teaching criteria.

Specific Criteria for Promotion and Tenure or Promotion in Rank

Teaching Criteria

• The teaching of students is central to the mission of Oregon State University. Professorial faculty and Instructor faculty have responsibilities in instruction; some Faculty Research Assistants may have limited teaching responsibilities. Teaching may take the form of:
  • presenting resident credit courses, international programs, for-credit distance learning programs;
  • directing undergraduate and graduate research or projects, internships, and theses, or serving on master and doctoral committees (or in some cases, University Honors College thesis committees);
  • collaborating with and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral associates.
• When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Faculty with responsibilities in instruction can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance in the teaching role.
• Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students.
• Other activities that provide evidence of a faculty member's particular commitment to effective teaching include:
  • contribution in curricular development, including collaborative courses and programs;
  • innovation in teaching strategies, including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning;
  • documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues, and incorporation of this information into the classroom.
  • evaluation of instruction is based on a combination of systematic and on-going peer evaluations, following unit guidelines for peer review of teaching; tabulated responses from learners or participants of courses taught by the candidate; and evaluation, by student representatives, of materials that pertain to teaching. Peer evaluations should be based both on classroom observations and on review of course syllabi, texts, assigned reading, examinations, and class materials. Where possible, evaluation is enhanced by evidence of student learning.

Research/Scholarship Criteria for Professorial Faculty

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

• Professorial faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor should have produced a minimum of five significant pieces of scholarship. Examples of significant pieces of scholarship include (but are not limited to): peer-reviewed journal articles, invited or peer-reviewed book chapter(s), invited papers at significant conferences or contributions to refereed conference proceedings, or edited books. In addition, the results of work-related projects (such as software code or curricular materials) may be considered significant if they are widely adopted and their impact on practice can be demonstrated.
• Articles in peer-reviewed journals should account for at least three of these significant pieces of scholarship. Peer-reviewed includes, but is not limited to, pre- or post- publication peer-review or critique. This type of scholarship should be published in journals appropriate to the faculty member's professional work and expertise.
• Recognizing that positions may evolve over the course of the pre-tenure period, it is imperative that the faculty member works with the supervisor to clearly articulate the major changes in duties and how those may impact research directions. These shifts will be documented and explained in the Promotion and Tenure Dossier.
• These expectations are generalized and do not ensure success in the promotion and tenure process. Every faculty member is responsible for articulating the purpose, value, and impact of their scholarly output.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

• Tenured faculty seeking promotion to full Professor should produce a body of scholarship that demonstrates a consistent commitment to research. After 6 years, the candidate may consider submitting their dossier for review. This body of work should extend the faculty
members of the OSU Libraries faculty serve as engaged participants in the evolution of the Libraries and Press and in the governance of the University. We are involved with shaping and strengthening the library, information science, and archives professions. We apply our expertise and skills to the needs, issues, and challenges of the University, and our local, national and global communities.

Context

- Tenure-track and tenured library faculty have a responsibility to engage in scholarship and creative activity. Scholarship and creative activity are understood to be intellectual and applied work that takes diverse forms; are documented; have their significance validated through peer evaluation or critique; and, are communicated to external audiences in appropriate outlets.
- Scholarship and creative activity derive from many activities, including but not limited to:
  - research contributing to a body of knowledge;
  - developing new technologies, materials, methods, or educational approaches;
  - integration of knowledge or technology leading to new interpretations or applications;
  - seeking competitive grants and contracts (particularly when the grants are highly competitive and peer-reviewed) can be a component of achievement in scholarship;
  - information or data discovery, integration, application, or the teaching of information/data concepts;
  - work on steering committees, funding agency panels, and editorships where the documented outcome shows a fundamental change in the field's direction.
- Scholarly Communication
  - As a faculty, we support open access to our research and recognize and value the changing nature of scholarly communications in academia. Faculty members consider access issues when choosing where to publish. We prefer journals and other outlets that protect our rights to share our work broadly over those publishers and venues who limit them.
- Scholarship Expectations
  - Faculty are expected to demonstrate continuous scholarly productivity and to communicate that scholarship to appropriate audiences. Doing so allows scholarly work to mature and for its impact to develop. Typically, faculty produce at least one significant piece of scholarly output annually, throughout their career.
  - All the pieces of scholarly output should form a cohesive picture of the faculty member as a librarian and a researcher. New faculty will benefit from discussing research directions with their supervisor and/or mentor. Often these are refined or revised as the research develops and the position's duties evolve.
- Audience
  - Library faculty communicate their work to build new knowledge and to have an impact on the collection, management, preservation, and use of information at OSU and beyond. The audiences and the relevant communication modes may vary for each piece of scholarship or creative activity. Scholarship relating to non-LIS disciplines is acceptable provided that the contributions to the discipline emphasize an aspect of the faculty's primary assignment or connect in some way to library and information science.
- Impact
  - Impact of scholarly and creative work must include an articulation of the importance of the problem explored and is measured in a variety of ways including dissemination and use. Because impact indicators are difficult to interpret without context, it is important to provide descriptions of the nature and importance of the problem explored, and how the findings have impacted the conversation in the candidate's field. Evidence of the breadth of dissemination of the work can include both qualitative and quantitative metrics, e.g., descriptions of stories in the media, pageview statistics, h-index, or alternative metrics. Evidence of how peers and practitioners used the work can also demonstrate impact. Examples can include both qualitative and quantitative indicators of impact, e.g., citation counts, incorporation of the work into instruction or services, adoption of code, and requests for presentations and consultations. Impact information can appear both in the CV and in the Candidate's Statement portions of the dossier.
- Collaboration & Authorship
  - The profession is highly collaborative by nature and this is reflected in our approach to scholarly endeavors. We value collaboration because many of the issues we research require a variety of expertise to explore and provide meaningful solutions. Faculty document their contributions to collaborative scholarship so that their unique roles and contributions are highlighted and understood. Individual research projects and scholarship are also valued, but not more so than collaborative work. Faculty are also encouraged to document the contributions to scholarship for which they may not be listed as authors, such as contribution of datasets, computer code, or survey instruments to subsequent scholarly products.
- NOTE: Adopted October 2011, Updated Spring 2016

Home

Service Criteria for Professorial Faculty

- **Communities**: Members of the OSU Libraries faculty serve as engaged participants in the evolution of the Libraries and Press and in the governance of the University. We are involved with shaping and strengthening the library, information science, and archives professions. We apply our expertise and skills to the needs, issues, and challenges of the University, and our local, national and global communities.
- **Expectations**: Service is an important professional value for librarians and archivists, and OSU Libraries’ service expectations for faculty reflect this. Candidates for promotion should be able to show growth in their service record over the period being evaluated. We recognize that service roles and assignments may be opportunistic. Our expectations revolve around demonstration of growth and willingness to accept opportunities as they arise, within the time allotted for service in the position description. Faculty are expected to broaden and deepen their networks of service and influence as they move through their career. They may do so by:
  - demonstrating leadership growth by holding progressively more responsible service positions (within their respective communities). Examples of progression include but are not limited to:
    - Serving on a committee (college, university or professional association) and then chairing it.
To meet this requirement, OSU Libraries and Press faculty should clearly demonstrate:

- Organizing workshops, institutes, or similar meetings for ever broader or more varied audiences at the state or national levels
- Serving in elected leadership roles of increasing responsibility within a professional organization.
- Being active in a local professional organization, and then moving to a regional or national association.

- Increasing impact on the profession through policy development, grant funded projects and collaborative efforts. Examples include:
  - Serving on a consortium task force and being a catalyst for a significant policy or operations decision.
  - Successfully pursuing grant or funding opportunities that support meaningful policy or services.
- Building a reputation for expertise within a professional community or subfield. This may include such activities as:
  - Delivering invited workshops or presentations at professional meetings, professional development events, etc.
  - Serving as a manuscript or article reviewer for professional publications.
  - Serving on journal editorial boards, or conference program committees.
  - Consulting on work relevant to professional expertise at OSU, in Oregon or nationally.
- Collaborating within the university. Some examples of this:
  - Developing relationships across the university by serving on committees and task forces external to the OSU Libraries and Press.
  - Serving as an advisor or mentor to students and student groups beyond regular teaching duties.
  - Representing the university to the local, regional, national and international audiences.

- Evaluation and Impact: To meet this requirement, OSU Libraries and Press faculty should clearly demonstrate:
  - How their service record demonstrates professional growth, as outlined above.
  - How their service record benefits the OSU Libraries & Press, the OSU community, the citizens of Oregon, and their professional community.
- Context: The University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines simply state that successful candidates have "an appropriate balance of institutional and professional service" and define this as "significant impact on one's academic unit and/or professional community as reflected in awards, involvement in significant university service (elected and appointed), leadership in professional organizations (elected or appointed)." As members of a land grant university, the OSU Libraries' faculty are committed to service to advance the library, institution, state, and profession. We work with a variety of communities and constituents depending on our professional interests, duties and expertise. Consequently, the service component of our work is variable, but the outcome is shared. We do this by actively engaging with appropriate audiences and communities and demonstrating the impact of that engagement.
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Procedures for Reviews

Levels of Review

Academic faculty candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion in rank go through multiple levels of review, including "unit" review and "college" review. Promotion and tenure resides in the academic unit, which for OSULP faculty is the library. The OSULP Promotion and Tenure Committee review is the equivalent of the "unit" review in OSU colleges. Since OSULP is not part of a college, the necessary "college" level review is done by the OSULP Senior Review Panel and the University Librarian. Additional review is provided by the supervisor along with review of teaching by unit peers, review of teaching/advising by students, and review of scholarship and service by external peers. Final decisions on promotion and tenure for professorial faculty are made by the OSU Provost and Executive Vice President, but the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's performance and recommending promotion and tenure rests with OSULP academic faculty and the University Librarian. Final decisions on promotion in rank for instructors and faculty research assistants are made by the University Librarian.

Home

Processes for Promotion & Tenure or Promotion in Rank Review

Mid-term Review

Dossier preparation by the candidate typically takes several terms preceding submission near the end of Winter term of the third year of probationary appointment. If the candidate's probationary service has been either shortened for prior service or lengthened for extenuating circumstances, the review should be done during the year which best equates with the midpoint in the faculty member's probationary service. Candidates work with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor to prepare the dossier. The format of the dossier is the same used for the final promotion and tenure process. Teaching peer reviews take place prior to the submission of the dossier. The candidate will be gathering student evaluation of teaching, consultation, advising, or mentoring data for each year leading up to dossier submission. OSULP interprets "students" to include all constituents of the candidate's teaching audience, internal or external to OSU, for whom the candidate has provided instruction, consultation, advising, or mentoring. Typically during the second year of probationary appointment (and into the beginning of the third year of probationary appointment), the candidate will collect student names and email addresses for student review of teaching/consultation/advising/mentoring letters.

By December 14

- Supervisor asks the candidate to sign Waiver of Access form indicating their decision to waive, or not waive, their right of access to student review letters. The signed document is needed to solicit student review letters. If the option to waive access is signed, this indicates that the candidate waives access to the letters (i.e. cannot see the letters) from student reviewers; the candidate always retains the right to access letters (i.e. see the letters) from the Department Head, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, and the University Librarian.
- Candidate submits names of potential student reviewers to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).
By December 15

- Supervisor begins to solicit letters from student reviewers and may also begin soliciting students for the Student Review Committee. Student reviewers are notified about the candidate’s status of access to review letters.
  - If additional student reviewer names are needed, supervisor will request them from the candidate.

By February 28

- Letters from student reviewers are due to supervisor.
- Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator completes Peer Review of Teaching Summary letter and submits it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator notifies the candidate and the supervisor that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By March 1

- The candidate’s dossier is due. The candidate submits the required dossier materials (see template on shared drive) in PDF format to their supervisor for inclusion in the final dossier. Candidate also submits PDF copies of, or links to, all publications (except monographs).
- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completion and then forwards the dossier to the appropriate Associate University Librarian, who forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant.

By March 7

- Library Administration Executive Assistant works with the supervisor and appropriate Associate University Librarian to process the dossier, ensure its completeness, and places it on the secured shared drive.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the dossier is ready for preliminary review.

By March 15

- The P&T Committee conducts a preliminary review of the dossier focusing on obvious omissions or problems and sends written recommendations to the candidate pertaining to strengthening the candidate’s statement and vita.
- Within 2-3 days of sending the written preliminary feedback to the candidate, the P&T Committee Chair, the Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator, the mentor (if applicable), and one additional P&T Committee member meet with the candidate to discuss the preliminary feedback.

By March 25

- The candidate may implement the P&T Committee’s suggestions for strengthening the dossier; the candidate resubmits the updated dossier to their supervisor.
- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completeness and forwards it to Library Administration Executive Assistant for placement on the secured shared drive.

By March 30

- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has candidate sign to acknowledge that the dossier is complete and current.

By April 1

- The Student Review Committee is finalized by the supervisor and charged to write a summary letter from the individual student evaluation letters and the teaching/advising portion of the dossier (see Student Review of Teaching appendix for additional details).

By May 1

- The supervisor receives the Student Review Committee summary letter and forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for addition to the open portion of the dossier. Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the letter has been received and that the dossier is ready for formal review.

By May 3

- The P&T Committee begins its review of the dossier. If the candidate has been granted credit toward tenure at hire, the review will generally take into consideration recent scholarship and professional service completed prior to the candidate’s appointment at OSU, insofar as that work is clearly connected to the research agenda and service portfolio the candidate has developed as a faculty member at OSULP. The P&T Committee will prepare a letter that comments on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description. The letter should include an evaluation of progress towards promotion and tenure, which includes the primary assignment, as well as recommended actions the faculty member and department should take. The review will include the candidate’s dossier, the peer review of teaching summary letter, and the student review of teaching summary letter.
- The supervisor begins their review of the dossier. If the direct supervisor is not tenured or non-tenure track, then the appropriate
Associate University Librarian will write the evaluation letter in consultation with the direct supervisor. The letter should include an evaluation of progress towards promotion and tenure, which includes the primary assignment, as well as recommended actions the faculty member and department should take. The review will include the candidate's dossier, the peer review of teaching summary letter, and the student review of teaching summary letter.

By May 21

- The P&T Committee letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier. A copy of the letter is also sent to the candidate.
- The supervisor letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The supervisor notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier. A copy of the letter is also sent to the candidate.

By May 25

- The supervisor and the appropriate Associate University Librarian meet with the candidate to discuss the supervisor's evaluation and the P&T Committee's evaluation. The P&T Committee Chair and other supervisors (if applicable) should also be invited to participate. Together they create a plan to ensure continued satisfactory progress, including specific actions, to address progress toward promotion and tenure, which includes the primary assignment.
- The candidate may add a written statement with comments, explanations, or a rebuttal to the review before signing to indicate that the document is complete.
- Dossier and all letters of evaluation are forwarded to University Librarian for review.

By May 30

- At the discretion of the University Librarian, the review is either signed and returned, or a meeting is scheduled with the faculty member, the University Librarian, the supervisor, and other appropriate administrators.

By June 7

- In the event of a meeting, the University Librarian will send written comments to the faculty member on the performance of the individual relative to P&T guidelines. The letter, including any modifications in the recommendations for the faculty member, is sent through the supervisor to the faculty member for signature and response, if desired.

By June 15

- The supervisor, in consultation with other supervisors, reviews the final results of the mid-term review with the faculty member and discusses issues or concerns raised during the review. A copy of the review and the recommendations, signed by the faculty member, the supervisor and the University, is placed in the individual's personnel file.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Indefinite Tenure Review

Dossier preparation by the candidate typically takes place during several terms preceding submission at the end of Summer term of the fifth year of probationary appointment, though teaching reviews will generally take place earlier. Candidates work with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor to prepare the dossier. The candidate will be gathering student evaluation of teaching, consultation, advising, or mentoring data for each year leading up to dossier submission. OSULP interprets “students” to be constituents, internal or external to OSU, for whom the candidate has provided instruction, consultation, advising, or mentoring. During the fifth year of probationary appointment, the candidate will collect student names and email addresses for student review of teaching/consultation/advising/mentoring letters.

By March 1

- Assistant faculty completing their fifth year of probationary appointment declare their intention to go up for promotion and tenure review by written communication to their supervisor.
- Assistant faculty completing their fifth year of probationary appointment who decide to not seek promotion and tenure review provide written communication of this decision to their supervisor and the University Librarian.

By March 5

- Supervisor forwards in writing the names of those candidates who are seeking promotion and tenure or promotion in rank to the appropriate Associate University Librarian (AUL).

By March 10

- The appropriate AUL provides written notification to the current P & T Committee Chair of faculty seeking promotion and tenure review or promotion in rank review.
By March 15

- Supervisor asks the candidate to sign Waiver of Access form indicating their decision to waive, or not waive, their right of access to external review letters and student review letters. The signed document is needed to solicit external review letters and student review letters. If the option to waive access is signed, this indicates that the candidate waives access to the letters (i.e. does not get to see the letters) from external reviewers and from student reviewers; the candidate always retains the right to access letters (i.e. see the letters) from the Department Head, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, the Senior Review Panel, the University Librarian, or the Provost and Executive Vice-President. External reviewers and student reviewers are notified about the candidate's status of access to external letters.
- (and up to July 15 if summer session is relevant) Candidate submits names of potential student reviewers to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By March 16 (and up to August 1, if summer session is relevant)

- Supervisor begins to request letters from student reviewers and may also solicit students for the Student Review Committee. Students graduating in June or August must be contacted before graduation (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By May 31

- The candidate submits their suggested list of 5-8 external reviewers to their supervisor. Potential reviewers should generally be faculty at a tenure-track institution who have achieved tenure and are at or above the professorial rank to which the candidate aspires or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. Potential external reviewers should have experience with/insight into the candidate's primary area of assignment. Potential external reviewers should not be co-authors or co-principal investigators who collaborated with the candidate in the last five years. They should also not be post-doctoral advisers, professors, or former students (unless there are extenuating circumstances, see External Reviewer appendix). The supervisor submits the candidate's list of suggested external reviewer to the appropriate Associate University Librarian.

Over the summer

- The initial dossier materials are prepared by the candidate working with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor.

By June 15

- The appropriate AUL identifies additional potential external reviewers, using the same criteria noted above.
- The appropriate AUL begins requesting 5-8 agreements to provide letters of evaluation from external reviewers (at least 3, but not more than half, should be from the candidate's suggested list).

By June 30 (OR September 1 if summer session is relevant)

- Letters from student reviewers are due to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching appendix for additional details).

By Aug 31

- Peer Review of Teaching Summary letter is completed by Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator and submitted to Library Administration Executive Assistant for the dossier. A copy is sent to the supervisor, and the candidate is notified that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By Sept 1

- Candidate's dossier submission deadline. The candidate submits the required dossier materials (see template on shared drive) in PDF format to their supervisor for inclusion in the final dossier. Candidate also submits PDF copies of, or links to, all publications (except monographs).
- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completion and then forwards the dossier to the appropriate Associate University Librarian, who forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant.

By Sept 10

- Library Administration Executive Assistant works with the supervisor and appropriate Associate University Librarian to process the dossier, ensure its completeness, and places it on the secured shared drive.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has candidate sign to acknowledge that the initial dossier is complete and current.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the dossier is ready for preliminary review.

By Sept 15

- The P&T Committee conducts a preliminary review of the dossier focusing on obvious omissions or problems and sends written recommendations to the candidate pertaining to strengthening the candidate's statement and vita.
By September 16

- Within 1 day of sending the written preliminary feedback to the candidate, the P&T Committee Chair, the Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator, the mentor (if applicable), and one additional P&T Committee member meet with the candidate to discuss the preliminary feedback.

By September 20

- The candidate may implement the P&T Committee's suggestions for strengthening the dossier; the candidate resubmits the updated dossier to their supervisor.
- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completeness and forwards it to Library Administration Executive Assistant to create a PDF of all dossier materials including publications.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has the candidate sign that they have reviewed the open part of their dossier and that it is current and complete. All original print materials pertaining to the dossier are filed and kept in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office.
  - NOTE: Once the dossier is certified, the only materials to be added subsequently will be the letters of committee and Administration review, and in some cases the candidate's response to an evaluation as described below. If manuscripts are accepted for publication after the dossier is certified, it is the faculty member's responsibility to inform his or her supervisor. That information will then be considered in the review.

By September 25

- The appropriate Associate University Librarian solicits external letters of evaluation.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant assists in the preparation and sending of packets to these reviewers. The packets should include a table of contents, the candidate's vita, position description(s), candidate statement, and copies of (or links to) his/her publications. The web address for the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines should be made available to external reviewers, as should the Libraries' specific criteria.

By October 1

- The Student Review Committee is finalized by the supervisor and charged to write a summary letter from the individual student evaluation letters (see Student Review of Teaching appendix for additional details).

By November 15

- (or as letters are received) The AUL posts the external reviewers' letters to the restricted share drive. When all letters are received, the P&T Committee Chair is notified.
- The supervisor receives the Student Review Committee summary letter and forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for addition to the open portion of the dossier by the posting it on the restricted share drive. Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the letter has been received.

By November 16

- The P&T Committee begins its review of the dossier and all signed letters of input, excluding the supervisor's letter. If the candidate has been granted credit toward tenure at hire, the review will generally take into consideration recent scholarship and professional service completed prior to the candidate's appointment at OSU, insofar as that work is clearly connected to the research agenda and service portfolio the candidate has developed as a faculty member at OSULP. The P&T Committee will prepare a letter that evaluates the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. The letter should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. The review will include the candidate's dossier, the peer review of teaching summary letter, the student review of teaching summary letter, and the six external review letters. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The voting members of the P&T Committee, those members at or above the professorial rank the candidate is seeking to attain, shall vote to recommend promotion and tenure and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter. The letter must include a description of the process used to constitute the committee.
  - The supervisor (or, in case the supervisor is not professorial faculty, the appropriate AUL) begins their review of the dossier and all signed letters of input. The supervisor will also consult the candidate's personnel file maintained in the unit. The letter will evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor, letters from each supervisor should be included. These letters should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The supervisor may include comments on any information in the candidate's file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments. If the individual serving in the supervisor role is on a 1040 assignment, they can write the supervisor's letter of evaluation.

By November 30

- The supervisor submits their evaluative letter, addressed to the University Librarian, to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier.
By December 10

- The P&T Committee Chair submits the Committee's evaluation and recommendation letter, addressed to the University Librarian, to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair also notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By five working days after Dec 10

- The supervisor meets with the candidate to discuss the outcome of the P&T Committee review and the supervisor's review.
- The candidate may request a meeting with the P&T Committee if clarification is needed.
- The candidate may add a written statement regarding the reviews.
- The candidate reviews their file, with the exception of waived letters, and signs the statement that they reviewed the open portion of their dossier. If the candidate did not sign the letter of waiver, they may also review the external letters.

By December 16

- The dossier, along with the P&T Committee and supervisor letters and any candidate comments, are forwarded to the Senior Review Panel for review. The Senior Review Panel's letter should include i) an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier, (ii) an opinion as to whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation (P&T Committee and supervisor) fairly and uniformly assess the merits of the candidate’s performance as documented in the dossier, and (iii) an assessment of the consistency of standards applied to all candidates. In addition, the committee should check that each dossier has been properly prepared. The letter must include a description of the process used to constitute the committee. The Panel shall vote to recommend promotion and indefinite tenure, and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter.
- The candidate will receive a digital copy of the complete dossier forwarded to the Senior Review Panel, with the exception of material covered in the waiver of access.

By Jan 7

- The Senior Review Panel Chair submits the Panel's evaluation and recommendation letter, addressed to the University Librarian, to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair also notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By three working days after Jan 7

- The candidate signs an acknowledgement that they have read the Senior Review Panel letter.
- The candidate may add written comments to the file.

By Jan 10

- The dossier, along with any candidate comments, is forwarded to the University Librarian.

By Jan 25

- The University Librarian writes a letter that provides an assessment of the candidate and recommendation for promotion and indefinite tenure based upon the dossier, including all signed letters of input and evaluation. The University Librarian notifies the candidate that this letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By three working days after Jan 25

- The candidate reviews the open portion of the dossier.
- The candidate may sign the acknowledgement that this is their final review of the open portion of the dossier or may request, in writing, a meeting with the University Librarian within the three days indicated above. (i.e. January 25 – 28)
  - If a meeting has been requested by the candidate, the University Librarian will meet with the candidate within three working days following the written request (i.e. latest date for meeting January 31). The candidate may present any information or evidence they believe may be germane to the evaluation and recommendation of the University Librarian.
  - The University Librarian may revise the letter of evaluation within three working days of the date of the meeting (i.e. latest date Feb. 3)
- The candidate may prepare a written statement to be included in the dossier supporting or refuting anything in the open portion of the dossier.
- Note that during this period, the original documents comprising the dossier remain in the Library Administration Office.

By Feb 7

- If applicable, the University Librarian's revised letter is added to the open portion of the dossier.
- The candidate is notified if the University Librarian's letter was revised and has the opportunity to review it.
- The candidate may prepare a written statement to be included in the dossier.
• If the candidate did not previously sign an acknowledgement that they reviewed the open portion of the final dossier, this is done now.

By Feb 8 (approximately):*

• "NOTE: exact deadline posted on [OSU P&T website](#)
• The University Librarian submits the completed dossier to the Office of Faculty Affairs to be reviewed by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition, a copy of the completed dossier is placed in the Libraries’ personnel files.
• When all necessary reviews and discussions have been completed, the Provost and Executive Vice President will make the final decision on promotion and indefinite tenure.

Spring

• The University Librarian is notified of the outcome of the University level review and informs the candidate of the result. They may also make a congratulatory announcement to the staff when the outcome is successful.

By June 30

• The Candidate receives written notification of the review outcome.

In the case of a negative decision, the basis for the denial will be stated, along with information on the right to appeal. Faculty not approved for promotion and tenure by the Provost and Executive Vice President may appeal to the President within two weeks of receipt of the letter announcing the decision. Extenuating circumstances, procedural irregularities that were not considered by the Provost and Executive Vice President, and factual errors in the evaluations are grounds for appeal. When appealing, the candidate should write a letter to the President stating which of the above criteria for appeal applies, and stating the facts that support the appeal. No other supporting letters will be considered. The President has the right to request additional information.

After the University level review is finished, the complete dossier is retained temporarily in the Office of Faculty Affairs. The dossier is subsequently returned to the University Librarian, typically at the start of the next academic year. After confidential letters have been removed, the dossier is retained as part of the faculty member’s personnel file.

Promotion to Full Professor:

Dossier preparation by the candidate typically takes place during Spring and Summer preceding submission, though teaching reviews will generally take place earlier. Candidates work with their supervisor to prepare the dossier. The candidate will be gathering student evaluation of teaching, consultation, advising, or mentoring data for each year leading up to dossier submission. OSULP interprets “students” to be constituents, internal or external to OSU, for whom the candidate has provided instruction, consultation, advising, or mentoring. During the year preceding dossier submission, the candidate will collect student names and email addresses for student review of teaching/consultation/advising/mentoring letters.

By March 1

• Associate faculty, who have completed at least 5 years of tenured service, declare their intention to go up for promotion review by written communication to their supervisor.

By March 5

• Supervisor forwards in writing the name of the candidate who is seeking promotion to the University Librarian (UL) and appropriate Associate University Librarian (AUL).

By March 10

• The appropriate AUL or UL provides written notification to the current P & T Committee Chair of faculty seeking promotion to full professor. If there are not enough librarians at full professor rank to form a review committee, the University Librarian works with the OSU Libraries’ P&T Chair and senior review panel to identify OSU faculty at full professor rank to form a Special P&T Committee.

By March 15

• Supervisor asks the candidate to sign Waiver of Access form indicating their decision to waive, or not waive, their right of access to evaluation materials (needed to solicit student letters and external review letters). The waiver, if signed, indicates that the candidate waives access to the letters (i.e. cannot see the letters) from external reviewers; it does not apply to letters from the Department Head, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, the Special Promotion & Tenure Committee, the Senior Review Panel, the University Librarian, or the Provost and Executive Vice-President. External reviewers and student reviewers are notified about the candidate’s status of access to external letters.

• (and up to July 15 if summer session is relevant) Candidate submits names of potential student reviewers to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By March 16 (and up to August 1, if summer session is relevant)
• Supervisor begins to request letters from student reviewers and may also solicit students for the Student Review Committee. Students graduating in June or August must be contacted before graduation (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By May 31
• The candidate submits their suggested list of six external reviewers to their supervisor. Potential reviewers should generally be faculty at a tenure-track institution who have achieved tenure and are at the professorial rank to which the candidate aspires or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. Potential external reviewers should have experience with/insight into the candidate’s primary area of assignment. Only in rare cases should potential external reviewers be co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students.
• The supervisor submits the candidate’s list of suggested external reviewer to the appropriate AUL or UL.

Over the summer
• The initial dossier materials are prepared by the candidate.

By June 15
• The appropriate AUL or UL identifies additional potential external reviewers, using the same criteria noted above.
• The appropriate AUL or UL begins requesting 5-8 agreements to provide letters of evaluation from external reviewers. At least 3, but not more than half, should be from the candidate’s suggested list.

By June 30 (OR September 1 if summer session is relevant)
• Letters from student reviewers are due to supervisor

By Aug 31
• Peer Review of Teaching Summary letter is completed by Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator and submitted to Library Administration Executive Assistant for the dossier. A copy is sent to the supervisor, and the candidate is notified that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By Sept 1
• The candidate submits the required dossier materials (see template on shared drive) in PDF format to their supervisor for inclusion in the final dossier. Candidate also submits PDF copies of, or links to, all publications (except monographs).
• The supervisor reviews the dossier for completion and then forwards the dossier to the appropriate AUL or UL who forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant.

By Sept 10
• Library Administration Executive Assistant works with the supervisor and appropriate Associate University Librarian or University Librarian to process the dossier, ensure its completeness, and places it on the secured shared drive.
• The Library Administration Executive Assistant has the candidate sign to acknowledge that the initial dossier is complete and current.
• The Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the Special P&T Committee Chair that the dossier is ready for preliminary review.

By Sept 15
• The Special P&T Committee conducts a preliminary review of the dossier focusing on obvious omissions or problems and sends written recommendations to the candidate pertaining to strengthening the candidate’s statement and vita.

By September 16
• [Optional?] the Special P&T Committee may meet with the candidate to discuss the preliminary feedback.

By September 20
• The candidate may implement the Special P&T Committee’s suggestions for strengthening the dossier; the candidate resubmits the updated dossier to their supervisor.
• The supervisor reviews the dossier for completeness and forwards it to Library Administration Executive Assistant to create a PDF of all dossier materials including publications.
• The Library Administration Executive Assistant has the candidate sign that they have reviewed the open part of their dossier and that it is current and complete. All original print materials pertaining to the dossier are filed and kept in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office
• NOTE: Once the dossier is certified, the only materials to be added subsequently will be the letters of committee and Administration review, and in some cases the candidate’s response to an evaluation as described below. If manuscripts are accepted for publication
after the dossier is certified, it is the faculty member's responsibility to inform his or her supervisor. That information will then be considered in the review.

**By September 25**

- The appropriate Associate University Librarian or University Librarian solicits external letters of evaluation.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant assists in the preparation and sending of packets to these reviewers. The packets should include a table of contents, the candidate's vita, position description(s), candidate statement, and copies of (or links to) his/her publications. The web address for the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines should be made available to external reviewers, as should the Libraries' specific criteria.

**By October 1**

- The Student Review Committee is finalized by the supervisor and charged to write a summary letter from the individual student evaluation letters (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

**By November 15**

- *(or as letters are received)* The AUL or UL posts the external reviewers’ letters to the restricted share drive. When all letters are received, the Special P&T Committee Chair is notified.
- The supervisor receives the Student Review Committee summary letter and forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for addition to the open portion of the dossier by the posting it on the restricted share drive. Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the Special P&T Committee Chair that the letter has been received.

**By November 16**

- The Special P&T Committee begins its review of the dossier and all signed letters of input, excluding the supervisor's letter. The Special P&T Committee may request the supervisor letter in cases where context about the candidate's work is needed. The Special P&T Committee will prepare a letter that evaluates the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s performance. The letter should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. The review will include the candidate's dossier, the peer review of teaching summary letter, the student review of teaching summary letter, and the six external review letters. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The Special P&T Committee shall vote to recommend promotion and tenure and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter. The letter must include a description of the process that was used to constitute the committee.
- The supervisor (or, in case the supervisor is not professorial faculty, the appropriate AUL) begins their review of the dossier and all signed letters of input. The supervisor will also consult the candidate's personnel file maintained in the unit. The letter will evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor, letters from each supervisor should be included. These letters should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The supervisor may include comments on any information in the candidate's file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments. If the individual serving in the supervisor role is on a 1040 assignment, they can write the supervisor's letter of evaluation.

**By November 30**

- The supervisor submits their evaluative letter, addressed to the University Librarian, to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier.

**By December 10**

- The Special P&T Committee Chair submits the Committee's evaluation and recommendation letter, addressed to the University Librarian, to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair also notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.
- The candidate will receive a digital copy of the complete dossier forwarded to the University Librarian, with the exception of material covered in the waiver of access.

**By five working days after Dec 10**

- The supervisor meets with the candidate to discuss the outcome of the Special P&T Committee review and the supervisor's review.
- The candidate may request a meeting with the Special P&T Committee if clarification is needed.
- The candidate may add a written statement regarding the reviews.
- The candidate reviews their file, with the exception of waived letters, and signs the statement that they reviewed read the open portion of their dossier. If the candidate did not sign the letter of waiver, they may also review the external letters.
By Jan 10

- The dossier, along with any candidate comments, is forwarded to the University Librarian.

By Jan 25

- The University Librarian writes a letter that provides an assessment of the candidate and recommendation for promotion and indefinite tenure based upon the dossier, including all signed letters of input and evaluation. The University Librarian notifies the candidate that this letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By three working days after Jan 25

- The candidate reviews the open portion of the dossier.
- The candidate may sign the acknowledgement that this is their final review of the open portion of the dossier or may request, in writing, a meeting with the University Librarian within the three days indicated above. (i.e. January 25 – 28).
  - If a meeting has been requested by the candidate, the University Librarian will meet with the candidate within three working days following the written request (i.e. latest date for meeting January 31). The candidate may present any information or evidence they believe may be germane to the evaluation and recommendation of the University Librarian.
  - The University Librarian may revise the letter of evaluation within three working days of the date of the meeting (i.e. latest date Feb. 3)
- The candidate may prepare a written statement to be included in the dossier supporting or refuting anything in the open portion of the dossier.
- Note that during this period, the original documents comprising the dossier remain in the Library Administration Office.

By Feb 7

- If applicable, the University Librarian's revised letter is added to the open portion of the dossier.
- The candidate is notified if the University Librarian's letter was revised and has the opportunity to review it.
- The candidate may prepare a written statement to be included in the dossier.
- If the candidate did not previously sign an acknowledgement that they reviewed the open portion of the final dossier, this is done now.
- Following this, Library Administration Executive Assistant has 2-3 days to prepare the completed dossier to be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

By Feb 8 (approximately)*

- The University Librarian submits the completed dossier to the Office of Faculty Affairs to be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition, a copy of the completed dossier is placed in the Libraries' personnel files.
- When all necessary reviews and discussions have been completed, the Provost and Executive Vice President will make the final decision on promotion and indefinite tenure.

Spring

- The University Librarian is notified of the outcome of the University level review and informs the candidate of the result. They may also make a congratulatory announcement to the staff when the outcome is successful.

By June 30

- The Candidate receives written notification of the review outcome.

In the case of a negative decision, the basis for the denial will be stated, along with information on the right to appeal. Faculty not approved for promotion or tenure by the Provost and Executive Vice President may appeal to the President within two weeks of receipt of the letter announcing the decision. Exculating circumstances, procedural irregularities that were not considered by the Provost and Executive Vice President, and factual errors in the evaluations are grounds for appeal. When appealing, the candidate should write a letter to the President stating which of the above criteria for appeal applies, and stating the facts that support the appeal. No other supporting letters will be considered. The President has the right to request additional information.

After the University level review is finished, the complete dossier is retained temporarily in the Office of Faculty Affairs. The dossier is subsequently returned to the University Librarian, typically at the start of the next academic year. After confidential letters have been removed, the dossier is retained as part of the faculty member's personnel file.

Home

Post-tenure Review
A post-tenure review (PTR) is to be performed if (i) requested by a faculty member (ii) requested by the unit head or supervisor after one negative review or (iii) a faculty member receives two consecutive negative periodic reviews of faculty (PROF). A negative PROF is defined as receiving unsatisfactory assessment of one or more areas identified in the position description (e.g., teaching, scholarship, service, outreach). A negative PROF must always be followed by either a PTR in the same or following year, or a PROF in the following year to determine if sufficient progress has been made to overcome the deficiencies identified in the first PROF.

Week 
- The appropriate Associate University Librarian or the appropriate supervisor will discuss the post-tenure review process with the faculty member receiving a second negative PROF.

Week 
- Supervisors forward in writing the names of those faculty members who will undergo post-tenure review to the appropriate Associate University Librarian

Week 
- The appropriate Associate University Librarian provides written notification to the Libraries Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair of faculty members to be considered.

Week 
- Peer Review Coordinator arranges for peer review of instruction (where relevant) during Fall and Winter term (up to submission of dossier).

Weeks _ - _
- The faculty member prepares initial dossier materials working with a mentor (if desired) and his/her direct supervisor.
- **Candidate’s Statement:** The faculty member’s Candidate’s Statement should discuss significant accomplishments in each of the three areas (primary assignment, scholarship, and service) that benefited the faculty member and the library since the first negative PROF. The statement should also include a description of the faculty member’s future professional goals.
- **External Reviewers:** If the faculty member or unit head request an external review, the faculty member identifies a suggested list of four to six external reviewers, outside of the library, but at OSU, as a part of this process.

Week __
- The PRT Committee is formed and a chair elected.

Week __
- Peer review of teaching summary letter completed and submitted to supervisor; added to candidate/faculty member dossier.

Week __
- Faculty member submits required dossier materials to their supervisor for inclusion in the final dossier. The faculty member is encouraged to also submit the complete dossier in electronic format – preferably PDF.
- The Supervisor submits a copy of the dossier to the appropriate Associate University Librarian.
- **If external review is sought** the supervisor submits the candidate’s list of suggested external reviewers

(Week __)
- **If external review is sought,** the appropriate Associate University Librarian identifies additional potential external reviewers.

Week __
- The PTR Committee reviews the post-tenure dossier for obvious omissions or problems.

Week __
- The PTR Committee meets with the faculty member to provide written recommendations and to discuss strengthening the dossier.

Week __
- The faculty member may implement the PTR Committee’s suggestions for strengthening the dossier and resubmits the updated dossier to the Committee.
Week __

- The Chair gives an original copy of the completed dossier to the Libraries' Administration Office staff member who creates a PDF of all materials (including publications) if the candidate did not submit a PDF in addition to the printed original. All original materials are kept in a master file in the Library Administration Office.

Week __

- Prior to the dossier receiving its first formal review, the candidate should sign a statement that he or she has reviewed the open part of the dossier and that it is complete and current.

Note: timelines diverge from this point on if external review is sought. External review extensions are given in parentheses.

(Week __)

- If external review is requested, the appropriate Associate University Librarian solicits external letters of evaluation.

The AUL will request 5-8 letters of evaluation from national leaders in the field (at least 3 should be from the faculty members suggested list). Only in rare cases should letters be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors, or former students. Letters should generally be from faculty at a tenure-track institution who have achieved tenure and are at or above the professorial level of the faculty member under review individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field.

The Libraries' Administration Office staff assists in the preparation and sending of packets to these reviewers. The packets should include a copy of the candidate's vita, position description(s), candidate statement, peer review of instruction summary letter and copies of (or links to) his/her publications. The Libraries' guidelines are not an official document and should not be sent to external reviewers; however, the web address for the University's Guidelines for Post-tenure Review of Faculty should be made available to external reviewers.

Week __ (or as letters are received)

- The Associate University Librarian submits the outside letters to the PTR Committee. Letters from external reviewers should be available to the Committee prior to initiating the final review of the dossier.

Week __ (add 3 weeks if external review sought))

- The PTR Committee reviews the dossier, peer review of teaching (and all letters of input from external review) and writes a report, addressed to the unit head or supervisor.

References to external reviewers should be by a number assigned to the reviewer and not by name. The Committee's letter of evaluation and summary shall review the candidate's performance in his/her professional assignment, scholarly accomplishments, and service. The Committee Chair notifies the faculty member that the Committee letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

This report will be included in the personnel file of the faculty being reviewed. If the PTR is initiated by a negative PROF, the report will address both the positive and the negative aspects of the PROF and assess their validity. Letters must include a description of the process that was used to constitute the committee.

Week __ (add 3 weeks if external review sought)

- Supervisor meets with faculty member to discuss the outcome
- Faculty member acknowledges he/she has read the report

Week __ (add three weeks if external review sought)

- If the PTR Committee confirms unsatisfactory performance in any aspect of the position description, a plan for improvement shall be developed jointly by the faculty being reviewed and the unit head in consultation with the PTR committee.

The plan should provide detailed actions, sufficient resources as are available and measurable goals to achieve satisfactory performance within a maximum of three years. Such resources might include support for scholarly professional activities (travel, time released from teaching, equipment, clerical or technical support, graduate assistants, laboratory or other workspace, etc.) or a program for the improvement of teaching.

- The candidate may add a written statement regarding the review.

Home

Promotion to Senior Instructor I/II Review

Dossier preparation typically takes place during Summer and Fall terms preceding submission, though teaching reviews will generally take place earlier. Candidates work with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor to prepare the dossier. The candidate will be gathering student evaluation of teaching, consultation, advising, or mentoring data for each year leading up to dossier submission. OSULP interprets "students" to be constituents, internal or external to OSU, for whom the candidate has provided instruction, consultation, advising, or mentoring. During the year preceding submission, the candidate will collect student names and email addresses for student review of
teaching/consultation/advising/mentoring letters.

By March 1
- (Senior I) Instructors declare their intention to go up for promotion review by written communication to their supervisor.

By March 5
- Supervisor forwards in writing the names of those candidates who are seeking promotion in rank review to the Associate University Librarian (AUL) for Learning Services.

By March 10
- The AUL for Learning Services provides written notification to the current P & T Committee Chair of faculty seeking promotion in rank review.

By March 15
- Supervisor asks the candidate to sign Waiver of Access form indicating their decision to waive, or not waive, their right of access to external review letters and student review letters. If the option to waive access is signed, this indicates that the candidate waives access to the letters (i.e. see the letters) from external reviewers and from student reviewers; the candidate always retains the right to access letters from the Department Head, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, the Senior Review Panel, and the University Librarian. External reviewers and student reviewers are notified about the candidate's status of access to external letters.
- (and up to October 30 if Fall term is relevant) Candidate submits names of potential student reviewers to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By March 16
- Supervisor begins to solicit letters from student reviewers and may also begin soliciting students for the Student Review Committee. Students graduating in June/Summer or December must be contacted before graduation (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By May 31
- The candidate submits their suggested list of four external reviewers to their supervisor. Potential reviewers, in general, should be individuals who hold a rank at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered, or an experience level equivalent to such a rank. Ability to objectively evaluate is the driver in selecting evaluators. Evaluators may be internal or external to OSU. Internal evaluators may be individuals who have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier.
- The supervisor submits the candidate's list of suggested external reviewers to the appropriate AUL for Learning Services.

Over the summer and fall
- The initial dossier materials are prepared by the candidate working with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor.

By June 15
- The AUL for Learning Services identifies additional potential external reviewers, using the same criteria noted above. Additional detail must be provided if an evaluator is not of a rank at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered, if they have been suggested based on experience level equivalency, and/or if they are internal to OSU and have worked with the candidate.
- The AUL for Learning Services begins requesting 4 agreements to provide letters of evaluation from external reviewers (2 should be from the candidate's suggested list).

By June 30
- Letters from student reviewers are due to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details)

By October 1
- The supervisor forms a student review committee, whose task is to write a letter summarizing the letters from student reviewers (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details)

By December 31
- Peer Review of Teaching Summary letter is completed by Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator and submitted to Library Administration Executive Assistant for the dossier. A copy is sent to the supervisor, and the candidate is notified that the letter has been added to the
The open portion of the dossier.

- Candidate's dossier submission deadline. The candidate submits the required dossier materials (see template on shared drive) in PDF format to their supervisor for inclusion in the final dossier. Candidate also submits PDF copies of, or links to, all publications (if applicable).

By January 2

- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completion and then forwards the dossier to the appropriate AUL for Learning Services and the Library Administration Executive Assistant for processing.

By January 5

- Library Administration Executive Assistant works with the supervisor and appropriate AUL for Learning Services to process the dossier and place it on the secured shared drive.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has candidate sign to acknowledge that the initial dossier is complete and current.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the dossier is ready for preliminary review.

By January 15

- The P&T Committee conducts a preliminary review of the dossier focusing on obvious omissions or problems and provides written recommendations to the candidate (the supervisor is copied) pertaining to strengthening the candidate's statement and vita.

By January 17

- The P&T Committee Chair, the Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator, the mentor (if applicable), and one additional P&T Committee member meet with the candidate to discuss the preliminary feedback.

By January 22

- The candidate may implement the P&T Committee's suggestions for strengthening the dossier; the candidate resubmits the updated dossier to their supervisor.
- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completeness and forwards it to Library Administration Executive Assistant for final dossier processing.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has the candidate sign that they have reviewed the open part of their dossier and that it is current and complete. All original print materials pertaining to the dossier are filed and kept in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office.
- NOTE: Once the dossier is certified, the only materials to be added subsequently will be the letters of committee and Administration review, and in some cases the candidate's response to an evaluation as described below. If manuscripts are accepted for publication after the dossier is certified, it is the faculty member's responsibility to inform his or her supervisor. That information will then be considered in the review.

By January 27

- The appropriate AUL solicits external letters of evaluation.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant assists in the preparation and sending of packets to these reviewers. The packets should include a table of contents, the candidate's vita, position description(s), candidate statement, and copies of (or links to) his/her publications (if applicable). The web address for the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines should be made available to external reviewers, as should the Libraries' specific criteria.
- The Student Review Committee is finalized by the supervisor and charged to write a summary letter from the individual student evaluation letters (see Student Review of Teaching appendix for additional details).

By February 28

- The supervisor receives the Student Review Committee summary letter and forwards it to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for addition to the open portion of the dossier. Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the letter has been received.
- (or as letters are received) The Library Administration Executive Assistant posts the external reviewers' letters to the restricted share drive. When all letters are received, the P&T Committee Chair and the supervisor is notified.

By March 1

- The P&T Committee begins its review of the dossier and all signed letters of input. The P&T Committee will prepare a letter evaluates the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. The letter should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. The review will include the candidate's dossier, the peer review of teaching summary letter, the student review of teaching summary letter, and the four external review letters. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The voting members of the P&T Committee, those members at or above the professorial rank the
candidate is seeking to attain, shall vote to recommend promotion and tenure and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter. The letter must include a description of the process used to constitute the committee.

- The supervisor begins their review of the dossier and all signed letters of input. The supervisor will also consult the candidate’s personnel file maintained in the unit. The supervisor letter will evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor, letters from each supervisor should be included. The supervisor letter(s) should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The supervisor may include comments on any information in the candidate's file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments.

By March 21

- The P&T Committee letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.
- The supervisor letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The supervisor notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By March 28

- The supervisor meets with the candidate to discuss the outcome of the P&T Committee's review and the supervisor's review.
- The candidate may request a meeting with the P&T Committee if clarification is needed.
- The candidate may add a written statement regarding the reviews.
- The candidate reviews the open portion of the dossier, in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office; if the candidate did not sign the waiver statement, they may also review the external letters. The candidate signs the statement that they reviewed the allowed section of their dossier.

By March 29

- The dossier and any candidate comments are forwarded to the Senior Review Panel for review. The Senior Review Panel's letter should include: (i) an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier, (ii) an opinion as to whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation (P&T Committee and supervisor) fairly and uniformly assess the merits of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier, and (iii) an assessment of the consistency of standards applied to all candidates. In addition, the committee should check that each dossier has been properly prepared. The letter must include a description of the process used to constitute the committee. The Panel shall vote to recommend promotion and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter.
- The candidate will receive a digital copy of the complete dossier forwarded to the Senior Review Panel, with the exception of material covered in the waiver of access.

By April 15

- The Senior Review Panel letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By April 22

- The candidate reviews the open portion of the dossier, in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office. The candidate signs the statement that they reviewed the allowed section of their dossier.
- The candidate may add a written statement regarding the Senior Review Panel review.
- The dossier is forwarded to the UL for promotion in rank decision

By May 1

- University Librarian makes the promotion in rank decision and communicates it to the Executive Assistant to the Sr. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Final decisions for promotions for Instructors will end with the University Librarian.
- The candidate receives written notification of the promotion in rank decision.
- The University Librarian may announce successful promotions to all library staff.

Promotion to Senior Faculty Research Assistant I/II Review

Dossier preparation typically takes place during Summer and Fall terms preceding submission (though teaching reviews, if applicable, will generally take place earlier). The candidate work with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor to prepare the dossier. The candidate will be gathering, if applicable, student evaluation of teaching, consultation, advising, or mentoring data for each year leading up to dossier submission. OSULP interprets "students" to be constituents, internal or external to OSU, for whom the candidate has provided instruction, consultation, advising, or mentoring. During the year preceding submission, the candidate will collect student names and email addresses for student review of
teaching/consultation/advising/mentoring letters.

By March 1

- (Senior I) Faculty Research Assistants declare their intention to go up for promotion review by written communication to their supervisor.

By March 5

- Supervisor forwards in writing the names of those candidates who are seeking promotion and tenure or promotion in rank to the Associate University Librarian (AUL) for Research and Scholarly Communication.

By March 10

- The AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication provides written notification to the current P & T Committee Chair of faculty seeking promotion in rank review.

By March 15

- Supervisor asks the candidate to sign Waiver of Access form indicating their decision to waive, or not waive, their right of access to external review letters and student review letters. The signed document is needed to solicit external review letters and student review letters. If the option to waive access is signed, this indicates that the candidate waives access to the letters from external reviewers and from student reviewers; he candidate always retains the right to access letters from the Department Head, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, the Senior Review Panel, and the University Librarian. External reviewers and optional student reviewers are notified about the candidate’s status of access to external letters and from student reviewers.
  - (and up to October 30 if Fall term is relevant) If Teaching/Advising/Mentoring is called out in Position Description, candidates submits names for optional student reviewers to supervisor (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By March 16 (and up to November 15, if Fall term is relevant)

- Supervisor begins to solicit optional letters from student reviewers. Students graduating in June/Summer or December must be contacted before graduation (see Student Review of Teaching section for additional details).

By May 31

- The candidate submits their suggested list of four external reviewers to their supervisor. Potential reviewers, in general, should be individuals who hold a rank at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered, or an experience level equivalent to such a rank. Ability to objectively evaluate is the driver in selecting evaluators. Evaluators may be internal or external to OSU. Internal evaluators may be individuals who have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier.
- The supervisor submits the candidate's list of suggested external reviewers to the AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication.

Over the summer and fall

- The initial dossier materials are prepared by the candidate working with a mentor (if applicable) and their supervisor.

By June 15

- The AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication identifies additional potential external reviewers, using the same criteria noted above. Additional detail must be provided if an evaluator is not of a rank at or above the level for which the candidate is being considered, if they have been suggested based on experience level equivalency, and/or if they are internal to OSU and have worked with the candidate.
- The AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication begins requesting 4 agreements to provide letters of evaluation from external reviewers (2 should be from the candidate's suggested list).

By June 30 (OR December 30 if fall term is relevant)

- Letters from student reviewers are due to supervisor.
- Letters are submitted to Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier in Section X: Other Letters and Materials

By December 31

- (if Teaching is called out in Position Description) Peer Review of Teaching Summary letter is completed by Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator, submitted to Library Administration Executive Assistant for the dossier and sent to the supervisor.
- Candidate's dossier submission deadline. The candidate submits the required dossier materials (see template on shared drive) in PDF format to their supervisor for inclusion in the final dossier. Candidate also submits PDF copies of, or links to, all publications (if applicable).

By January 2
The supervisor reviews the dossier for completion and then forwards the dossier to the AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication and the Library Administration Executive Assistant for processing.

By January 5
- Library Administration Executive Assistant works with the supervisor and AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication to process the dossier and place it on the secured shared drive.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has candidate sign to acknowledge that the initial dossier is complete and current.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant notifies the P&T Committee Chair that the dossier is ready for preliminary review.

By January 15
- The P&T Committee conducts a preliminary review of the dossier focusing on obvious omissions or problems and provides written recommendations to the candidate (the supervisor is copied) pertaining to strengthening the candidate's statement and vita.

By January 17
- The P&T Committee Chair, the Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator, the mentor (if applicable), and one additional P&T Committee member meet with the candidate to discuss the preliminary feedback.

By January 22
- The candidate may implement the P&T Committee's suggestions for strengthening the dossier; the candidate resubmits the updated dossier to their supervisor.
- The supervisor reviews the dossier for completeness and forwards it to Library Administration Executive Assistant for final dossier processing.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant has the candidate sign that they have reviewed the open part of their dossier and that it is current and complete. All original print materials pertaining to the dossier are filed and kept in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office.
  - NOTE: Once the dossier is certified, the only materials to be added subsequently will be the letters of committee and Administration review, and in some cases the candidate's response to an evaluation as described in the following section. If manuscripts are accepted for publication after the dossier is certified, it is the faculty member's responsibility to inform his or her supervisor. That information will then be considered in the review.

By January 27
- The AUL for Research and Scholarly Communication solicits external letters of evaluation.
- The Library Administration Executive Assistant assists in the preparation and sending of packets to these reviewers. The packets should include a table of contents, the candidate's vita, position description(s), candidate statement, and copies of (or links to) his/her publications (if applicable). The web address for the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines should be made available to external reviewers, as should the Libraries' specific criteria.

By February 28
- (or as letters are received) The Library Administration Executive Assistant posts the external reviewers' letters to the restricted share drive. When all letters are received, the P&T Committee Chair and the supervisor is notified.

By March 1
- The P&T Committee begins its review of the dossier and all signed letters of input, excluding the supervisor's letter. The P&T Committee will prepare a letter that evaluates the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. The letter should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. The review will include the candidate's dossier, the peer review of teaching summary letter (if applicable), the individual student review of teaching/mentoring letters, and the four external review letters. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The voting members of the P&T Committee, those members at or above the professorial rank the candidate is seeking to attain, shall vote to recommend promotion and tenure and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter. The letter must include a description of the process used to constitute the committee.
- The supervisor begins their review of the dossier and all signed letters of input. The supervisor will also consult the candidate's personnel file maintained in the unit. The supervisor letter will evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance. If the candidate reports to, or works closely with, more than one supervisor, letters from each supervisor should be included. The supervisor letter(s) should comment on key points in the dossier and address all responsibilities identified in the position description, and provide a fair and balanced summary of all peer and external solicited evaluations. External evaluators should be identified only by a coded key when their comments are cited from these confidential letters. The supervisor may include comments on any information in the candidate's file that is relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties, collegiality, professional integrity, or willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments.
By March 21

- The P&T Committee letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.
- The supervisor letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The supervisor notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By March 28

? The supervisor meets with the candidate to discuss the outcome of the P&T Committee's review and the supervisor's review.
? The candidate may request a meeting with the P&T Committee if clarification is needed.
? The candidate may add a written statement regarding the reviews.

- The candidate reviews the open portion of the dossier, in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office; if the candidate did not sign the waiver statement, they may also review the external letters. The candidate signs the statement that they reviewed the allowed section of their dossier.

By March 29

- The dossier and any candidate comments are forwarded to the Senior Review Panel for review. The Senior Review Panel's letter should include: (i) an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier, (ii) an opinion as to whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation (P&T Committee and supervisor) fairly and uniformly assess the merits of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier, and (iii) an assessment of the consistency of standards applied to all candidates. In addition, the committee should check that each dossier has been properly prepared. The letter must include a description of the process used to constitute the committee. The Panel shall vote to recommend promotion and that recommendation shall be documented in the letter.
- The candidate will receive a digital copy of the complete dossier forwarded to the Senior Review Panel, with the exception of material covered in the waiver of access.

By April 15

- The Senior Review Panel letter, addressed to the University Librarian, is due to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the dossier. The Chair notifies the candidate that the letter has been added to the open portion of the dossier.

By April 22

- The candidate reviews the open portion of the dossier, in the Library Administration Executive Assistant's office. The candidate signs the statement that they reviewed the allowed section of their dossier.
- The candidate may add a written statement regarding the Senior Review Panel review.
- The dossier is forwarded to the UL for promotion in rank decision

By May 1

- University Librarian makes the promotion in rank decision and communicates it to the Executive Assistant to the Sr. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Final decisions for promotions for Faculty Research Assistants will end with the University Librarian.
- The candidate receives written notification of the promotion in rank decision.
- The University Librarian may announce successful promotions to all library staff.
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Process for Peer Review of Teaching

As outlined in this document, Peer Review of Teaching refers specifically to the evaluation of teaching for the tenure and/or promotion process. The [OSU Faculty Handbook](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines) states, "When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Faculty with responsibilities in instruction can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance in the teaching role."

Library faculty are also encouraged to use a variety of evaluation methods, including peer review, to improve their teaching. While candidates may include information from peer reviewers to discuss their professional development as teachers in the vita or candidate statement, the focus of the Peer Review of Teaching Letter will be the documentation of effective performance in the teaching role.

Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator

The Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator (Coordinator) is a tenured library faculty member and member of the Promotion & Tenure committee. The coordinator is typically selected by the new P&T Committee Chair.

Procedure for Peer Review of Teaching
**Scheduling**

- The coordinator will meet with the candidates at least one year before they submit their dossiers to explain the process, determine the best terms/classes to be observed, and answer questions:
  - Mid-tenure review candidates and instruction review candidates (and faculty research assistant candidates, if they have teaching duties), meet no later than November of the year prior to dossier submission.
  - Tenure and promotion review candidates meet in August of the year prior to dossier submission (ex: meet August 2010 if submitting dossier August 2011).
- The candidate and the coordinator should discuss the types of teaching that should be included in the review. Both format and audience should be considered in this discussion, and the decision should be shaped by teaching responsibilities as they are specifically articulated in the position description. If desired, the candidate's supervisor may be included in this discussion.
- Formats can include, but are not limited to: face-to-face sessions, credit courses, webinars, workshops, tutorials, and handouts.
- Audiences can include, but are not limited to: students, faculty, community members and library employees.
- Once the candidates know their teaching schedules for upcoming instruction sessions, they will notify the Coordinator of classes they would like to have observed. If the candidate would like any non-library faculty to observe them, the candidate will provide names to the coordinator.
- If the candidate and coordinator agree that non face-to-face teaching should be reviewed, they should identify specific teaching materials (tutorials, webpages, documentation, handbooks, etc.) to be reviewed.
- Each candidate should receive three different reviews, by three different reviewers in the year before they submit their dossier for Mid-tenure review, for Tenure and/or Promotion review, for Promotion in Rank review, and for Post-tenure review.

**Reviewers**

- The coordinator will solicit volunteers to provide peer reviews from among the library faculty.
- Any library faculty member may serve as a peer reviewer. At least one review should be conducted by a tenured faculty member. An effort should be made to recruit reviewers who have similar teaching responsibilities as the candidate being reviewed.
- Reviewers will meet with the candidates before conducting their review to identify: the candidate's goals for the instruction, and any relevant context for the instruction.
- Reviewers will conduct an independent review of the class or teaching materials and submit their individual assessments to the candidate, her/his supervisor, and the coordinator.

**Summary Letter**

- The coordinator will write a summary letter which synthesizes: the individual reviewer's evaluations and the mid-tenure teaching review summary letter (for promotion and tenure reviews).
- Summary letters are due December 30th for mid-tenure review and instructor review (and faculty research assistant review, if appropriate); August 31st for Tenure and/or Promotion Reviews; and January 30th for Post-Tenure Reviews.
- The letter will be included in the open section of the dossier. The coordinator will notify the candidate that the letter has been added to the dossier.
- If the candidate would like clarification, they have the option to request a meeting with the coordinator. This meeting should happen within 5 working days. The candidate also has the option to write a response to the letter. This should be added to the dossier no more than five working days after the meeting.

**Approved**

- March 14, 2008,
- Rev. July 20, 2009,
- Rev. June 13, 2011,
- Rev. September 18, 2014

**Process for Student Review of Teaching**

Per the OSU promotion and tenure guidelines, students will be invited to participate in the review of faculty for promotion and tenure. OSULP interprets “students” to include all constituents of the candidate’s teaching audience, internal or external to OSU, for whom the candidate has provided instruction, consultation, advising, or mentoring. The following guidelines from the OSU Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (Student Letter of Evaluation section) have been modified for OSULP. The purpose of the student evaluation letter is to document the student perspective of the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher, research consultant, advisor (if applicable), or mentor (if applicable). In order to provide the university with a consistent source of information for the process, the unit P&T committee and the unit supervisor should endeavor to organize student committees for faculty evaluation using the following process.

NOTE: the timeline below specifically addresses the Associate Professor and Professor reviews. Timeline modifications for the Mid-term review, Senior Instructor I/II review, and Faculty Research Assistant I/II review are specifically noted in those timelines.

By March 15
• Supervisor asks the candidate to sign the Waiver of Access form indicating their decision to waive, or not waive, their right of access to external review letters and student review letters.

• The supervisor receives from the candidate a list of names and email addresses of students and advisees (if appropriate) from the dossier preparation year (including workshop attendees, and students with whom the candidate has provided research consulting). This list may include students who graduate in June (or August) of that year. A list of titles and section numbers of courses and workshops taught should also be provided by the candidate.

By March 16 (and up to August 1, if Summer Session if relevant)

• The unit P&T committee and the supervisor jointly generate an additional list of student names taken from class lists of the courses, workshop attendees lists, research consultations and advisees (if appropriate).

• The supervisor begins to request review letters from the combined list of students. Students graduating in June or August must be contacted before graduation. The supervisor may wish to work with Library Administration Executive Assistant to determine when students are graduating. An attempt should be made to request input from students whose collective experience represents the profile of the teaching, research consultation and advisory (if appropriate) duties of the faculty member. For example, if a faculty member teaches all undergraduate courses, it is appropriate for all letters to come from undergraduates. If the faculty member teaches, consults with or advises a mixture of undergraduate and graduate students, the chosen students backgrounds should reflect that diversity in order to provide sufficient information to evaluate the candidate's performance.

• Letters to the students requesting the evaluative reference must inform the student as to who will see their review letters. Access to those letters will be determined by whether the candidate has signed a waiver of access. Students must also be informed that only signed letters will be used as part of the process. Sample letters are available on the share drive: Shared\P-\T\Student_rev iew_of_teaching\Sample_letters

• As a rule one half of the letters should be from the list generated by the candidate and one half from a list generated by the unit. In practice, the supervisor and candidate work together to generate the list of student names.

• There is no specific minimum number of letters required. The total number of letters should be on the order of 4-12, depending on the complexity of the candidate's teaching duties.

• If an insufficient number of students agree to write letters, the P & T Committee and the supervisor should select an additional set of names from the existing lists and request letters from those students.

• Supervisor begins planning the formation of the Student Review Committee in order to have this committee in place by October deadline.

By June 30 (or Sept. 1 if Summer Session is relevant)

• Student review letters are due to the supervisor.

• Letters received from student referees are kept on file in the unit office. Consult the OSU records retention schedule for the required period the letters must be kept on file. The names of the students and the content of the letters are kept confidential if the candidate has signed a waiver of access.

By October 1

• The supervisor forms a student review committee, whose task it is to write a letter summarizing the letters from student reviewers. Members of this committee:
  • Should be current students (OSULP understands this to include all constituents of the candidate's teaching audience, internal or external to OSU)
  • As a rule, one half should be from a list provided by the candidate and one half from a list generated by the unit.

• The student committee is provided with the student review letters and the student-oriented teaching, research consultation and advising portion of the dossier (e.g., excluding faculty peer review), plus any additional available information pertinent to their review. The Library Administration Executive Assistant helps prepare these packets.

• The student chair of the committee is selected by the supervisor. The only duty of this committee is to write a summary letter addressed to the P&T Committee that includes information from the student referee letters and the teaching, research consultation, and advising portion of the dossier. The student committee should be instructed to include in its summary the perspectives represented by all the student referee letters (e.g. not to integrate opinions into an intermediate position).

By November 15

• The Student Review Committee summary letter is due to the supervisor. The supervisor forwards the letter to the Library Administration Executive Assistant for inclusion in the open portion of the dossier. The contents of the summary letter and the names of the individuals on the student committee will be known to the candidate and P&T committee even if the candidate has signed a waiver of access.

• The student committee section of the dossier must include:
  • A description of the process used in the unit for the selection of the student committee;
  • A copy of the instructions given to the students;
  • A short description of the group of students that provided letters, the nature of their relationship to the faculty member and whether the candidate or the P&T committee nominated the student to be a member of the committee; and
  • The summary letter from the student committee, signed by the members of the committee.

Approved

• Revised May 7, 2010
Process for External Evaluation of Scholarship/Service

Candidates for promotion and tenure, candidates for promotion in rank, as well as some who will go through the post-tenure review process, will be evaluated by external reviewers (6 minimum, 8 maximum for professorial faculty; 4 for Faculty Research Assistants and Instructors). Candidates must submit a list of at least 5 evaluators (4 for FRAs and Instructors) who meet the criteria stated below and from this list at least three letters (two letters for FRAs and Instructors) will be obtained for the final dossier. If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate by the unit head. The other evaluators are to be selected by the AUL. Letters should generally be from leaders in the candidate's field, chosen for their ability to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. Letters should not be solicited from co-authors or co-principal investigators who collaborated with the candidate in the last five years. In general, letters should not be solicited from former post-doctoral advisers, professors, or former students. If such letters are necessary, include an explanation and state why the evaluator can be objective. Letters should generally be from tenured professors or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academe who are widely recognized in the field. External letters for professorial faculty should never be solicited from clients or others whom the candidate has directly served in his/her work. For FRAs and Instructors, the letters can be from internal evaluators who have worked with the candidate but who are widely recognized in the field. External letters for professorial faculty should never be solicited from clients or others whom the candidate has directly served in his/her work. For FRAs and Instructors, the letters can be from internal evaluators who have worked with the candidate but can objectively evaluate the candidate's dossier. Careful consideration should be given to minimizing conflict of interest when choosing all evaluators.

This web page provides additional tips. [+http://academic-librarian-status.wikispaces.com/+]

By May 31

- The candidate for Promotion and Tenure or promotion to Professor submits a list of 5-8 potential external reviewers to their supervisor, who forwards them to their AUL.
- The candidate for Promotion in Rank (Instructor or FRA) submits a list of 4 potential external reviewers to their supervisor, who forwards them to their AUL.

By January 31st (and only if external review was requested)

- The faculty member going through post-tenure review submits a list (minimum of 5 names) of external reviewers to their supervisor, who forwards them to their AUL.

To facilitate contact with the external reviewers, candidates should provide the following info for each external reviewer: Name, Title, Rank, Mailing Address, Phone, Email.

Process for Reviewing a Candidate for Hiring with Tenure

On certain occasions, it may be strategic to offer a candidate a tenured position. The University allows this providing the Libraries' Promotion and Tenure process is used to review the candidate and generate a recommendation on the tenure decision. The Libraries Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Senior Review Panel recommend tenure and not rank. The University Librarian will make a recommendation on tenure and rank, and the University generally will accept that recommendation. The P&T Committee shall use the same criteria applied in the regular tenure process. As with other promotion and tenure decisions, the P&T Committee will strive to make the process clear and unbiased. This decision generally needs to be made very quickly, within a few days if possible. Therefore, the P&T Committee shall give the process priority. All promotion and tenure deliberations are confidential.

Procedure:

1. In the initial stage of a search, the University Librarian will decide whether the position may generate a tenure review prior to hiring. If so, the Search Committee and the University Librarian will develop a framework for collecting appropriate evidence of the candidate's potential for a successful tenure decision. This framework would include strong language in the position announcement and a request for references that can address the candidate's impact on his/her institution and the profession. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (the P&T Committee) will be alerted to ensure that the P&T Committee and Senior Review Panel are in place. (This should be the case in most instances.)
2. Once a candidate is identified, the University Librarian will inform the candidate of the process and then compile a dossier consisting of the candidate's c.v., cover letter for the search, three to five publications and any other pertinent information such as information from the Search Committee including a summary of the reference inquiries. This dossier will be posted to the P&T Committee's restricted folder for review.
3. The University Librarian may decide to send the dossier to an external reviewer. If so, the timeline will be extended.
4. The P&T Committee will review the dossier as quickly as possible (within five days of its availability) and send its letter to the Senior Review Panel.
5. The Senior Review Panel will review the updated dossier as quickly as possible (within three days of its availability) and send its letter to the University Librarian.
6. The University Librarian considers both review letters and forwards a tenure and rank recommendation to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.
7. Once a decision is received from the University Committee, the University Librarian includes the offer of tenure and rank to the candidate in the letter of offer.
Optimal Timeline:

- Day 1: Candidate is identified and the chair of the P&T Committee alerted. University Librarian decides if an external letter is needed.
- Day 2: University Librarian submits the compiled dossier for review.
- Within five working days: The P&T Committee meets and drafts its review letter.
- Day 8: The chair of the P&T Committee submits the Committee's letter to the Senior Review Panel.
- Within three working days: The Senior Review Panel meets and drafts its review letter.
- Day 12: The chair of the Senior Review Panel submits the Panel's letter to the University Librarian.
- Within two working days: The University Librarian submits the final recommendation for tenure and rank to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- Within two working days: The University Librarian receives a decision from the University Committee.
- Day 17: The University Librarian sends the letter of offer.

Timeline with External Letter of Review:

- The external review would add at least another five working days to the timeline above.

Presented to the LFA on May 11, 2012 and adopted in principle

Formation of Review Committees

Senior Review Panel (for "college" review)

- Overview
  - The Senior Review Panel (SRP) is the OSULP's equivalent of the college-level promotion and tenure committee. The SRP reviews every candidate for tenure and/or promotion, except those candidates being reviewed by a special committee.
  - The SRP reviews the work of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) for consistency throughout all reviews in a given year. They conduct an independent evaluation of each candidate, determining whether the letters of evaluation accurately assess the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier. They add their letter of evaluation and recommendation to the dossier, and submit it to the University Librarian.
  - The members of the SRP are reintegrated into the P&T Committee as part of the review process for mid-term reviews and are eligible to serve on post-tenure review committees. In addition, SRP members are eligible to serve in coordinating roles such as Peer Review of Teaching Coordinator, as those reviews are being performed for the next year's candidate(s).
- Composition and Selection
  - The SRP consists of the immediate past chair of the P&T Committee (who is at the rank of associate professor or above) and two additional library academic faculty at the rank of associate professor or above.
  - The two incoming SRP members shall be elected from the library academic faculty members at the rank of associate professor and above and may include department heads. Ideally the incoming members of the SRP should have served at least one year on the P&T Committee.
  - The two incoming SRP members are elected by a vote of all library academic faculty from a ballot listing those eligible for service. This election shall be administered by the current P&T Committee Chair beginning on June 1 (and concluding in 1 week). In the event of no plurality, successive run-off elections shall be conducted until the SRP members are selected.
- Panel Service
  - The term of service for the SRP members is one year beginning July 1.
  - In normal circumstances, the SRP members shall not serve in consecutive years. All library faculty members at the rank of associate professor and above are eligible for election to the Panel with the following exceptions:
    - University Librarian
    - Associate University Librarians
    - Faculty under review in the upcoming year
    - Faculty with conflicts of interest for any candidate under review in the upcoming year
    - Current Chair of the P&T Committee (becomes immediate past chair and a designated member of the SRP)
      - If any SRP member becomes unable to complete their service, they will be replaced in a special election conducted by the current P&T Committee.
    - Chair
      - The immediate past Chair of the P&T Committee serves as the SRP Chair.

Promotion & Tenure Committee (for "unit" review)

- Overview
  - The Libraries' Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) is a peer review group that conducts a critical, objective, and fair evaluation of each candidate being considered for mid-term review, promotion associate professor and tenure review (promotion and tenure review), and promotion in rank review. The supervisor and the P&T Committee work with the candidate in accordance with the OSU/OSULP Promotion and Tenure Guidelines to ensure that the strongest dossier possible is presented for review. Additionally, the P&T Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the University Librarian.
For the promotion and tenure review and promotion in rank reviews, the P&T Committee forwards its work to the SRP along with its review and recommendation to the University Librarian.

For the mid-term review, the P&T Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the University Librarian and forwards its review to the University Librarian and to the candidate's supervisor.

### Composition and Service

- The P&T Committee shall consist of all library academic faculty (assistant/associate/full professors; instructors; faculty research assistants) with the following exceptions:
  - University Librarian
  - Associate University Librarians
  - Faculty undergoing review
  - Faculty members elected to serve on the Senior Review Panel, including the immediate Past Chair of the P&T Committee

- Approval must be sought from the University Librarian if academic faculty members are unable to serve for other reasons.
- Academic faculty members who have an ethical conflict of interest ([http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#procedural](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#procedural) Section: Declaration and Management of Conflicts of Interest) in any particular dossier review are expected to recuse themselves in writing to their supervisor and the current P&T chair, detailing the conflict. They will continue to serve on the P&T Committee for reviewing other dossiers that year.
- Changes to the Committee composition need to be approved by vote by the Library Faculty Association.
- **Special Committee Members**
  - There are certain circumstances where peers may be recruited from outside the library to join the P&T Committee
    - A candidate is being reviewed for promotion and there is an insufficient number of eligible academic library faculty at the appropriate rank to vote as part of the review (at least three voting faculty needed)
    - Conflicts of interest ([http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#procedural](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#procedural) Section: Declaration and Management of Conflicts of Interest) lead to an insufficient number of eligible academic library faculty to vote as part of the review (at three voting faculty needed).
      - E.g., An Associate University Librarian is being reviewed and there is an insufficient number of eligible academic library faculty to vote as part of the review.
      - E.g., A Department Head is being reviewed and there is an insufficient number of eligible academic library faculty to vote as part of the review.
  - If there are no academic library faculty eligible to serve on the review committee, the University Librarian must be consulted for input regarding the composition of a special review committee (see Special Review Committee guidelines below).

### Chair

- By June 10, after the SRP members have been elected by the library academic faculty, the current P&T Committee Chair will initiate the election for the new P&T Committee Chair using a ballot listing those eligible for service as Chair. Those eligible for Chair shall have both tenure and at least Associate Professor rank, as they will be chairing the SRP the following year.
- The ballot for Chair should exclude those faculty with conflicts of interest for any faculty being reviewed that year. In the event of no plurality, successive run-off elections shall be conducted until a Chair is elected.
- The Chair shall normally serve a one-year term beginning July 1.

### Special Review Committee

- **Overview**
  - If there are no academic library faculty eligible to serve on a committee for a library faculty member seeking review (e.g., review for promotion to full professor), the University Librarian will constitute a special review committee to undertake the entire review process.
  - The committee will generally be formed by the end of the summer term immediately preceding the candidate's dossier submission so that the established review timeline can be followed. If constitution of the review committee is delayed, the review timeline will need to be adjusted.

- **Composition and Selection**
  - The review committee will comprise at least 3 campus faculty, at the rank of Professor, external to the library.
  - In selecting committee members, the University Librarian will typically consult with the Associate University Librarians, and generally the candidate undergoing review, about the ability of potential committee members to understand the context of the candidate's work (and librarianship more generally). The University Librarian will also seek out committee members who are knowledgeable about the candidate's specific work and scholarship.
  - The committee will select the chair from among its members.

- **Service**
  - The committee members shall serve on the committee only for the duration of the review.
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### Post-Tenure Review Committee

- **Overview**
  - The Libraries' Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTR Committee) is a peer review group that conducts a critical, objective, and fair evaluation of each faculty member undergoing PTR. The PTR Committee forwards its review and recommendations to the
University Librarian and to the candidate's supervisor.

- **Composition and Selection**
  - The PTR Committee shall be composed of library academic faculty who are at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, who do not have conflicts of interest pertaining to the faculty member undergoing PTR.
  - The current P&T Chair shall initiate the election of the PTR Committee using a ballot listing those library academic faculty eligible for service. All members of the current P&T Committee and Senior Review Panel are eligible to vote.
  - The PTR Committee shall also include a representative from outside the library.
    - The external committee member shall be selected by the PTR Committee from a list of those faculty members at or above the rank of the faculty being reviewed. The list (at least three such faculty members) shall be provided by the faculty member undergoing PTR.

- **Service**
  - Service on the PTR Committee shall be for the duration of the specific PTR only.