

**JAMES E. FAUST LAW LIBRARY
S.J. QUINNEY COLLEGE OF LAW**

**Criteria, Standards, and Procedures
for Tenure-line and Tenured Librarians**

Approved by Faust Law Library Tenure-Line Librarians: October 24, 2016

Approved by Faust Law Library Director: October 31, 2016

Approved by Dean: November 1, 2016

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on June 30, 2019 and the Senior Vice President on July 26, 2019 for implementation on August 1, 2019.

This document serves as the James E. Faust Law Library's 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 James E. Faust Law Library is dedicated to the teaching, research, and service mission of the S.J. Quinney College of Law. As the legal information repository for the University of Utah and the largest public law library in the state, the library also serves the legal information needs of the broader community.

Table of Contents

Table of 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 Review	4
2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Review	4
2.4 Candidates Hired at Rank of Associate Librarian or 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 Professional Growth and Scholarly or Creative Activity.....	6
3.3 Evaluation of Librarianship/Teaching	11
3.4 Evaluation of Service.....	13
4. RPT Procedures	14
4.1 RPT Participants	14
4.2 Informal Review Procedures.....	14
4.3 Formal Review Procedures.....	16
Appendix A: RPT File Contents	19
Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Sr. Vice President Notices of Final Approval.....	21

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of July 1, 2019. All librarian 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 Library Director by email or in writing 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 librarians and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the Law 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 seven 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 seven-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

Rank at Appointment	Year of Informal Review	Year of Formal Review
Assistant Librarian	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 5 th , 6 th	4 th , 7 th
Associate Librarian and Librarian (appointed without tenure)	1 st , 2 nd , 4 th	3 rd , 5 th

If a librarian does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the RPT Advisory Committee or the Library 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. Early review cases require a candidate either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Library 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; scholarly and other creative activity; and service to the profession, university, and public.

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 Library 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 and other creative activity is not at issue in the review.

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

The Law Library typically does not appoint new tenure-line librarians at or promote current tenure-line librarians 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 librarian may be promoted to Associate Librarian without the immediate granting of tenure.

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Librarian

A tenured librarian 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 Law 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 will be considered when seeking promotion to the rank of Librarian.

3. RPT Guidelines

The three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as tenure criteria in University Policy, are: (1) research/creative research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Librarians' contributions to the law school and the University are somewhat different in nature.

Because of the distinctive nature of academic law librarianship, this document treats "librarianship" as the equivalent of the "teaching" component for other faculty. In the research/scholarship arena, librarians spend a large part of their time assisting and supporting law faculty with their research and scholarship. Practicing librarians normally have limited opportunities to engage in pure research, though they can and do make scholarly contributions to librarianship.

The modified tenure criteria for law librarians are therefore: (1) professional growth and scholarly/creative activity, (2) librarianship/teaching, and (3) service to the Library, University, public, and the profession.

The Law Library uses a four-level scale for evaluating performance: *excellent*, *very good*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*. On this scale, the standard *very good* is located between the standards of *excellent* and *effective* in University Policy.

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, professional growth and scholarly or other creative activity, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

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 *excellent* in either scholarly/creative activity or librarianship/teaching and at least *very good* in scholarly/creative activity, librarianship/teaching, or service. The candidate must also achieve at least *effective* in the remaining category. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Librarian in due course.

Assistant Librarian: The rank of Assistant Librarian is the initial rank conferred at the start of the probationary period to librarians with limited professional experience. An Assistant Librarian should possess a graduate degree in library or information studies and/or other advanced degree related to the position for which he or she is hired, must have demonstrated abilities that show promise for success as a librarian, and must have shown potential for successfully achieving the criteria needed for tenure.

Associate Librarian: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either scholarly/creative activity or librarianship/teaching and at least *effective* in the other. The candidate must also achieve at least *effective* in service. 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 *excellent* in two out of the three criteria, scholarly/creative activity, librarianship/teaching, and service, and at least *very good* in the third. The evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Librarian.

3.2 Evaluation of Professional Growth and Scholarly/Creative Activity

Judgments about a candidate's scholarly/creative activity 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 activity, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research/creative activity in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality and quantity of contributions, and the professional context of the candidate, including whether the candidate produces their own scholarly/creative work or whether their scholarly activity consists primarily of supporting the research work of College of Law faculty.

We expect candidates to contribute significantly and distinctly to the development and dissemination of new knowledge. In order to do so, we expect candidates to produce publications of their own prior to receiving tenure. The quantity of expected publications will remain consistent with law library peers, which is currently at least one substantial publication before seeking tenure. Additional scholarship beyond this is encouraged and supported.

In addition, candidates typically will have supported law faculty in the pursuit of *the faculty members'* research/creative activity. Accordingly, in addition to scholarly works produced by librarians, the research support that librarians supply to the faculty and students is considered as part of their professional growth and scholarly/research activity. Also included are efforts to design and create research tools to assist faculty and students, or contributions to the law school or profession other than formal publications that are considered scholarly activity. This includes, but is not limited to:

- i. Presentations at professional meetings, conferences, workshops, and seminars;
- ii. Shorter published works such as articles in bar journals or newsletters, brief book reviews, or entries on professional blogs;
- iii. Editorial work such as serving as the editor of a published journal or newsletter;
- iv. Projects that significantly improve library operations, librarianship, law librarianship, or legal research (this includes online research guides);
- v. Creation or development of significant innovations with respect to library collections (print or digital), services, or methods;
- vi. The award of external support such as grants to support research, special projects, or initiatives.

a. Quality of Scholarly/Creative Activity for Scholarship Produced Directly by Librarians
With respect to librarians' own scholarship, the quantity of scholarly/creative activity is not judged by publication counts or impact factors. Candidates are expected to produce substantial publications in a number that is consistent with the field and peer institution expectations prior to tenure. It is also expected that the work of a librarian is part of a defined scholarly agenda for that particular librarian.

Co-authorship is encouraged. If a candidate has co-authored scholarship being considered as part of their file, a letter will be solicited from the co-author to describe the relative contributions of the candidate and the co-author. Credit will be afforded to the candidate commensurate with their contribution to the scholarship.

Professional growth and scholarly/creative activity is evaluated with respect to three facets of quality: purpose; significance of outlet; and impact.

1) Nature and Purpose of the Contribution

Creation of New Knowledge. This category includes scholarly/creative products or productions that present new theory, methodology, empirical evidence, studio practice, or interpretations relevant to law librarianship, legal research, or library and information science. Contributions must be novel rather than re-expressions of existing methods.

Novel Synthesis of Existing Knowledge. This category includes scholarly/creative activity that presents a new synthesis of existing knowledge with new implications for future scholarly/creative activity and theory. Examples include a bibliography, literature review, book review or review that proposes new conceptualizations of existing evidence, or a comprehensive meta-analysis that produces a new understanding of existing empirical evidence.

New Descriptive Evidence. This category includes scholarly/creative products that details new evidence of law librarianship or 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 based on surveys, focus groups, or other types of testing.

2) Significance of the Scholarly/Creative Activity Outlet

The quality of contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear. Four levels of significance are listed below with common examples. The examples are meant to serve only as general guidelines for assessing the significance of outlets. Each product is considered for its own unique merits relative to this facet of quality. Candidates for tenure are ordinarily expected to produce at least one item at Level A.

Level A. Examples of this category include authored books by respected publishers, articles in scholarly journals related to law librarianship, librarianship, legal education, or other relevant field or in a specialty area, book chapters in a high quality edited book, edited books, and authored books on professional topics for the general public.

Level B. Examples of this category include substantial works and presentation of papers prepared for professional conferences, workshops, and meetings such as annotated bibliographies, CLE materials, and other works containing original thought.

Level C. Examples of this category include instructional materials (print and/or online) published by major publishers such as CALI (the Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction).

Level D. Examples of this category include articles, book reviews, and bibliographies in non-peer reviewed journals, unpublished research reports and conference presentations. It also includes contributions to the research and scholarship of others as evidence by acknowledgment in a published work, letter, or other correspondence.

3) Potential Impact of the Work

With regard to impact, scholarly/creative activity is not judged by simple publication counts. In judging the scholarly/creative activity of a candidate for promotion or tenure, the RPT Advisory Committee will ask for opinions from knowledgeable evaluators outside of the Law Library.

As stated previously, most librarians at the Faust Law Library contribute to new knowledge primarily by supporting law faculty in their research/creative activity. In supporting faculty, candidates will provide assistance in researching and locating information as requested by faculty. Assistance can be given directly or may be given to research assistants.

b. Quality of Support of Faculty in their Research/Creative Activity

Librarian support of faculty in their scholarly/creative activity is evaluated with respect to three facets of quality: ability to solve complex research problems, ability to evaluate and synthesize critical research information/data, and ability to communicate results efficiently and effectively.

Before any substantive review, candidates shall prepare a brief written statement describing any significant support they have provided for faculty research. The statement shall include at a minimum the name(s) of the faculty member(s) and a description of the services performed. Candidates shall have the faculty members for whom they provided substantive research support submit a brief statement to the Library Director or the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, which can take the form of a memorandum or email memorandum, attesting to the support that the candidate provided to their research.

Summary Rating Scale for Scholarly or Creative Activity

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of scholarly or creative activity as described above.

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

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of scholarly or creative activity. The quality and quantity of 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 scholarly or creative activity. The quality and quantity of 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 scholarly or creative activity.

3.3 Evaluation of Librarianship/Teaching

The following shall be considered in evaluating librarian performance in the area of librarianship/teaching:

- a. Professional competence – A member of the Law Library faculty must be an effective librarian in the position he or she fills on the library staff. Professional competence is evidenced by mastery of the specific skills and knowledge related to the position.
- b. Job performance – Job performance is demonstrated by factors such as completion of assigned responsibilities, production of substantial amounts of quality work, and effective management of time and resources. A member of the Law Library faculty also must continue to learn and grow as tools and resources change over time. Librarians must keep abreast of new developments, such as by attending conferences or webinars, and stay active in professional organizations such as the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), the American Association of Law Libraries Western Pacific Chapter (WestPac), and the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC).
- c. Service orientation – Service orientation is demonstrated by factors such as attitude towards and interaction with library patrons, enthusiasm, motivation, initiative,

dedication, and willingness to perform whatever tasks are required to accomplish library objectives.

- d. Ability to work harmoniously with others – Ability to work harmoniously with others includes working with supervisors, coworkers, and subordinates, and is demonstrated by good communication and listening skills, willingness to compromise, collaborating with and respecting others, and the ability to resolve conflicts in a professional manner.
- e. Involvement in the law school – A member of the Law Library faculty shall maintain an interest in law school initiatives and activities. This may be evidenced by attendance at and/or providing support for law school events and initiatives, as well as by working with law review staff and mentoring students.
- f. The following shall be considered for **public services librarians**:
 - i. Knowledge of legal materials and legal research methodology, both traditional and online.
 - ii. Effectiveness in providing legal reference assistance to patrons of the Law Library.
 - iii. Effectiveness in providing research assistance to patrons of the Law Library.
 - iv. Continued growth in knowledge of legal materials, both traditional and online.
 - v. Effectiveness of teaching legal research, both formally and informally, in groups and one-on-one, using manual and online sources, as applicable.
 - vi. Ongoing awareness, understanding, and application of developments in technology as they relate to law libraries.
 - vii. Effectiveness in supervising staff and student employees.
 - viii. Knowledge of the public services modules of the library's automated system.
 - ix. Support of faculty research, both directly and by working with research assistants.
- g. The following criteria shall be considered for **technical services librarians**:
 - i. Knowledge of the public and technical services modules of the library's automated system.
 - ii. Knowledge of current and developing technology used in law libraries.
 - iii. Effectiveness in using technology to perform cataloging, acquisitions, and other library functions as appropriate.
 - iv. Knowledge of cataloging principles used in academic libraries and their application in online systems.
 - v. Knowledge of the content and format of legal materials and of the legal publishing industry.
 - vi. Effectiveness in communicating with Law Library staff regarding technical services concerns.
 - vii. Effectiveness in supervising staff and student employees.

- viii. Support of faculty research, such as by identifying and obtaining topical new resources or posting faculty research to online repositories.
- ix. Preparation of internal reports or manuals.

Summary Rating Scale for Librarianship/Teaching

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the components of librarianship/teaching described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of teaching/librarianship, including student advising and mentoring, engagement with library patrons, including students, faculty, and the public, and, if applicable, course instruction and curriculum/program development.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant and sustained contributions in areas of teaching/librarianship, including student advising and mentoring, engagement with library patrons, including students, faculty, and the public, and, if applicable, course instruction and curriculum/program development.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in librarianship/teaching including student advising and mentoring, engagement with library patrons, including students, faculty, and the public, and, if applicable, course instruction and curriculum/program development. The candidate shows sufficient progress in these areas to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in librarianship/teaching.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

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

a. Service to the Library or University

This refers primarily to either (i) service on elected or appointed Law Library and Law School committees, councils, or task forces; or (ii) service on campus library and University committees, councils, or task forces.

b. Service to the public

This refers to any of the following:

- i. Membership and activity, including leadership, in local or regional organizations with a library or legal focus;
- ii. Work with civic and charitable organizations and groups that involves using library or legal skills, knowledge, and background;
- iii. Work in the community beyond the formal librarian/patron relationship; and
- iv. Documented pro bono services to public institutions or non-profit organizations.

c. Service to the profession

This refers to any of the following:

- i. Active participation in national, regional, state, and law or library professional associations as demonstrated by activities such as holding office and service on committees;
- ii. Organizing or coordinating programs, workshops, institutes, or similar meetings;
- iii. Continued education by staying abreast of work, developments, and other activities in the field, and/or contributing to or facilitating such developments;
- iv. Professional recognition as evidenced by honors, awards, consultant positions, etc.

d. Summary Rating Scale for Service. Ratings on the four-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 law school or University, and/or the public.

Very Good: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions to the profession, the law school or University, and/or the public.

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 librarian 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 Librarian or Associate Librarian, selected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line librarians eligible to participate in the election.
- d. Department Chairperson. The Law Library director.

- e. External Evaluators. These are individuals from outside the Law Library (but may be from within the University) selected by the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson in consultation with the candidate to evaluate the candidate's work. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or mentor of the candidate. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators. While external evaluators from outside the Law Library but within the University are acceptable under Policy 6-303.III.D.9, to strengthen the file, the committee should prioritize external evaluators from peer institutions who have not collaborated with the candidate.
- f. Student Advisory Committee. The Student Advisory Committee will ideally be comprised of one student from each law school class for a total of three members. There will be an open nomination process, including a self-nomination. If there is more than one candidate interested in representing a particular class, the Student Bar Association will make the final choice.
- g. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured law librarians who conduct peer reviews of teaching/librarianship. They are selected by the Library Director and/or the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson.

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 scholarly or creative activity, librarianship/teaching, and service. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 15.

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track appointment in another academic department or interdisciplinary academic program, the Library Director 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 Library Director 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 RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson. Evaluations from other institutions, if any, 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 review the candidate's file and meet with the candidate to ensure that the file is complete. The RPT Advisory Committee shall review the candidate's file and meet with the candidate as a group. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting which evaluates the candidate's 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. After studying the candidate's record, the Library Director shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, the Library Director shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the Library 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 during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The Library Director will review the candidate's scholarly or creative activity, librarianship/teaching performance, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching/librarianship, or service. The Library Director 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 will follow the same format and will follow the process described above for informal reviews unless otherwise specified below.

a. **Library Director Responsibilities.** By April 1, the Library Director will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, in writing, the librarians required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track librarians wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Library Director by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Library Director 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 Library Director shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the College of Law to submit written statements for the file of each candidate to be considered.

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track appointment in another academic department or interdisciplinary academic program, the Library Director 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 October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the joint/shared appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

The Library Director 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 Library Director no later than September 15. The Library Director must provide the candidate's relevant materials to the SAC no later than August 1. The SAC is to evaluate teaching (if applicable) and mentorship 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. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall oversee the candidate's file in the RPT process. This shall occur by April 30.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Library Director shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching/librarianship reviews and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. Candidates must provide a list of no fewer than three external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts by June 1. The RPT Advisory Committee will also develop a list of appropriate external reviewers. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Library Director, 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 RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson 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 open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (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 vita, (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 (scholarly or other creative activity, librarianship/teaching, and service), including a description of any significant support they have provided for faculty research as provided in

3.2(b)(4). The candidate may similarly submit other relevant materials, including material from outside the University.

- 2) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents.* The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall ensure that the file includes: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, if applicable, (ii) available SAC reports, (iii) any written recommendations from College of Law faculty and staff, including statements from relevant faculty as provided in 3.2(b)(4), (iv) any reports from joint/shared appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (vii) 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 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 October 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 (scholarly or other creative activity, librarianship/teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Library 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 RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson 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 RPT Advisory 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 RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall forward the summary report to the Library Director and the candidate, along with a list of all librarians 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) *Library Director Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Library 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 Library Director.
- 3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level.* Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy. However, appeals shall be referred to the Dean of the College of Law as opposed to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The College of Law faculty shall follow the UPTAC procedures (see [Policy 6-304](#)).

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 Library 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 Library Director for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. Curriculum Vitae. This should include at least the following:
 - a. All scholarly publications/creative works since the candidate began his/her professional career.
 - b. Substantial works and papers prepared for professional conferences, workshops, and meetings.
 - c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.
 - d. Honors received for research/scholarly work.
 - e. All committees served on or chaired.
 - f. Individual student research supervised, if any.
 - g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.
 - h. Service activities for the law school, University, profession, and public.
2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in scholarly or creative work, librarianship, teaching (if applicable), and service. It should also include a description of any significant support provided to faculty for their research or creative activity, as provided in 3.2(b)(4).
3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books, and copies of the relevant pages of works where the librarian is acknowledged for his or her contribution.
4. Course syllabi for all 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 the candidate chooses to include.
5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence observe teaching or review 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 include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.

Law Library's Responsibility

It is the Library Director's responsibility to include the following documentation in the candidate's RPT file, prior to the file closing date.

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching/librarianship.
2. All student 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), if applicable. For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
3. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a joint or shared appointment.
4. SAC Reports (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).
5. Copies of all prior years' RPT files.
6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals, including statements from relevant faculty, as provided in 3.2(b)(4).
7. Evidence of librarian responsibility. This may include letters from the Library 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 librarian that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
8. 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, Library Director, or Committee Chairperson)

Appendix B:
Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President
Notices of Final Approval

Review Committee Approval:



6/30/2019

Lincoln L. Davies, Chair

Date

Senior Vice President Approval:



7/31/2019

Harriet W. Hopf, Designee

Date