

## **SPENCER S. ECCLES HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY**

### **Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement for Tenure-line Faculty**

Approved by Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library Tenure-line Faculty: December 15, 2015 (approved as to amendments by SFRSC July 15, 2016)

Approved by Director: December 17, 2015, (approved as to amendments by SFRSC July 15, 2016)

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (SFRSC) on July 18, 2016 and the Senior Vice President on August 2, 2016, for implementation on August 3, 2016.

This document serves as the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library's (Eccles Health Sciences Library) Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures required by University Policy. This statement along with relevant University Policies, Policy 6-303, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php>, and Policy 6-311, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php>, govern the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

The mission of the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library is to advance and transform education, research, and health care through dynamic technologies, evidence application, and collaborative partnerships. The library contributes to the success of health professionals, students, researchers and the community.

## Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty .....	3
2. Informal and Formal Reviews.....	3
2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period.....	3
2.2 Informal Reviews.....	4
2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews .....	4
2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Librarian or Librarian Rank Without Tenure.....	5
2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Librarian .....	5
3. RPT Guidelines.....	5
3.1 Summary of RPT Standards .....	6
3.2 Evaluation of Librarianship/Teaching.....	6
3.2a. Librarianship .....	6
3.2b. Teaching .....	8
3.3 Evaluation of Research/Creative research.....	9
3.4 Evaluation of Service.....	11
4. RPT Procedures.....	12
4.1 Participants .....	12
4.2 Informal Review Procedures.....	14
4.3 Formal Review Procedures.....	15
Appendix A: RPT File Contents.....	19

## **1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty**

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of August 3, 2016. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Librarian (see below), candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior RPT requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations.

Candidates who will be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Librarian after the effective date of this Statement will be reviewed according to the statement and requirements in effect at the time review materials are sent to external evaluators.

## **2. Informal and Formal Reviews**

### **2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period**

a. Timing. To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Eccles Health Sciences Library will conduct either informal or formal reviews of its tenure-track candidates in each year of their probationary period as indicated in Table 1 below.

b. Normal probationary period. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of Assistant Librarian is six years. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of Associate Librarian or Librarian is five years.

Candidates with a six-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year.

Candidates with a five-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the third year.

**Table 1: Normal Review Schedule**

<b>Rank at Appointment</b>	<b>Year of Informal Review</b>	<b>Year of Formal Review</b>
Assistant Librarian	1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup> , 6 <sup>th</sup>
Associate Librarian and Librarian (appointed without tenure)	1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup>

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the Eccles Health Sciences Library RPT Advisory Committee or the Director, according to University Policy.

c. Shortening or extending the probationary period. Candidates may request early tenure reviews (i.e., *shortening* the otherwise applicable probationary period) on the grounds described in and by following the procedures provided for in University Policy. Because early review cases require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress, few requests are made and few are granted. Candidates are therefore encouraged to consult with the Director and senior colleagues before requesting an early tenure review.

If the candidate has had an authorized *extension* of the probationary period (e.g., for medical or parental leave), the years of the formal retention review and the mandatory review for tenure shall be adjusted accordingly. Extensions of the probationary period authorized by University Policies may postpone formal reviews, but informal reviews will occur in any year in which a formal review is not held.

## **2.2 Informal Reviews**

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on RPT expectations to candidates. A primary function of the informal review is to provide advice in developing the file that will be made available for the formal review process, with due attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: librarianship/teaching; research/creative research; and service to the profession, university, and community.

## **2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews**

If in the context of an informal review in which the candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the Director or a majority of the RPT Advisory Committee members

votes to conduct a formal review, a “triggered” formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate. A triggered formal review shall include external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality of research/creative activity is not at issue in the review.

## **2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Librarian or Librarian Rank Without Tenure**

The Eccles Health Sciences Library typically does not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at or promote current tenure-line faculty to the Associate Librarian or Librarian rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. Under appropriate exceptional circumstances, however, a new faculty member may be appointed at the rank of Associate Librarian or Librarian or a current tenure-track faculty member may be promoted to Associate Librarian without the immediate granting of tenure.

## **2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Librarian**

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Librarian may request a review for promotion to the rank of Librarian at any time when they have met the requirements for that rank. The Eccles Health Sciences Library does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Librarian before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Librarian. In general, however, such requests are not made until the time of one’s first tenured faculty review, which occurs five years after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to the rank of Librarian.

## **3. RPT Guidelines**

A faculty member’s stature is based on the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) librarianship/teaching, (2) research/creative research, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period; tenure; promotion to the rank of Associate Librarian; and promotion to the rank of Librarian are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate’s librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

University Policy allows a candidate’s conduct as a responsible member of the faculty to be taken into consideration during a review. As a result, one’s failure to abide by the Faculty

Code may be considered in determining whether one will be retained, promoted, or tenured.

### 3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that they have *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure.

Tenure: A candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of *excellence* in librarianship/teaching, at least *effectiveness* in research/creative research, and *excellence* in service.

Associate Librarian: A candidate for promotion to this rank requires that one has developed a broad reputation for *high quality* librarianship/teaching; demonstrated *sustained effectiveness* in research/creative research; and performed *excellent* service in some combination of university, community, and professional settings. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Librarian in due course.

Librarian: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in librarianship/teaching resulting in a national reputation in his or her field, at least *sustained effectiveness* in research/creative research, and *sustained excellence* in service. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Librarian.

### 3.2 Evaluation of Librarianship/Teaching

#### 3.2a. Librarianship

Librarianship refers to professional-level work involved in (1) ensuring accurate connections to information, (2) facilitating research and scholarship competencies, (3) developing professional relationships with learners in order to ensure that they find the right information at the right time, (4) developing and advocating information, visual, research, technology, and health literacies across the health sciences disciplines, or (5) enabling informed decision-making in health care.

The five components of librarianship are:

##### *Accurate Connections to Information*

Ensuring accurate connections to information includes building, managing, or facilitating access to collections, describing information, demonstrating effective searching techniques, and/or displaying or producing information. In judging the candidate's ability to ensure accurate connections to information, consideration shall be given to the following: What is the quality of the techniques used to establish connections to information? How current are the methods used? Does the candidate meet expectations established by his/her division in the library?

### *Facilitating Research and Scholarship Competencies*

Library faculty work in an academic environment where students follow a course of study and collaborate with faculty from unique disciplines. Library faculty's professional role is to make the existence of broader information known and findable. In judging the candidate's ability to facilitate research competencies, consideration shall be given to the following: How has the candidate contributed to developing research and scholarship competencies?

### *Developing Professional Relationships with Learners and Information Seekers*

Understanding the basic information needs of students, staff, and faculty remains essential in order to meet the library profession's standard of finding the right information at the right time. In judging the candidate's ability to develop professional relationships with learners and information seekers, consideration shall be given to the following: How effectively has the candidate worked with the information seeking community, including students, faculty, staff, and administration?

### *Developing and Advocating Literacies across the Health Sciences Disciplines*

Library faculty collaborate with specific programs, individual course instructors, and independent learners in order to develop and advocate for information, visual, research, technology, and health literacies across the health sciences disciplines. In support of literacy goals, librarians engage in activities such as developing lesson plans, assignments, and other materials; delivering invited lectures; serving as embedded librarians; creating online guides; offering consultations; and/or hosting office hours. In judging the candidate's ability to develop and advocate literacies, consideration shall be given to the following: Which programs has the candidate worked with to develop and advocate for information, visual, research, technology, and health literacies? What has the candidate done to develop and advocate for information, visual, research, technology, and health literacies across the health sciences disciplines, independent of specific programs?

### *Enabling Informed Decision-Making in Health Care*

Library faculty have a key role in enabling informed decision-making in health care. Library faculty work with administrators, providers, patients, families, and the community to provide evidence appropriate to each user, teach people how to use and engage with evidence at all levels, and facilitate easy access to high quality, evidence-based health care information. Library faculty enable informed decision-making by cultivating strong partnerships, including those engaged with: electronic medical records, clinical decision support, patient engagement opportunities, direct teaching and consultation, clinical rounding, developing and providing health literacy materials, participation on clinical and research teams, and many other opportunities. In judging the candidate's ability to enable informed decision-making, consideration shall be given to: How has the candidate enabled informed decision-making in health care?

### **3.2b. Teaching**

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. In the Eccles Health Sciences Library context, students refers to undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, healthcare providers, and community members. There are therefore three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program developments, and (3) student advising and mentoring.

#### ***a. Course instruction***

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's Eccles Health Sciences Library-sponsored credit-bearing course instruction\* shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations, (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports.\* Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the candidate so chooses.

#### ***b. Curriculum and program development***

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new and novel courses and the publication of textbooks or other teaching materials.

---

\* Some or all of this committee's responsibilities can only arise in the context of an academic unit offering credit-bearing courses (identified in University Policy [6-001](#) as a "course-offering unit"). At the time the Eccles Health Sciences Library Charter was originally adopted (2015-2016), the Eccles Health Sciences Library had not been authorized as a course-offering unit—and did not offer any credit-bearing courses. Thus, until such time as the Eccles Health Sciences Library offers credit-bearing courses, this Committee will not exist and will not take part in the RPT process for a given candidate. However, it is anticipated that the Eccles Health Sciences Library will seek authorization and directly offer one or more credit-bearing courses. This committee and their responsibilities which are dependent on course-offering status are described here in anticipation of that development. If and when the Eccles Health Sciences Library begins offering credit-bearing courses, this Committee will be part of the RPT process for candidates, if applicable.



### ***c. Student advising and mentoring***

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring; (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees; and (3) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.

### **3.2c. Summary Rating Scale for Librarianship/Teaching.**

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the five components of librarianship and the three components of teaching described above.

*Excellent:* The candidate has made significant contributions to librarianship in areas of information connections, facilitating research and scholarship competencies, developing professional relationships with learners and information seekers, developing and advocating literacies across the health sciences disciplines, and enabling informed decision-making in health care. If the candidate teaches, excellence in librarianship/teaching also includes making substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.

*Effective:* The candidate has contributed to the area of librarianship. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of information connections, facilitating research and scholarship competencies, developing professional relationships with learners and information seekers, developing and advocating literacies across the health sciences disciplines, and enabling informed decision-making in health care. If the candidate teaches, effectiveness in librarianship/teaching also includes making acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching, as shown by sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made insufficient contributions in librarianship given time in rank, including, if applicable, insufficient contributions in teaching given time in rank.

### **3.3 Evaluation of Research/Creative research**

Judgments about a candidate's research/creative research are based on both the quality and quantity of research/creative products and their relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive research/creative research, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research/creative research in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality and quantity of contributions, and the professional context of the candidate.

a. Description of research/creative research.

Candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure are expected to conduct research and produce scholarly publications or creative works that are presented or distributed publicly in appropriate venues—in print, online (including digital repositories or collections), or face-to-face at conferences, meetings, or exhibitions. In general, publication includes books, monographs, bibliographies, professional articles and reviews in journals or blogs, book chapters, and formal presentations.

Research grants or funding demonstrate excellence in research, but they are not a necessary component for library faculty. Where appropriate, the Faculty Review Committee will give positive consideration to the extent an individual has been able to obtain research grants or funding to support current and/or future research contributions.

Faculty in the Eccles Health Sciences Library are expected to produce research/creative research that adheres to the coherent agenda of the tenets of modern and evolving health sciences librarianship.

Research/creative research is evaluated with respect to purpose: (1) creation of new knowledge; (2) novel synthesis of existing knowledge; and (3) new descriptive evidence. Research/creative research is not judged by simple publication counts. In judging the research/creative research of a candidate for promotion or tenure, the Faculty Review Committee will ask for opinions from knowledgeable evaluators outside the University.

*Creation of New Knowledge*

This category includes scholarly/creative products or productions that present new theory, methodology, empirical evidence, practice, or interpretations relevant to librarianship, library and information science, or the health sciences. Contributions must be novel. Examples include novel systematic reviews, new digital collections, original research articles, learning objects, scholarly monographs, or presentations.

*Novel Synthesis of Existing Knowledge*

This category includes research/creative research that presents a new synthesis of existing knowledge with new implications for future research/creative research and theory. Examples include annotated bibliography, literature review, or review that proposes new conceptualizations of existing evidence.

*New Descriptive Evidence*

This category includes scholarly products that detail new evidence of library science, but have little or no development of new conceptual or theoretical understanding. Examples include description of new or reimagined library services or new approaches to library work.

#### b. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative research

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/creative research as described above.

*Excellent:* The candidate has made substantial, sustained important contributions in one or more topic areas of research/creative research. The quality and quantity of research/creative research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research / creative research. The quality and quantity of research / creative research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research / creative research.

### **3.4 Evaluation of Service**

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) community or public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the strengths and interests of individual faculty members.

#### a. Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a regional, national, or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); and attending and presenting professional workshops. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals.

#### b. Library and University Service

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the Eccles Health Sciences Library, libraries of the University, Health Sciences, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces, or serving in administrative positions, at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.

### c. Community or Public Service

This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and international community settings and can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines.

#### Summary Rating Scale for Service.

Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above.

*Excellent:* The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the Library, the University, and/or the public. Community service adds to the distinction of excellence, but is not required.

*Effective:* The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant.

*Not Satisfactory:* The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service.

## **4. RPT Procedures**

### **4.1 Participants**

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

- a. Candidate. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.
- b. RPT Advisory Committee. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.
- c. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. The Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty, elected biannually by April 30, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.
- d. Ad Hoc Subcommittees. The ad hoc subcommittees prepare a report about an RPT candidate for consideration by the RPT Advisory Committee as defined in the Eccles Health Sciences Library Charter. Members of Ad Hoc Subcommittees are selected in consultation with the candidate by the Chairperson of the RPT Advisory Committee, who also designates a chairperson for the subcommittee. The Committee consists of certain tenure-line faculty

as specified for a particular RPT decision, as described in the Eccles Health Sciences Library Charter. Membership of the Committee for each particular case shall consist of a minimum of three tenure-line faculty, including all voting-eligible Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty members. If additional voting-eligible faculty members are needed to comply with the “small academic unit rule” (as described in University Policy [6-303](#)), they will be appointed by the RPT Committee Chairperson in consultation with the Director. For recommendations on retention, all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases. For recommendations on promotion, all tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases. For recommendations on tenure, all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases.

e. Director. The administrative head of the Eccles Health Sciences Library, who for the Library has the specific RPT responsibilities University Policy 6-303 prescribes for a Dean.

f. Student Advisory Committee (SAC).<sup>\*</sup> A primary function of the Committee is to provide information and recommendations regarding teaching-related performance of Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty members for purposes of the faculty review processes described above in conjunction with the faculty review committees. In particular, it serves as the “SAC” referred to in University Policy [6-303](#) for RPT and TFR reviews of tenure-line faculty members. Membership consists of a representative group of students enrolled in credit-bearing courses/programs which the Eccles Health Sciences Library offers (or cooperates with other academic units to offer) and one or more ASUU-elected representative(s). Members of the Committee will annually elect a committee member to serve as chair for a one-year term.

g. Curriculum and Peer Teaching Review Committee.<sup>\*</sup> The Committee evaluates the teaching-related contributions of Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty members for purposes of official reviews of the tenure-line faculty. Membership on the Committee shall consist of the Associate Director overseeing education and three tenure-line or career-line faculty. The Director will consult with the Executive Committee on the selection of Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty to serve on the Committee. Members of the committee will annually elect a Committee member to serve as chair for a one-year term.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Some or all of this committee’s responsibilities can only arise in the context of an academic unit offering credit-bearing courses (identified in University Policy [6-001](#) as a “course-offering unit”). At the time the Eccles Health Sciences Library Charter was originally adopted (2015-2016), the Eccles Health Sciences Library had not been authorized as a course-offering unit—and did not offer any credit-bearing courses. Thus, until such time as the Eccles Health Sciences Library offers credit-bearing courses, this Committee will not exist and will not take part in the RPT process for a given candidate. However, it is anticipated that the Eccles Health Sciences Library will seek authorization and directly offer one or more credit-bearing courses. This committee and their responsibilities which are dependent on course-offering status are described here in anticipation of that development. If and when the Eccles Health Sciences Library begins offering credit-bearing courses, this Committee will be part of the RPT process for candidates, if applicable.

i. External Evaluators. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson and Director in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's progress in librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of excellence in the candidate's field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

## **4.2 Informal Review Procedures**

Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted.

a. Informal Reviews after the First Year. These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae and (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas, and a description of current activities and future plans, in librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files.

In the case of a candidate having a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the Department prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

Course evaluation results from the University of Utah are added to the file by the Director. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the candidate.

The Student Advisory Committee\* is not asked to submit a report for and external evaluators are not involved in informal reviews.

The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will appoint the members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to review the candidate's file and write an informal review report that evaluates progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the candidate

and added to the RPT file. The candidate shall have the opportunity (but not an obligation) to provide a written response to the report.

The RPT Advisory Committee will then meet to discuss the Subcommittee report and any response of the candidate, and agree on feedback to be provided to the candidate. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the candidate's file: (i) the ad hoc subcommittee's report, (ii) any response of the candidate, and (iii) the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee's meeting. After studying the candidate's record, the Director shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, a member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Director or members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted within the first six months after appointment to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will review the candidate's librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, or service. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will prepare a brief written report copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file. The candidate has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

### **4.3 Formal Review Procedures**

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Librarian or to Librarian) review follow the same format.

a. RPT Advisory Committee Responsibilities. By April 1, the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will also request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered.

In the case of a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Chair of the RPT Advisory

Committee shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress, which should be submitted to the Department prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will notify the Student Advisory Committee\* of candidates undergoing formal review by April 30, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform that reports shall be due to the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee no later than September 30. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than September 1. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint members to and select a chairperson for the ad hoc subcommittee.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Chair of the Curriculum and Peer Teaching Review Committee\* shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews of credit-bearing course instruction and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of five or more potential external evaluators and any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Director and the ad hoc subcommittee chairperson, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Librarian or to Librarian) review. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

e. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date. A candidate's file will close no later than September 30 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

- 1) *Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson to place in the candidate's file: (i) a current curriculum vitae, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans, for the relevant criteria



(librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service). The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

- 2) *RPT Advisory Committee Responsibilities for File Contents.* The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall ensure that the file includes as appropriate: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (ii) available SAC reports\*, (iii) any written recommendations from University faculty and staff, (iv) any reports from joint/shared appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) peer teaching reviews\*, (vii) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (viii) all other required materials.

f. Candidate's Rights to Comment on File. A candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of his or her non-confidential file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.

g. Formal Review—RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.

- 1) *RPT Advisory Committee Action.* The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than November 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Director may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate).

Whenever possible, the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes in advance of the meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

The minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two

business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Director and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

The candidate is to be informed of the Committee recommendation by the Committee Chairperson as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chairperson about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

- 2) *Director Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Director shall prepare his/her written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the Director.
- 3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Eccles Health Sciences Library Level.* Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy.

## **Appendix A: RPT File Contents**

In order for the RPT process to operate effectively, and to ensure that all candidates receive the most accurate reviews possible, certain participants in the RPT process have responsibilities for placing certain materials in the file. All materials listed below are to be added by the file closing date, and are considered for the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. Additionally, the report of the RPT Advisory Committee meeting, recommendation of the Director, and any candidate responses to either, are added subsequently.

### **Candidate's Responsibility**

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following, where applicable:
  - a. All research publications/creative works since you began your professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on peer review, or other selection method.
  - b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.
  - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
  - d. Honors received for research/creative research.
  - e. All graduate student committees you have served on or chaired.
  - f. Individual student research supervised.
  - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
  - h. Service activities for the University, profession, and community.
2. Personal Statement. This document should detail your accomplishments as well as your future plans in librarianship/teaching, research/creative research, and service.
3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.
4. Course syllabi for all credit-bearing\* courses taught (in the past year for informal reviews, since the previous formal review for formal reviews, and the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure review) and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts as the candidate chooses. The candidate should provide this information for the file early enough for Curriculum and Peer Teaching Review Committee, SAC, and the RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee to use this material for their reports.
5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, links to digital materials, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and

Learning Excellence observe the candidate's teaching or review the candidate's teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research is unclear, the candidate may wish to include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.

6. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

### **RPT Advisory Committee's Responsibility**

It is the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee's responsibility to include the following documentation in the candidate's RPT file, prior to the file closing date, where applicable.

1. Copies of all prior years' RPT files.
2. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
3. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters from the Director describing the candidate's service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
4. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived his or her right to read)
  - a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
  - b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae
  - c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator(candidate, Director, or Committee Chairperson)
5. Report of RPT Ad Hoc Subcommittee
6. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching in credit-bearing courses.\*
7. All student credit-bearing course evaluations\* at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Librarian). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
8. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews)\*.
9. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.

Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library at the University of Utah  
Academic Library Council Charter

Approved by the Eccles Health Sciences Library Tenure-line and Career-line Faculty:  
6/30/2015

Approved by the Director: 6/30/2015

Final approval by the Academic Senate Executive Committee: 2/22/2016 (and  
presented for the Information of the Senate 3/7/2016).

Implementation date: 4/1/2016

### **I. PURPOSES AND DUTIES**

Pursuant to University Policies [6-001](#) and [6-003](#), this charter governs the structure and functions of the Academic Library Council of the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library (Eccles Health Sciences Library), which is the representative body of the faculty of the Eccles Health Sciences Library.

Subject to the approval of the Academic Senate, the Eccles Health Sciences Library Council has jurisdiction over all questions of educational policy affecting the Eccles Health Sciences Library, including policies regarding appointments and reappointments to the faculty, promotion, tenure, and review of current faculty in all categories, program development, curriculum, course fees, library services, and special projects.

Eccles Health Sciences Library is one of the libraries of the University of Utah, a type of academic unit described in University Policies [6-001](#) and [6-015](#). This charter pertains exclusively to the Eccles Health Sciences Library and its faculty.

Eccles Health Sciences Library is administered by a Director and Deputy Director, and organized by divisions overseen by Associate Directors. This administrative structure may be reorganized as needed. As described below, certain Council committees are structured to ensure the membership is representative.

Faculty at the Eccles Health Sciences Library connect people to knowledge and information, and advocate for democratic access to health information. Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty instruct, investigate, innovate, and partner to produce, create, preserve, disseminate, manage, assess, and ethically use information. Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty advance literacy in its various forms, including information, visual, research, technology, and health. Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty continually improve individual and community health and quality of life by creating, selecting, organizing, and preserving health sciences

knowledge to facilitate informed decisions. No matter the area, Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty strive for excellence.

## **II. COUNCIL STRUCTURE**

Membership and Voting Privileges. All Eccles Health Sciences Library Faculty members in the tenure-line category and all full-time (at least .75 FTE) faculty members in the career-line category, as those categories are described in University Policy [6-300](#), are voting members of the Eccles Health Sciences Library Council. One student affiliated with the Health Sciences Colleges and Schools will serve as a voting member, selected by the Executive Committee for a one-year term and eligible to serve up to three consecutive terms.

- A. Officers. The Director of the Eccles Health Sciences Library shall serve as Chair of the Council. The Deputy Director or Director's Designee shall serve as Vice Chair. The Director shall appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council annually from the membership of the Council.
- B. Meetings. The Eccles Health Sciences Library Council shall ordinarily meet once a month. Special meetings shall be held at the call of the Director or at the request of any three members of the Council.
- C. Quorum. A simple majority of the Eccles Health Sciences Library Council shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. A majority of those voting is required to carry a motion. All Council members shall have full discussion and voting privileges with the exception of the Director who may participate fully in the conversation but shall vote only in the event of a tie. Voting will ordinarily be by voice vote, but shall be conducted by written ballot at the request of any member. *Robert's Revised Rules of Order* shall be the authority for parliamentary procedure.

## **III. COMMITTEES**

- A. Committees generally
- B. Academic Appeals Committee
- C. Budget Advisory Committee
- D. Curriculum and Peer Teaching Review Committee
- E. Executive Committee
- F. Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee
- G. RPT Advisory Committee
- H. Student Advisory Committee

### A. Committees generally.

The Council shall designate such standing and ad hoc committees as it deems necessary to prepare and administer its programs and policies effectively. Standing committees serve to address ongoing needs in the Eccles Health Sciences Library; ad hoc committees will be created at the Director's discretion or by vote of the Council for specific concerns, issues, or projects of a limited scope and duration. All committees are accountable to the Council, and all actions taken by the Council shall be subject to review by the

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and shall be subject to the power of the Senate to establish uniform policies and to take action on all matters of University concern (University Policies [6-001](#) and [6-003](#)). Appointments to standing committees are normally made annually. Ad hoc committees will be constituted by the Director or by a vote of the Council.

Unless otherwise specified for a particular committee, membership on standing and ad hoc committees shall consist of tenure-line faculty and/or full-time (at least .75 FTE) career-line faculty of the Eccles Health Sciences Library, appointed or elected students, and appointed or elected staff employee representatives when appropriate for a particular committee. Annual election or appointment of standing committee members shall be made by April 30<sup>th</sup>. The term of elected or appointed members for standing committees shall commence July 1. In the event of a mid-term vacancy, the Director or designee shall appoint a replacement to serve until the next election. The Director or designee shall serve as an ex officio member of all Eccles Health Sciences Library Council standing and ad hoc committees, except the Executive Committee and the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee, which the Director chairs.

- B. Academic Appeals Committee.<sup>\*Note</sup> In accordance with the University Student Code (University Policy [6-400](#)), members of this Committee are appointed to staggered 3-year terms by the Director. The full committee shall consist of one representative from the tenure-line or career-line faculty, the Student Advisory Committee Chair, and one external faculty representative as determined by the Academic Senate's Personnel and Elections Committee. The Deputy Director or the Director's designee shall serve as chair. The Committee shall establish internal procedures consistent with the Student Code. The Committee formed according to the circumstances of the particular case and in accordance with the University's policy shall consider all appropriate appeals. See University Policy [6-400](#)-Sec. IV-C, V-C, VI-C (Student Code—Academic Appeals Committee).
- C. Budget Advisory Committee. The Committee advises the Director on the allocation of the Eccles Health Sciences Library's budget. Membership consists of members of the Executive Committee plus one selected tenure-line or career-line faculty, and one member selected from Eccles Health Sciences Library full-time (at least .75 FTE) staff employees by the Director to serve for a term of two years. Members of the Committee will annually elect a committee member to serve as chair for a one-year term. The Eccles Health Sciences Library primary accountant will be a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee.
- D. Curriculum and Peer Teaching Review Committee.<sup>\*Note</sup> The Committee develops and maintains Eccles Health Sciences Library's curriculum and

considers new courses, program changes, course fees, and certificate programs. The Committee recommends for or against approval of requests.

The Committee evaluates the teaching-related contributions of Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty members for purposes of official reviews of such faculty (e.g. Retention, Promotion, Tenure (RPT), or Tenured Faculty Reviews (TFR) of the tenure-line faculty, or reappointment and promotion reviews of career-line faculty). These evaluations are of faculty members who teach Eccles Health Sciences Library's curriculum as well as Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty who significantly contribute to the design or teaching of courses offered by other academic units, or who advise students. Evaluations will consider course instruction, curriculum and program development, and student advising and mentoring. Consideration is given to factors that can affect student ratings and SAC evaluations in the Committee's overall evaluation of teaching-related performance.

Membership on the Committee shall consist of the Associate Director overseeing education and three tenure-line or career-line faculty. The Director will consult with the Executive Committee on the selection of Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty to serve on the Committee. Members of the committee will annually elect a Committee member to serve as chair for a one-year term.

- E. Executive Committee. The Committee serves as an advisory board to the Director on matters of Eccles Health Sciences Library governance, programs, and operations. Membership consists of the Director of the Eccles Health Sciences Library, the Deputy Director, Associate Directors, and the manager overseeing the information technology division. In addition, one full-time staff or faculty member will be selected by the Director to serve for a term of one year. The Executive Committee shall convene monthly or more frequently at the discretion of the Director or designee. The Director or designee sets the agenda for Executive Committee meetings. The Director or designee shall appoint an Executive Secretary of the Executive Committee annually. The Executive Committee is also charged with budget advisory responsibility, in conjunction with other members of the Budget Advisory Committee, and with issues relating to the Eccles Health Sciences Library's commitment to diversity and inclusion.
  
- F. Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee. The membership structure and responsibilities of the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee are in accordance with University Policy [6-302](#) (Appointments of Faculty). The Committee represents the Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty as a whole to produce formal recommendations on each potential faculty appointment (including initial appointments and reappointments). The committee considers issues relating to the Eccles Health Sciences Library's commitment to diversity and inclusion as part of



the faculty appointment process. As described below, the Committee's voting membership is structured in particular ways for purposes of particular decisions regarding appointments of particular candidates. However, it is the policy of the Eccles Health Sciences Library that for any appointment of any candidate to any faculty category, in discussions leading up to voting, any tenure-line or career-line faculty member not eligible to vote may nevertheless participate in discussion and put forward considerations of faculty. This is in light of the stated objective in University Policy [6-302](#) "of developing a faculty with diverse educational backgrounds, varying intellectual experiences, and broadly ranging academic interests." If approved by a majority of the Eccles Health Sciences Library tenure-line faculty, other interested persons may attend (but not vote): faculty from outside the Eccles Health Sciences Library, staff, students, and community representatives.

The Director or designee will serve as the non-voting chair of the Committee and will schedule meetings of the Committee to review and make recommendations regarding possible appointments or reappointments to the faculty. The Director or designee may participate in discussions, but shall not vote on actions of the Committee.

#### **F1. Quorum and Voting Options**

A quorum of the Committee shall consist of two-thirds of the members entitled to vote on the particular case. Preferably, voting shall be conducted in person, but can also be done through telephone, electronic mail, or similar means of communication (albeit only in rare exigent circumstances for any appointment to a tenure-line position). Faculty members on formal leave of absence or absent because of medical conditions shall not be counted to determine a quorum.

Whenever possible, the Director or designee "shall advise each eligible member on leave or otherwise absent and unable to participate in the meeting of the proposed action and shall request his/her written opinion and vote. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed during the meeting, and their votes will be recorded and counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting during which a vote is taken by the committee."

[6-302](#)-III-B-4

#### **F2. Confidentiality in Appointment Deliberations**

All Committee deliberations and votes are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law. Committee votes on specific candidates shall normally be conducted by secret ballot. Open ballots are possible if the voting members of the Committee, through a secret ballot at or before the

meeting, unanimously determine that open balloting is appropriate under the circumstances for any particular vote.

### **F3. Voting Procedures**

The Committee produces a written recommendation regarding each appointment action based on votes of the eligible members.

For appointments of tenure-line faculty, all tenure-line members of the Committee shall first vote on a recommendation as to the making of the appointment generally, with the appointment to be made carrying at least the lowest rank applicable for the type of position being filled. . Second, if it is proposed that the appointment be made at any higher rank, then there shall be a separate vote taken among only those tenure-line members holding a rank equivalent to or higher than the proposed appointment rank, and they shall vote on a recommendation as to that specified higher rank.

For appointments (including initial appointments, reappointments, and reappointments with promotion) of career-line faculty members, adjunct, or visiting faculty members, the voting eligible members of the Committee include all tenure-line faculty members, and by policy of the Eccles Health Sciences Library (hereby adopted through this Charter in accord with University Policy [6-302-III-B-1](#)) also all existing career-line members of the faculty at .75 FTE or above holding a rank equivalent to or higher than the proposed appointment rank. These eligible members shall vote on (i) the appointment to a position of the relevant category (e.g., visiting, adjunct, or a specified career-line subcategory —lecturer, clinical, research), (ii) the specific rank, and (iii) the term duration of the position.

The Director or designee shall record the votes as to the recommendation of the Committee. Subsequent steps in the appointment process are as described in University Policy [6-302](#), including a written recommendation from the Director, followed by actions of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, President, Academic Senate, and Board of Trustees.

## **G. Faculty Review Committees**

### **G1. General provisions:**

These faculty review committees have primary responsibility for developing the faculty review systems, including contents of the statements of criteria, standards, and procedures governing each type of review, and for ensuring that all required reviews of individual

faculty members are being conducted in a timely, effective, and efficient manner.

Each member has the following responsibilities for activities of the committee: (1) to independently review all of the materials in each candidate's file; (2) to review the materials in light of Eccles Health Sciences Library's statements of criteria, standards, and procedures; (3) to share determinations and rationale as called upon by the Chair in scheduled committee meetings; (4) to contribute to the reporting process as required by University regulations; (5) to maintain the highest standards of professional judgment and conduct in completing each element of the review process, and (6) to preserve the confidentiality of the materials and the proceedings.

The elected Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee (described below) will form the other faculty review committees described below according to the faculty category and type of review being undertaken, and may select a chairperson (or co-chairs) for any committee:

### **G2. Career-Line Faculty Review Committee**

Membership of the Committee consists of a minimum of three faculty members. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee will choose two career-line faculty members and one tenure-line faculty member from the Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty, or if needed to achieve the minimum of three, any additional faculty members as needed (in keeping with the general principle behind the "small academic unit rule" described in University Policy [6-303](#)). The Committee shall oversee preparation of a review file for each career-line (or adjunct or visiting) faculty member undergoing review in a given year, in accord with the Library's Statement of Standards and Procedures for Appointment, Review, and Reappointment of Career-line Faculty, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty (approved per [Policy 6-310](#)). For a reviewed faculty member who is to be considered for reappointment (including reappointment with promotion in rank), the Committee shall then forward the file for consideration by the Library's Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee.

### **G3. Tenured Faculty Review Committee**

Membership of the Committee consists of a minimum of two tenured faculty at the same or higher rank as the faculty member undergoing review, including all eligible Eccles Health Sciences Library tenured faculty members. If additional tenured faculty members are needed, they will be appointed by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair in

consultation with the Director. For “Follow-Up Reviews” the membership shall be constituted as described in [Policy 6-303-III-L](#). This Committee conducts reviews of tenured faculty members in accord with the Library’s “TFR Statement” (approved per Policy 6-303-III-L),

**G4. RPT Advisory Committee.**

The Committee consists of certain tenure-line faculty as specified for a particular RPT decision, as described in the voting procedures below. Membership of the Committee for each particular case shall consist of a minimum of three tenure-line faculty, including all voting-eligible Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty members. If additional voting-eligible faculty members are needed to comply with the “small academic unit rule” (as described in University Policy [6-303](#)), they will be appointed by the RPT Committee Chairperson in consultation with the Director.

The tenure-line faculty of the Library will annually elect a tenured faculty member to serve as Chairperson of the Committee.

The Committee advises and votes on matters of retention, promotion, and tenure, of tenure-line faculty members, in accord with the Library’s “RPT Statement” approved per University Policy [6-303](#).

**RPT Advisory Committee Voting Procedures**

For recommendations on *retention*, all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases.

For recommendations on *promotion*, all tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases.

For recommendations on *tenure*, all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases.

Votes will normally be taken by secret ballot. Open ballots are possible if the voting members of the Committee, through a secret ballot at or before the meeting, unanimously determine that open balloting is appropriate under the circumstances for any particular vote.

H. Student Advisory Committee.<sup>\*Note</sup> A primary function of the Committee is to provide information and recommendations regarding teaching-related performance of Eccles Health Sciences Library faculty members for purposes of the faculty review processes described above in conjunction with the faculty review committees. In particular, it serves as the “SAC” referred to in University Policy [6-303](#) for RPT and TFR reviews of tenure-line faculty members. Membership consists of a representative group of students enrolled in credit-bearing courses/programs which the Eccles Health Sciences Library offers (or cooperates with other academic units to offer) and one or more ASUU-elected representative(s). Members of the Committee will annually elect a committee member to serve as chair for a one-year term.

\*Note: For the committees to which this Note pertains, some or all of the committee responsibilities can only arise in the context of an academic unit offering credit-bearing courses (identified in University Policy [6-001](#) as a “course-offering unit”). At the time this Charter is originally adopted (2015-2016) the Eccles Health Sciences Library has not been authorized as a course-offering unit—and does not offer any credit-bearing courses, but rather participates with other authorized course-offering units in certain arrangements regarding offering of curriculum. It is anticipated that the Eccles Health Sciences Library will seek authorization and directly offer one or more credit-bearing courses. These committees and their responsibilities which are depending on course-offering status are described in this Charter in anticipation of that development—so that a Charter revision will not be needed at that juncture, but meanwhile the committees may not be populated or may not be assigned particular duties until the need arises.