

Library Faculty Review Committee 4Y and Q-Contract PRC Review Guidelines

A. Progress Assessment

The Faculty Review Committee is responsible for assessing the progress of 4Y and Q-contract cases towards promotion and tenure. Tenure is granted when retention of the faculty member is expected to advance the quality of the University Library, as evidenced by the candidate's performance in the areas of 1) librarianship and 2) research, creative, and scholarly activity, with consideration also given to 3) valuable professional service. The Progress Assessment is conducted by the Faculty Review Committee in order to inform the University Librarian on 4Y and Q-contract cases that may not be successful in the upcoming Promotion and Tenure process.

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor shall show tangible evidence of achievement and a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to the field and to the department in the future, including:

- Excellence in librarianship, including a demonstrated high level of expertise;
- a strong record of scholarly publishing, constituting a significant contribution to the literature;
- Evidence of valuable public/professional service at the Library, campus, state, regional, national, or international level.

Logistics:

All 4Y and Q-contract PRC reports will be read by all members; however, the Committee will divide into groups of 2 with each group assigned authoring responsibility for a subset of the PRC Reports being reviewed. FRC members should read the dossiers with the criteria and guidelines presented in the *Statement on Promotion and Tenure to the Library Faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign* and *Provost Communication 9* in mind.

This assessment letter, addressed to the University Librarian, will include a clear, explicit statement assessing the candidate's case:

- 1 – Excellent case, proceed with promotion and tenure documentation.
- 2 – Adequate case, but major concerns must be addressed very quickly. Case may depend on external and internal evaluations (specify concerns following ranking).
- 3 - Inadequate case, no obvious progress towards tenure. Recommend terminal contract.

Any concerns about a case should be noted on the letter (see template).

Timetable:

- April 4: PRC documents due to UL office. Copies placed in Faculty Review directory.
- Last week of May: drafts of progress letter to candidate, Peer Review Committee members and UL with ranking will be up in shared FRC folder and available for

reading by all FRC Committee members. Groups should communicate as drafts become available.

- March 26: FRC meeting to discuss cases as needed.
- May: Assessment letters finalized and sent to UL.

B. PRC Report Critique

In order to provide the candidate and their peer review committee members with recommendations to improve their dossier, FRC members have the opportunity to critique the PRC report on both substance and form. A letter critiquing the PRC report may be sent to PRC members and the candidate (cc'd to UL for paper preparer/editor). Tips for future PRC's may be distilled from recurrent themes in written reviews.

Logistics:

The groups assigned to the Preparedness Assessment may draft a short critique of their PRC report. Outline for critique should address the following 5 major areas explicitly (see template below). *Focus should be on critiquing the report not the candidate.*

- Completeness: are all the elements of the dossier present? Is all the essential information included (as best we can tell)? Did PRC include a cover letter listing referees consulted?
- Absence of common mistakes: did the PRC use names of referees when attributing specific comments (they shouldn't do so)? Has PRC or candidate put things in the wrong place? Is the information clearly organized and presented, and citations complete & correct?
- PRC's use of referees: Did PRC choose appropriate referees and number of referees to consult? Did PRC make effective use of referees in preparing evaluative sections (i.e., did they quote them to good purpose)?
- Quality of PRC's evaluative statements -- librarianship, service, research, future potential.
- Quality of each of candidate's statements -- Descriptive statement Librarianship, Descriptive statement Instruction (if present), Candidate's self-review in librarianship & instruction, Candidate's summary of service, Candidate's statement of research goals & accomplishments.

Timetable:

- May 8: rough drafts of all critiques will be up in shared FRC folder and available for reading by all FRC Committee members. Groups should communicate as drafts become available. Review done by email to all FRC members.
- May 22: all critiques final. FRC groups make any necessary final revisions.
- By end of May: critiques delivered to PRC's.

Template:

Date:

To: PRC-Member1 and PRC-Member2

From: Library Faculty Review Committee

RE: 4Y Promotion and Tenure Progress Assessment for Professor XXX

The Faculty Review Committee has reviewed the PRC report submitted for Assistant Professor XXX. The FRC recommends that

We appreciate the commitment that each PRC demonstrates in providing thoughtful, evaluative feedback to untenured faculty. Below are some comments specifically related to the PRC report for XXXI.

- ***Completeness:***
- ***Absence of common mistakes:***
- ***PRC's use of referees:***
- ***Quality of PRC's evaluative statements:***
- ***Quality of the candidate's statements:***

Other comments (optional)

We appreciate your participation in this important service to the Library faculty, and will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

cc: Paula Kaufman
Candidate