

# APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

**Responsible Committee:** AP&T

**History:** 7/98; rev.9/00; rev. 6/05; rev. 8/08; rev. 5/09; rev. 7/09 (Superseded "Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure: 9/92; "Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure 3/93; "Procedures for Appointment, Evaluation, Salary, and Promotion and Tenure Reviews" 3/93; "Documentation Requirements for Fourth Year, Tenure and Promotion Reviews" 10/94; "Annual Peer Review of Nontenured Library Faculty" 4/96)

---

## I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the [Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure](#), the Office of Academic Affairs' [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the Libraries and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the Libraries shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, during the first year of the Director's appointment or reappointment.

This document must be approved by the Director of Libraries and the Provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the Libraries' mission and, in the context of that mission and the mission of the University, criteria and procedures for faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Director of Libraries and Provost of the University accept the mission and criteria of the Libraries and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating candidates for positions and continuing faculty in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in the following faculty rule:

### [3335-6-01](#) *General considerations.*

*(A) Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of rule 3335-47-03 (H) are invoked). Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance -- normally tenure initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in faculty rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards*

*established in faculty rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence.*

*(B) In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to race, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex, disability, Vietnam-era veteran status, or sexual orientation.*

All faculty members of the Libraries have a right and a responsibility to participate in elections for members of the Libraries' Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (AP&T). In addition, faculty members who are tenured and have a rank higher than a candidate for promotion and tenure have a right and a responsibility to provide written comments to AP&T about a candidate's record of librarianship, scholarship, and service.

Recommendations of AP&T concerning candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be forwarded to the Director of Libraries for review. The recommendations will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence regarding how the candidates meet the standards established in this document. When the Director of Libraries does not accept the recommendation of AP&T, the Director will communicate in writing to the Committee that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence and will provide appropriate explanation.

---

## **II. DEPARTMENT MISSION**

### **II.A. Vision of Excellence:**

To be a world-class library system by providing outstanding resources and services.

### **II.B. Mission:**

The Ohio State University Libraries are committed to meeting the diverse and changing information needs of the University's students, faculty, and staff, and to participating in resource sharing programs throughout Ohio and the world.

The Libraries' facilities, collections, services, instruction, and scholarship contribute to the University's attainment of excellence in teaching, research, and service.

To these ends, the Libraries collect, create, organize, manage, preserve, and provide access to information sources, and foster an environment conducive to academic inquiry, scholarly

communication, creative achievement, and lifelong learning. (Approved by Library Council on May 26, 1998)

---

### III. APPOINTMENTS

#### III.A. Criteria

##### III.A.1. Tenure Track Faculty

This section establishes criteria for appointment primarily at the rank of assistant professor. (Criteria for appointment at higher ranks, consistent with promotion to those ranks, are discussed later in this document.) The Libraries is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Libraries. All candidates for appointment are evaluated on their past accomplishments and potential for achievement in librarianship, scholarship, and service in support of the Libraries' mission.

##### III.A.1.a. Rank at appointment

The following criteria for appointment and reappointment are based on requisites established in the University's faculty rules which specify that candidates for appointment must show strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. See [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#)

The Ohio State University Libraries Faculty must contribute to the development of new knowledge, and thus are expected to have a strong commitment to the University's land grant mission of teaching, research/creative work, and service. The OSUL faculty must be able to acquire, organize, preserve, and make available all types of information in support of the University's mission.

The required academic preparation for OSUL faculty is: 1) a master's degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association; or 2) a master's degree with specialization in archives; or 3) a master's degree in museum studies; or 4) a comparable graduate degree in one of the above fields from a non-U.S. university, reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

**Instructor.** Candidates are not ordinarily offered appointment at the instructor rank, which is a non-tenurable position. Appointment at this rank may be considered only for candidates who expect to receive a master's degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association, or comparable credential from a foreign institution, by the beginning of the third year of appointment at this rank. Exceptions may be made for some special collections positions, as noted in above paragraph. See [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03\(B\)](#).

**Assistant Professor.** Candidates ordinarily will be appointed at the rank of assistant professor if they have obtained a master's degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association, or comparable credential from a foreign institution. Exceptions may be made for some special collections positions, as noted in above paragraph. There must be evidence of potential for achievement in librarianship/teaching, service, and scholarship that contributes to the mission of the libraries.

**Associate Professor.** Candidates may be appointed at the rank of associate professor if they meet the criteria for appointment at the assistant professor level and, in addition, possess a substantial record of performance in the field of librarianship/teaching, and quality scholarship that contributes to the mission of the libraries. In addition, involvement in professional service is expected. There must be indications that this level of achievement will continue.

**Professor.** Candidates may be appointed at the rank of professor if they have met the formal requisites applicable to the rank of associate professor and also possess a distinguished record of librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service that contributes to the mission of the Libraries and is recognized nationally and/or internationally. There also must be indications that these outstanding contributions will continue.

### **III.A.1.b. Length of probationary period**

**Instructor.** An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Director of Libraries so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

**Assistant Professor.** An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year if promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointments to the ranks of associate professor or professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition by the Director of Libraries. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior

rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the ranks of associate professor and professor require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

### **III.A.2. Non-tenure track faculty**

**Auxiliary faculty.** The Libraries may appoint faculty on a temporary basis as compensated or non-salaried auxiliary faculty. Compensated auxiliary faculty include lecturers and senior lecturers and may include faculty with regular titles below fifty percent and visiting faculty. Visiting faculty, whose appointments may not exceed three continuous years, include individuals on leave from other academic institutions and temporary faculty. For faculty with regular titles below fifty percent and visiting faculty, rank at appointment is based on the same criteria as described for tenure track faculty (see above). Non-salaried auxiliary faculty include adjunct faculty and faculty with regular titles at zero percent time. They may also include visiting faculty and interns. Rank at appointment is based on the same criteria as described for tenure track faculty (see above). Expectations for contribution to the work of the Libraries are provided in the position description. The criteria described for each rank also are used in evaluating the occasional auxiliary faculty member who desires promotion. Auxiliary appointments may be made for only one year at a time and thus require formal annual review and renewal if they are to be continued.

**Courtesy appointments.** A courtesy appointment is a non-salaried joint appointment for regular University faculty from another tenure initiating unit. A courtesy appointment is based on the expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the Libraries' work. Continuation of the appointment is dependent upon ongoing contributions. Unlike auxiliary appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review or reappointment.

## **III.B. Procedures**

### **III.B.1. Tenure track faculty**

In general, a national search is required to fill a faculty position unless the University's Office of Academic Affairs approves an exception to this policy. Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates are required.

#### **III.B.1.a. Vacant or new position descriptions**

The Director of Libraries consults with the Executive Committee, the Planning and Policy Committee, the Faculty at large, and with others as appropriate in redefining vacant faculty positions or creating new ones. Creating a new faculty line requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

#### **III.B.1.b. Search and screen process**

Vacancies for regular faculty generally are advertised nationally. For all faculty positions, a search and screen committee consisting of faculty from the Libraries

and, where appropriate, classified and administrative and professional staff of the Libraries and faculty from other academic units, is appointed by the Director of Libraries following procedures set forth in the [Guidelines for Faculty Search Committees](#).

The Chair of the Search Committee schedules opportunities for the Libraries faculty to meet with and interview candidates for regular appointments. Some of these opportunities might also be open to Libraries support staff and external faculty, as appropriate. For most positions, candidates may be required to give a formal presentation or participate in an informal question-answer session at an open meeting. In the matter of auxiliary appointments, only the faculty members in the area involved normally are consulted. For regional campus faculty, interviews with appropriate faculty or other personnel will be conducted both at the regional and Columbus campuses.

As part of the hiring process, a subcommittee of AP&T meets with candidates for appointment and advises the Director of Libraries on its assessment of the candidate's potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks, with a recommendation for rank at appointment based on the criteria (see III.A above). In this regard, consideration is given to the candidate's potential for achievement in librarianship, scholarship, and service in support of the Libraries' mission. The AP&T Committee will also advise the Director of Libraries in cases where credit toward tenure may be appropriate. Ordinarily, the recommendation for newly hired faculty will be appointment at the assistant professor rank, unless there is evidence of performance, scholarship, and service that warrants consideration for appointment at a higher rank.

#### **III.B.1.c. Offers of appointment**

On the basis of the foregoing search and screen process and the recommendation of other appropriate administrators, the Director of Libraries makes the final recommendation for appointment, including determination of rank. All offers at the associate and professor ranks (with or without tenure) and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

**III.B.1.d.** At the time of appointment, all faculty shall receive copies of appropriate governance documents, including those pertaining to appointment, tenure, and promotion.

#### **III.B.2. Non-tenure track faculty**

**Auxiliary faculty.** Appointments of auxiliary faculty normally do not require a national search, although one may be conducted depending on the need. A search and screening

committee might be appointed and interview opportunities provided according to the specific position.

**Courtesy appointments.** The Libraries does not normally make courtesy appointments, involving regular University faculty from another tenure initiating unit. Should such a need arise, the Director of Libraries will consult with the Policy and Planning Committee, AP& T, and others as appropriate in establishing the expected contribution to the Libraries' work. Interviews will be conducted as appropriate to the specific position and might not include all faculty of the Libraries. Rank at appointment normally will parallel that of the other tenure initiating unit.

---

## IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS

### IV.A. Procedures for annual review

#### IV.A.1. Annual review of all faculty

In accordance with university rules, all faculty of The Ohio State University must have an annual performance review. For untenured faculty this review is a critical component of monitoring progress toward tenure. For all faculty the review serves as a basis for annual salary recommendations, for assisting faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans, and for calling attention to performance problems where they exist. All evaluations are based on an estimate of the faculty member's potential for future development. ([Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) and University Rule [3335-6-03\(C\)](#))

In the Libraries, an annual written performance review is mandatory for all faculty. The annual review has two major components: the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), including the curriculum vitae, and the annual evaluation written by the faculty member's administrative evaluator.

Probationary faculty also have an additional evaluation by AP&T. (see IV.A.2 below).

**IV.A.1.a.** The FAR form is distributed to the faculty early in the calendar year. The purpose of the FAR is to allow the faculty to document their librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service for the previous calendar year. The completed FAR is used by the faculty member's administrative evaluator as the basis for the annual evaluation and, when appropriate, during deliberations of AP&T. In addition to the FAR form, each faculty member must provide an updated curriculum vita for the personnel file every year. (See the [Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#))

**IV.A.1.b.** Instructions for faculty evaluations and a copy of the completed FAR are provided to the appropriate administrative evaluator in early spring. The

annual evaluation focuses on librarianship/teaching, service; and scholarship. The evaluator makes a recommendation to retain and/or promote the faculty member to the Director or Assistant Director.

All probationary faculty members and their administrative evaluators are required to meet as part of the evaluation process. A face-to-face meeting of tenured faculty and their administrative evaluator is required if either party requests a meeting. The faculty member is informed in advance of the date of an evaluation meeting with the evaluator. The purpose of the meeting is to review the faculty member's accomplishments during the past year, assess whether goals have been achieved, and discuss future goals. The evaluator should comment on performance in all aspects of the faculty member's position and recommend actions for reaching and/or maintaining a high level of performance and productivity. The meeting may also cover specific strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member and recommendations for improvement where needed. ([Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).)

The faculty member is provided with a copy of the written evaluation before it is submitted to the appropriate administrator so that the faculty member will have time to review the evaluation and make written comments. After the evaluation meeting the evaluator sends one copy to the Libraries' Office of Human Resources for the faculty member's personnel file and one to the evaluator's administrator.

#### **IV.A.2. Annual review of probationary faculty**

Faculty members will be reviewed annually during the probationary period regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the reasons described in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#), unless absence from campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#)(G) also stipulates that probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a non-renewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accordance with fourth year review procedures set forth under section VI.B.2-3 of this document and the standards set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#).

In addition to the annual administrative evaluation of all faculty, the evaluation of probationary faculty will include an annual peer review conducted by a subcommittee of AP&T. The peer review will observe the following procedures:

**IV.A.2.a.** Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually by a subcommittee of AP&T until the fifth-year review is completed. The sixth-year review is

undertaken by the full Committee as part of the tenure and promotion review. The annual peer review will be separate and distinct from the annual administrative evaluation. All probationary faculty members will be notified in advance that annual peer reviews of probationary faculty will be scheduled.

**IV.A.2.b.** The Chair of AP&T will appoint three-member subcommittees to conduct peer reviews of probationary faculty members. The subcommittees will be charged to review and evaluate probationary faculty members based on documentation of librarianship, scholarship, and service, as mandated by University rules. A subcommittee may not include persons who write administrative evaluations for, or report to, the probationary faculty member under review. Membership of the peer review subcommittees will rotate annually so that each probationary faculty member is reviewed by a different subcommittee each year.

**IV.A.2.c.** The peer review subcommittees will examine probationary faculty personnel files, including the FAR and administrative evaluation for the previous year. The annual peer review will evaluate probationary faculty members' performance in librarianship, scholarship, and service in accord with this document. If necessary, the peer review subcommittee may obtain external evaluations of a probationary faculty member's publications and, with the candidate's approval, research in progress.

**IV.A.2.d.** Each peer review subcommittee will write a brief, signed report in the form of a letter addressed to the probationary faculty member under review. Probationary faculty will have an opportunity to respond in writing to each annual peer review.. The annual peer review report will be placed in the probationary faculty member's personnel file and a copy will be sent to the faculty member's administrative evaluator and the Director of Libraries.

**IV.A.2.e.** If the director of libraries decides that a probationary faculty member should not be reappointed, the case will be directed to AP&T for consideration using procedures for fourth year reviews. [University Rule 3335-6-03\(C\)\(2\)](#).

---

## **V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**

### **V.A. Criteria**

Recommendations for salary increases and any other performance-based rewards are made by a faculty member's administrative evaluator and then referred through administrative channels for review. The recommendation is based on evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's performance during the previous year and the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record. Librarianship/teaching, scholarship or creative activities, and service will be used as criteria.

## **V.B. Procedures**

Adjustments in salary for faculty are administered within University guidelines issued each year. Salary adjustments normally take effect at the beginning of the University fiscal year (October 1).

Merit increases are expressed in terms of points (on a scale of 0-5) which are recommended by administrative evaluators and forwarded through appropriate administrators to the Director of Libraries or the Director of the Health Sciences Library when appropriate for consideration before final recommendation to the Office of Academic Affairs.

The Director of Libraries or the Director of the Health Sciences Library when appropriate informs individual faculty members in writing, at the earliest time allowed by University directive, of the actual salary adjustment and the rating on which it is based.

## **V.C. Documentation**

Probationary tenure track faculty must follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs to record their performance for annual evaluations and for salary determination. Adequate documentation of performance in librarianship, scholarship, and service is required of all faculty on an annual basis. Faculty who submit documentation insufficient to allow an informed evaluation of their performance may be denied merit increases. ([Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook](#))

---

## **VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION**

This section applies to Columbus Campus Librarians, for Regional Campus Librarians see Section IX of this document.

Each faculty member has an essential role in fulfilling the mission of the Libraries and the University. Tenure and promotion are an incentive, an acknowledgment, and a reward for sustained contributions to that mission. Both are earned after a record of meritorious accomplishments and the judgment of peers within the context of University policies and rules.

Reviews for tenure and promotion will take into account the diversity of librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service that support the mission of the University Libraries. In all cases, the goal of tenure and promotion is to identify, retain, and promote individuals who have a proven and continuing pattern of achievement in librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service.

### **VI.A. Criteria**

**Promotion to the rank of assistant professor without tenure.** The awarding of a promotion to the rank of assistant professor without tenure is based on obtaining a master's degree from a

program accredited by the American Library Association, or comparable credential from a foreign institution, by the beginning of the third year of appointment as instructor.

**Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure.** The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on a strong record of growth and achievement in the field of librarianship and accomplishments in scholarship consistent with the mission of the libraries. In addition, involvement in professional service is expected. There must also be indications that this level of achievement will continue. Faculty tenured at the rank of assistant professor who believe that they have met the criteria for promotion to associate professor are encouraged to present their cases for promotion in accordance with the above criteria.

**Promotion to the rank of professor.** Professors should serve as role models and mentors. Promotion to the rank of professor requires a record of sustained excellence in librarianship and of quality scholarship and service that is nationally and/or internationally recognized and consistent with the mission of the libraries. There must also be indications that this level of achievement will continue.

## **VI.B. Procedures**

### **VI.B.1. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (AP&T)**

The following statements are to be considered within the general framework of University policies on faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure ([Faculty Rule 3335-6](#))

To maintain high professional standards for the Libraries, decisions regarding appointment, promotion, and tenure merit careful consideration in judging candidates on their performance record in librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service. Such decisions are critical for the future of the Libraries.

The AP&T Committee is charged by the faculty with the responsibility for making official recommendations to the Director of Libraries concerning appointments above the rank of assistant professor, annual peer reviews for probationary faculty, fourth-year reviews, sixth-year tenure reviews, and promotions . The Committee is also charged to review non-renewal of appointment actions referred by the Director of Libraries.

**Membership.** The AP&T Committee shall consist of twelve elected, tenured members of the regular faculty of the University Libraries at the rank of associate professor or higher. The Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) (see [OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#)) also serves as an *ex officio*, non-voting member of the Committee. The POD shall be a tenured member of the regular Faculty of the University Libraries at the rank of Associate Professor or higher and is appointed by the Director in consultation with AP&T. The Director of Libraries, assistant directors of Libraries, and the Director of the Health Sciences Library and assistant director of Health Sciences Library are not eligible for membership on the Committee. The Committee elects its own Chair and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect.

For promotion to full professor, all eligible full professors in the libraries serve as the review committee, with the POD serving as an *ex officio*, non-voting member. The POD serves as the convener of this committee of the whole. If there are fewer than five library faculty eligible to serve, the Director will invite professors from related tenure-initiating units to complete the review committee.

**Elections.** The twelve members of the AP&T Committee shall be elected at-large by the regular faculty of the University Libraries. Members shall be elected by written/electronic ballot for four-year terms and shall be eligible for re-election. Terms shall begin October 1. To ensure continuity in the Committee's work there shall be staggered terms of membership with one-fourth being elected each year.

**Rules.** The Committee shall maintain a set of [Standing Rules](#), which will be reviewed as needed.

### **VI.B.2. Evaluation procedures**

See [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) Promotion and tenure review procedures.

Renewal of appointments of probationary faculty is made by the Director of Libraries upon recommendation of AP&T, the appropriate immediate administrator, and the appropriate assistant director.

The appropriate committee meets in executive session to consider peer annual reviews, fourth-year reviews, mandatory tenure reviews, seventh-year reviews, non-mandatory promotions to all ranks, and non-renewal of appointment actions. Discussions are confidential, and all voting is by secret ballot. At a minimum, faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate shall not participate in the review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest. For example, it may be difficult for a faculty member to objectively review a candidate when the faculty member is co-author of a significant portion of the candidate's publications or when the faculty member is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional services. Also, eligible committee members shall not be in the candidate's line of supervision. Every eligible committee member takes part in discussions and votes on tenure and/or promotion. Each Committee member shall attend all meetings in their entirety, if at all possible, where he or she is eligible to participate and vote on the actions under consideration. Recommendations to the Director of Libraries shall be based on the results of all Committee members voting on a given recommendation as follows:

For non-renewal of appointment: 2/3 majority of those voting

For tenure and promotion: 2/3 majority of those voting

For promotion in rank: 2/3 majority of those voting

For non-mandatory promotion and tenure pre-review or promotion pre-review: a majority of those voting

An abstention indicates that an individual does not wish to go on the record with a position. As such abstentions are not counted. In paper balloting, a blank ballot, a ballot with abstain written on it, and a ballot that is not returned are all the same. Only votes that are cast (aye/nay, yes/no, for/against) are counted.

Each candidate is evaluated by the AP&T Committee with respect to assigned duties, considering the record of performance in meeting the criteria defined in this document Section VI.A. The candidate shall have primary responsibility for preparing, according to Office of Academic Affairs' guidelines, a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments. The Director of Libraries or the POD is responsible for verifying the accuracy of citations and other aspects of the dossier. The AP&T Committee bases its recommendation on a thorough and confidential review of the candidate's accomplishments.

**Fourth-year review:** At the time of the fourth-year annual review it is expected that the candidate will have demonstrated substantial progress in all three areas: librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service.

The Committee shall review the candidate's dossier describing accomplishments in librarianship, scholarship, and service and shall vote on the candidate. The Vice-Chair shall prepare a written assessment of the case, including both strengths and weaknesses, and the numerical vote of the Committee, to be forwarded to the Director. The candidate is notified of the completion of the Committee's review, of the availability of these reports and the Director's recommendation. A copy of these reports is placed in the candidate's dossier. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The POD meets with the candidate to review the dossier and explain the university comments process. The candidate then has ten calendar days to provide the POD with written corrections to factual errors, clarifications, or comments. If the candidate comments on the review process itself, the POD will forward the comments to the committee and Director who may respond in writing. Only one iteration of comments is permitted. Comments and responses must be included in the dossier.

**Mandatory tenure review:** The review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory. Evaluation for tenure and promotion is more thorough than other annual peer reviews and requires extensive documentation. The candidate's performance and accomplishments in librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service are evaluated in a variety of ways.

The Committee shall review the candidate's documentation of librarianship, scholarship, and service and shall vote on a recommendation. The Chair will forward a report of the Committee's assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, and the numerical vote of the Committee to the Director. The candidate is notified of the completion of the Committee's review, of the availability of these reports and the Director's

recommendation. A copy of these reports is placed in the candidate's dossier. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The POD meets with the candidate to review the dossier and explain the university comments process. The candidate then has ten calendar days to provide the POD with written corrections to factual errors, clarifications, or comments. If the candidate comments on the review process itself, the POD will forward the comments to the committee and Director who may respond in writing. Only one iteration of comments is permitted. Comments and responses must be included in the dossier.

The Director shall authorize the POD to ensure all relevant materials are in the completed dossier. The POD will forward the dossier with all internal and external documentation, including AP&T's assessment and vote with the candidate's comments, and any response to those comments, to the Office of Academic Affairs.

The Director is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the Board of Trustees (if positive). The candidate's supervisor and Assistant Director will be informed of the decision.

**Non-mandatory pre-review:** All candidates requesting a non-mandatory promotion and tenure or promotion review go through a pre-review. A positive decision in the pre-review is no guarantee of success in the full formal review.

The POD makes a candidates updated version of Section III of the core dossier and any other information available to the appropriate committee of eligible faculty. The committee will conduct a preliminary review of the faculty members scholarship, teaching, and service. The committee reviews the dossier for the following purposes:

- a) to determine that sufficient evidence has been assembled and that it is in satisfactory form;
- b) to advise if further evidence is needed; and
- c) to screen the evidence submitted and advise the POD if some items should not be included.

The POD convenes a meeting of the appropriate committee according to rules outlined in VI.B.2. The committee Chair forwards a report of the committee's assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, and the numerical vote of the committee, to the Director. Upon completion of the pre-review, the Chair meets in person with the candidate and provides a copy of the report. If the vote is positive, the case moves onto full review using the procedures as described for mandatory reviews.

### **VI.B.3. Specific procedures and timetables**

#### **VI.B.3.a. Tenure and Promotion.**

At the time of initial appointment the University establishes for probationary faculty members the dates of fourth-year review and of the mandatory tenure review.

#### **VI.B.3.b. Promotions.**

Written nominations for non-mandatory promotion and tenure or for promotion review may be submitted to the Chair of AP&T by the candidate (self-nomination), by relevant administrators, or by a faculty colleague before the specified deadline. Nominations for non-mandatory promotion to full professor are submitted to the Chair of the Committee of Professors. A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the Committee, after a review of the faculty member's dossier, may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are determined not to warrant such review. The Committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years. See also the [Standing Rules for Professors Committee](#); [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04\(A\)](#).

#### **VI.B.3.c. Timetable.**

Fourth-year review should be held as early as possible during the fourth year. For regular faculty hired at the beginning of spring quarter, the tenure clock will not start until the following autumn quarter

The POD informs probationary faculty in a timely manner of the calendar of deadlines involved in preparing for and undergoing the fourth-year and mandatory tenure reviews and notifies faculty of deadlines regarding review for promotions in rank. The POD assists all candidates in preparing their dossiers and securing appropriate documentation.

The POD informs faculty during the fall quarter of deadlines involved in preparing for non-mandatory promotion for the next review cycle. A faculty member wishing to be considered submits to the POD an updated version of Section III of the core dossier by February 15th of the review year. Non-mandatory pre-reviews take place between March 1 and mid-April.

#### **VI.B.3.d. Peer review.**

The AP&T Committee is the peer review committee for purposes of tenure and promotion recommendations. The Chair of the Committee appoints visiting committees to meet with candidates for mandatory tenure review to observe and

interpret the candidates' performance in their primary responsibility and to discuss scholarship and service.

Visiting committees consist of three members, two of whom are appointed by the Chair of AP&T, the third being selected by the candidate from among tenured faculty, i.e., someone outside the candidate's administrative evaluation process, generally not a member of the Committee, and not under evaluation for promotion. Guidelines for [Visiting Committees](#) to Candidates for Tenure describes the procedures followed by this committee.

The Director or the POD shall be responsible for gathering documentation of the quality and effectiveness of librarianship, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service, as appropriate, within the Libraries. The visiting committee shall be responsible for recommending to the Director external evaluators and evaluators from other units of the University in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. A minimum of one and a maximum under half of all external evaluators are persons suggested by the candidate. The Visiting Committee suggests the majority of external evaluators. The list of all proposed evaluators is reviewed by the candidate and visiting committee to ensure there are no known conflicts of interest that could affect an evaluator's ability to provide a fair assessment. External evaluators should be recognized authorities in the candidate's field of librarianship and/or scholarship and, when possible, affiliated with universities similar in stature and mission to The Ohio State University. External evaluators are asked to comment on the candidate's scholarship/creative work, and may comment on service. They are not asked to evaluate job performance. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the Director, from the final list of names supplied by the Visiting Committee, can not be included in the dossier.

In cases involving candidates for tenure and promotion, all eligible members of the Libraries faculty will be given the opportunity to provide written comments. The Chair of AP&T will invite eligible faculty to send their written comments by a specified date. The dossier should be readily available for review by persons who are asked to comment on the performance of faculty being reviewed.

Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure or non-mandatory promotion once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Director in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Libraries, the Director shall inform the Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted. The request to withdraw from mandatory tenure review, or early tenure review if external letters of evaluation have already been solicited, shall include the candidate's acknowledgement that s/he will not

receive tenure and must discontinue employment according to university policies and schedules. See [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04\(A\)\(4\)](#)

## **VI.C. Documentation**

### **VI.C.1. Librarianship/teaching**

Libraries faculty differ from classroom faculty in several ways. Libraries faculty have responsibilities for librarianship between quarters and during summer quarter and have less time for scholarship than classroom faculty. Libraries faculty also work in a highly collaborative environment where daily coordination and cooperation with colleagues are required. In this environment, it is not usually possible to obtain user evaluations equivalent to student evaluation of classroom teaching. In fact, users affected by the activities of librarianship, in addition to students, faculty, and staff, may be other library personnel, University administrators, researchers from other colleges and universities, or individuals and groups who are not members of the University community.

These differences aside, however, librarianship is fundamental to the mission of the University for "the attainment of international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service." Librarianship has a primary role in the creation and dissemination of knowledge for use in education, scholarship, and service.

#### **VI.C.1.a. Evidence of librarianship/teaching**

The following are representative examples of documentation for librarianship/teaching:

- i. reference service, interactions with users of the Libraries, interpretation of the Libraries collections, procedures, and services to Libraries users and consortia, and related public service functions;
- ii. identification, selection, evaluation, acquisition, and preservation of materials for the Libraries collections and databases;
- iii. analysis and classification of materials to provide access to the collections;
- iv. organization, retrieval, and manipulation of data in print, non- print, and electronic forms to assist Libraries users;
- v. supervision and management of units within the Libraries which perform services and functions;
- vi. administrative functions, including budgeting, planning, goal- setting, and analysis;

- vii. instruction of students in for-credit courses offered through teaching departments in the candidate's subject specialty;
- viii. bibliographic instruction offered as a component of for-credit courses;
- ix. participation in instructional lectures and workshops offered by the Office of Library User Education;
- x. instruction of Libraries users; bibliographic instruction, instruction in research methods, instruction in access, selection, evaluation, and utilization of information;
- xi. presentation of workshops, lectures, and orientations on the resources, services and procedures of the Libraries;
- xii. development of instructional materials; and responsibilities of academic librarianship as required in the position of each faculty member.

**VI.C.1.b. Documentation of librarianship/teaching for promotion and/or tenure**

- i. The faculty annual report (FAR) is submitted by each faculty member as a summary record of activities in the area of librarianship for which the individual had responsibility during the past twelve months;
- ii. The faculty annual evaluation is the written outcome of discussions between the faculty member and the person who has the administrative responsibility to review and evaluate the faculty member in the activities of librarianship;
- iii. The annual peer review of probationary faculty is an assessment by the APT Committee of the faculty member's progress in librarianship, scholarship and service toward the goal of tenure and promotion; the candidate's response is part of the document;
- iv. Letters from eligible faculty, i.e. at a rank higher than the reviewed, who have been invited to comment as part of the process of tenure and/or promotion;
- v. Annual salary notice from the Director of Libraries or the Director of the Health Sciences Library when the salary increase is based on merit as explained in the notice itself;
- vi. Awards, grants, or other forms of recognition for librarianship;
- vii. Unsolicited or solicited letters acknowledging activities or services provided by the faculty member as a librarian.

viii. Documents illustrating activities, such as bibliographic aids, pages from web sites, internal documents written as part of assigned duties and special projects, detailed description of activities reported in the FAR, etc.

## **VI.C.2. Scholarship**

Scholarship is the creation of new knowledge or organization of knowledge within a new framework or presentation. In the University Libraries, scholarship usually takes the form of a publication, but it can also be evidenced in other ways, e.g., exhibits, public performances, digital resources, papers at professional meetings, etc. Creative works not related to the candidate's responsibilities will be considered as supplemental evidence of contributions to the University and/or broader community. Scholarship should be consistent with the mission of the libraries.

Joint publications in librarianship are relatively common because librarians work in a highly collaborative environment. However, the processes and rewards of tenure and promotion pertain to the accomplishments of the individual, not the group. Therefore, each candidate who has a jointly produced work must define clearly the extent of contribution made by each participant.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must have a record of quality scholarship. Criteria for evaluation will include originality, breadth of dissemination, and impact on scholarship and/or practice in the candidate's field of research. Particularly important are works that have been reviewed by peers as worthy of merit. Generally speaking, examples of scholarship which have been reviewed by peers before publication or dissemination, , have higher value as evidence of the quality of scholarship than those which have not.

Quality of scholarship is not measured in numbers; however, quantity of publication is useful in demonstrating the candidate's growth as a scholar, ongoing dissemination of research findings, and continuing commitment to scholarship. Probationary faculty should begin publishing early and establish an ongoing program of scholarship. A single flurry of scholarly activity is not persuasive evidence of a continuing commitment to scholarship.

### **VI.C.2.a. Evidence of scholarship**

In general, regardless of their formats, works that demonstrate command of a subject, collect and analyze new data, undergo rigorous peer review prior to publication, and are widely disseminated are particularly important as evidence of scholarship. A work that has not yet been published will be considered as evidence only when accompanied by a letter from the publisher indicating acceptance without major revision. Books will be evaluated as evidence if the final draft has been accepted by the publisher. Works in progress, i.e., works not yet accepted for publication, will be considered only as evidence of ongoing scholarship. The following are representative examples:

- i. books, monographs, and chapters in books;
- ii. annotated bibliographies, indexes and directories, collected works, anthologies, and other works of reference;
- iii. articles in peer-reviewed journals;
- iv. editorship of scholarly books, conference proceedings, periodicals, exhibition catalogs, etc. (to be evaluated in terms of the depth and degree of scholarship demonstrated);
- v. creative works, performances, exhibits, translations and digital resources (to be evaluated in terms of the depth and degree of scholarship demonstrated);
- vi. articles in publications that are not peer reviewed, (that some areas of specialization lack refereed journals will be acknowledged);
- vii. guides to the literature, comparative guides to reference sources, and bibliographic essays;
- viii. papers in published conference proceedings;
- ix. publications in larger works, e.g., entries in encyclopedias or biographical dictionaries, guest columns in periodicals, etc. (to be evaluated according to the depth and quality of the contribution);
- x. literature or research review articles;
- xi. topical presentations at professional conferences;
- xii. reviews.

**VI.C.2.b. Documentation of scholarship for tenure and/or promotion**

- i. The faculty annual report (FAR) contains a comprehensive list of accomplishments in scholarship during the last twelve months, a self-assessment of creative activities undertaken, and a statement of scholarly activities planned for the next twelve months;
- ii. The annual review of probationary faculty provides a record of evaluations of scholarship and progress towards tenure and promotion by subcommittees of the AP&T Committee; the candidate's response is part of the document;
- iii. Copies of published works, catalogs, programs, and papers, or letters from publishers indicating acceptance without major revision;

- iv. For electronic resources, a printed representation of the work with the date and url or other appropriate citation;
- v. Reviews of the candidate's works published or disseminated by other scholars for a broad audience;
- vi. Letters solicited by the AP&T Committee from eligible University faculty;
- vii. Letters solicited by the AP&T Committee from peers of the candidates at other universities similar in stature and mission to The Ohio State University;
- viii. Letters from peers recommended by the candidate as part of the promotion and tenure process;
- ix. Awards, grants or other forms of recognition of scholarship.
- x. Evidence that publications are cited by other researchers or used by practitioners.

### **VI.C.3. Service**

Activities generally considered to be service include administrative work for the Libraries; the University, including departments, colleges, etc.; service to the profession such as leadership roles and editorial and reviewing activities; and application of professional expertise in service to the community. Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to promotion and tenure reviews. Efforts should be made to identify indicators of the quality as well as the quantity of service roles. The quality of departmental service will be generally known. Indicators of the quality of service beyond the department and external to the University would include election or appointment to leadership roles, or other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after, and awards.

Depending on the nature of a candidate's service activities, it may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should have a record of service appropriate to the rank to which they aspire. Generally, candidates for the rank of professor are expected to have more evidence of service in national and international organizations than candidates for the rank of associate professor.

#### **VI.C.3.a. Evidence of service**

Especially valued is service in a leadership role that actively promotes or advances the mission of the Libraries and the University. The following are representative:

- i. membership/leadership on committees and task forces of the Libraries;
- ii. membership/leadership on committees and task forces of the University, including departments, colleges, etc.;
- iii. membership/leadership in local, state, regional, national, and international associations related to librarianship or an academic discipline.

#### **VI.C.3.b. Documentation of service**

- i. The FAR provides information about participation in professional organizations during each twelve month period;
- ii. The annual review of probationary faculty written by the subcommittee of AP&T comments on the extent and appropriateness of service activity; the candidate's response is part of the document;
- iii. Letters or other documentation of appointment from the Libraries, the University, and professional associations related to librarianship or an academic discipline;
- iv. Evidence of election to office in professional associations related to librarianship or an academic discipline;
- v. Letters from appropriate individuals evaluating performance of responsibilities for a professional association related to librarianship or an academic discipline;
- vi. Awards or other forms of recognition of service.

---

## **VII. APPEALS**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE APPEALS PROCEDURES**

*Scope:* This document outlines the promotion and tenure appeals process and procedure in the University Libraries in compliance with the procedures in the [Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

*University rules:* It is the policy of the Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in these rules. These are supplemented by

additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by the tenure initiating units, in this case, the University Libraries. If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision.

Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in [Faculty Rules 3335-5-05](#) and [3335-6-05\(A\)](#). Those procedures are summarized as follows: Complaints alleging improper evaluation shall be presented in writing to the faculty members of the committee on academic freedom and responsibility and to the provost within thirty days after a faculty member has been notified of the decision the faculty member wishes to challenge.

*University Libraries' rules:* In all formal proceedings under this rule, the burden of going forward and the burden of establishing proof shall be on the complainant. Appeals will follow the procedures and definitions in [Faculty Rules 3335-5-05](#) and [3335-6-05\(A\)](#).

An appeal may also be based on the allegation of discrimination. Such an appeal would focus on discrimination based on race, color, creed, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, sex, age, handicap, or Vietnam-era veteran status. A complaint alleging discrimination should be presented in writing to the Director of Consulting Services in the Office of Human Resources, with a copy to the provost, within 30 days of the date of the letter from either the TIU head or dean informing the faculty member of the provost's negative decision.

If necessary, a written statement of the intent to appeal, on either of the above grounds, may be submitted within the thirty-day period and the full complaint submitted within a reasonable period thereafter.

Only the candidate may appeal a tenure or promotion decision. Appeals by colleagues, students, or others on behalf of candidates will not be considered and unsolicited commentary by such persons on a negative decision will not influence the course of an appeal. Unsolicited letters are not considered in promotion and tenure reviews at any time during this appeals process. In addition, department chairs, deans, and the provost will not normally discuss promotion and tenure decisions with individuals who are not party to the decision making process.

---

## VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

This section outlines the process and procedure in the University Libraries following [Faculty Rule 3335-6-05\(B\)](#), which sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh-year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth-year review.

**Seventh-year reviews.** Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is rendered. If the new information becomes available after a decision is rendered, the candidate informs the Director of Libraries. In rare instances, the Director of Libraries may petition the Chair of the AP&T Committee to conduct a seventh-year review for a candidate who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the AP&T

Committee and the Director must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh-year review must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh-year review, if approved, would take place during the regular University review cycle of the candidate's seventh and last year of employment.

If the Director and the AP&T Committee concur in the forwarding of the petition, the Director shall in turn petition the Provost for permission to conduct a seventh-year review. If the Provost approves the request, a new promotion and tenure review including the new evidence will be conducted. The conduct of a seventh-year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member is responsible for bringing forward new information to the Director. Only the Director may initiate a petition for a seventh-year review. Candidates may not appeal the denial of a seventh-year review petition initiated by the Libraries or appeal a negative decision following a seventh-year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth-year review.

---

## **IX. REGIONAL CAMPUS LIBRARIANS**

### **IX.A. Appointments**

In the case of a tenure track position on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean and Director has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description, but should consult with and seek agreement with the Director of Libraries.

The Director of Libraries and the regional campus Dean and Director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units. Candidates should, as a minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus Dean and Director, the representatives of the Director of the Libraries, the search committee and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with AP&T on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Director of the Libraries and of the regional campus Dean and Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and a letter of offer must be signed by the Director of the Libraries and the Dean and Director of the regional campus.

### **IX.B. Annual reviews of probationary faculty members**

**IX.B.1.** Probationary faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean and Director, the immediate administrative supervisor, and by AP&T. The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on librarianship and service, should take place first. The Dean and Director's report of that review and a copy of the

faculty member's FAR will be forwarded to the Director of Libraries for the personnel file. The review by AP&T will focus on the candidate's librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service. The Chair of the AP&T Committee will give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean and Director. It is important that the Director of Libraries and the regional campus Dean and Director be alert to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty member between the quality of librarianship and service and that of scholarship. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus Dean and Director should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the Director of Libraries.

### **IX.B.2. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty**

The annual reviews of tenured regional campus faculty are conducted by the regional campus Dean and Director and the immediate administrative supervisor according to policies set forth in the [OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

The annual review of tenured regional campus faculty is normally conducted on the regional campus but tenured faculty are encouraged to seek periodic feedback from AP&T.

A copy of the Dean and Director's review letter, and the supervisory evaluation, should be sent to the Director of Libraries for the faculty member's personnel file. In addition, the faculty member, the Dean and Director, or the Director of Libraries may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns. ([Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).)

### **IX.C. Merit salary increases and other rewards**

Each of the regional campuses has its own salary budget for distribution to its faculty. Regional campus Deans and Directors have responsibility for recommending to the Provost increases for regional campus faculty.

### **IX.D. Reviews for promotion and tenure or for promotion**

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on librarianship and service expected of regional campus faculty will, therefore, ordinarily be greater. The University Libraries expects regional campus faculty members to establish a program of high quality scholarship. The University Libraries recognizes, however, that the greater librarianship and service commitments of regional campus faculty require a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets the standards of the University Libraries for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher librarianship expectations and lesser access to research resources. (For specific information about criteria of the University Libraries, see Section VI of this document.).

### **IX.E. Procedures for promotion and tenure, and promotion of regional campus faculty members**

Fourth year, mandatory tenure and non-mandatory promotion reviews follow the procedures in Section VI of this document. These reviews take place in the tenure-initiating unit, which in the case of regional campus library faculty is University Libraries. The Director of Libraries, or the POD, will notify regional library faculty in writing of the timetable of their annual, fourth-year and/or mandatory tenure reviews, with a copy to the dean or director of the regional campus.

The dean or director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on librarianship/teaching. The dean or director forwards the report of this review and a recommendation to the Director of Libraries for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the AP&T Committee. From this point the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews with two exceptions:

**IX.E.1.** The Director of Libraries will send copies of the annual peer reviews, reports of the AP&T Committee, and the Director of Libraries recommendations to the Dean and Director of the regional campus;

**IX.E.2.** If the recommendations of the regional campus Dean and Director and the AP&T Committee differ, the Director of Libraries will consult with both the regional campus Dean and Director and the AP&T Committee before making a recommendation.