Faculty Personnel Policy and Review
Guidelines for Librarian Review Candidates

The review file is the review candidate's opportunity to share with the Personnel Committee (PC), Review Committee (RC), Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), and President their work and growth in teaching, scholarly and/or artist endeavors, and service contributions during the review period. It is the review candidate's responsibility to present compelling evidence that the relevant criteria have been met according to the Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status as stated in the *Academic Handbook*. A successful review outcome is **100% dependent upon a carefully constructed argument using the best evidence available** and review candidates should approach this task much like scholarly work. A successful review is **not** dependent on a large volume of evidence.

This document strives to provide comprehensive direction and guidance for file construction, however, additional questions may arise while working on the file. Those available to assist or answer questions may include the candidate's department chair, program director, or dean, a colleague in or outside the department or program, the Faculty Development Coordinator, or a current or former Review Committee member. Please keep in mind that the review file guidelines have recently changed and some may not yet be familiar with it.

Within the limitations provided herein, candidates are free to include evidence most apt to result in a positive review. Candidates will provide statements about their teaching, scholarly and/or artistic work, and service. Candidates should use these statements to make their case for a positive review based on evidentiary documents in the file. Within the limits provided, candidates should provide context for the evidence in the file to assist the PC and RC in their review of the material. Candidates should tell the narrative of their roles as a teacher and scholar or artist, and the service contributions they have made. In all three areas, they should help the PC and RC understand **what** they do, **why** they do it that way, and **how** it is effective.

While some materials, such as student opinion surveys, are automatically placed in each candidate's file by Academic Affairs, candidates will add to the file, within limits, additional items to make their case. Necessarily this will not allow candidates to include everything they have done during the review period.

The amount of material candidates can submit to their file is limited and defined. As with much academic writing, candidates must make good choices about the best evidence to include and provide a clear and convincing narrative to help the committees understand all aspects of their work at DePauw. It is possible that either the PC or the RC will find that the review file is missing information needed to make a recommendation. In such a case the PC, upon request, or the RC may enter into investigative mode to obtain the information needed. While this sounds intimidating, investigative mode does not indicate the likelihood of a negative recommendation. It is simply a committee requesting additional information. The committee must be specific about the information it needs, and the open file policy continues to be in effect.

The Structure of a Review File for Librarians
The file is divided into sections on Interfolio. The first section is Committee Documents and includes materials submitted automatically by the VPAA/Office of Academic Affairs. All other materials are submitted by review candidates into the following sections: Curriculum Vitae, Teaching/Library Effectiveness Section, Scholarly and Artistic Work Section, and Service Section. The contents of each section are described below.

Committee Documents
The following materials will be uploaded to Interfolio by the VPAA/Office of Academic Affairs:
• Memo(s) from the VPAA on details of the review
• The review candidate's Position Description
• Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status
• Summary of Library Effectiveness Tasks Performed
• Representative Activities for the Five Library Effectiveness Areas
• When required, annual reports and performance appraisal forms for the period under review. Annual reports submitted voluntarily may be included at the request of the candidate.
• When required, classroom peer observations; all other peer observations are included at the request of the review candidate (when applicable).
• Beginning with awards granted in 2017-2018, all documents written for funded competitive, sabbatical, and pre-tenure leave awards (proposal, report, and response from FDC).
• All letters submitted to the Academic Affairs office before the appointed deadline and accompanied by an acknowledgement of the open file policy.
• Letters from past reviews for years covered in the current review at the request of the review candidate (typically these are letters from interim or term reviews).
• Library Instruction Feedback Semester Summaries and/or Student Opinion Survey responses for the period under review (when applicable).
• Grade Point Distribution data for all faculty members.
• Advising statistics for the review candidate, the department, and the University (when applicable).
• Other materials moved from the candidate's personnel file housed in Academic Affairs at the request of the review candidate or the VPAA.
• PC Reports and Review Committee letters from past reviews (when applicable).
• Review candidate response, if desired, to any prior PC report(s) included in the current file. (Candidate's responses to PC reports are not shared with PC's so candidates decide whether or not to include them in the current file.)

Review candidates are responsible for submitting materials for the remainder of the file. **All documents prepared by candidates for the review file must use a 12-point font and 1" margins. All documents must conform to the page or word limits described below.**

Curriculum Vitae
The CV provides a brief and accurate reference of accomplishments with particular emphasis on the period under review. The CV should provide a concise overview of everything related to the three aspects of a faculty member's work: teaching/library effectiveness, scholarly and artistic work, and service. Although everything listed on the CV should *not* be in the review file, candidates should be able to provide evidence for anything listed if requested. To assist the personnel review process, the CV submitted for the review file should be organized according to the criteria for review at DePauw, with main headings of "Teaching/Library Effectiveness,"

"Scholarly and Artistic Work," and "Service." Candidates are encouraged to use one of two CV templates.

<u>Teaching – Library Effectiveness Section</u>
The total number of pages (double-spaced, 12-point font, 1" margins) may not exceed 100 pages. Within the 100-page limit, candidates have the flexibility to make their best case. However, no more than 10 pages should be dedicated to Library Effectiveness Philosophy and Library Effectiveness Statement and no more than 90 pages should be dedicated to evidence of library effectiveness and teaching if appropriate.

This section should contain the following:
- Library Effectiveness Philosophy - recommend 500-600 words or no more than 2 double-spaced pages.
- Library Effectiveness Statement - recommend 2000-2500 words or no more than 8 double-spaced pages.
- Evidence to support at least two of the five areas of library effectiveness:
  a. reference services for the university community;
  b. development of library collections and information resources;
  c. provision of bibliographic organization and control over library collections;
  d. instruction in the use of information resources and services including workshops, library and information instruction sessions, and research consultations;
  e. creation of instructional materials and tools on the use of information resources and services including catalogs, bibliographies, and indexes
  *See Representative Activities for the Five Library Effectiveness Areas

Files that include the Spring 2020 and/or Fall 2020 term may include 500 additional words or 1 additional page to the Library Effectiveness Statement to address challenges incurred by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Librarians may also show evidence related to teaching and include syllabi and graded work.

<u>Scholarly and Artistic Work Section</u>
The total number of pages (double-spaced, 12-point font, 1" margins) may not exceed 30 pages. Within that 30-page limit the Review Committee wants to allow candidates flexibility to make their best case. This section should contain the following:
- Scholarly and Artistic Work Statement - recommend 2000-2500 words or no more than 8 double-spaced pages.
  Files that include the Spring 2020 and/or Fall 2020 term may include 500 additional words or 1 additional page to the Scholarly and Artistic Work Statement to address challenges incurred by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Selected Evidence of Scholarly and Artistic Work, such as:
  • excerpts of published work, for example articles or book chapters;
  • copies of short grant proposals and summaries or abstracts of longer proposals;
  • reviews of any scholarly and artistic work (including grants);
  • evidence of awards received;
  • abstracts of scholarly presentations; and
  • excerpts of materials in progress, which will only be considered if a review candidate provides a short statement addressing whether the work is an early draft, nearing submission, under review, or accepted but not yet in print.

Note: Review candidates should not include everything they have done during the period under review in this section. When we say *selected* evidence we mean it. Additional evidence of Scholarly and Artistic work may be put into an appendix section for reference. PC members will read the complete appendix so review candidates should be judicious in the selection of materials. Since the materials in the appendix are not part of the core review file, members of the Review Committee are not required to and probably won't read the appendix, but may if they deem it necessary.

The Review Committee recommends that review candidates place in the appendix complete copies of their contributions to selected scholarly work for which portions have been included in the review file. This includes complete books the candidate has written or complete chapters for an edited book if an excerpt was provided and complete grant proposals if only a summary or the narrative section was provided.

Service Section

NOTE: The faculty approved a change to the service criteria effective July 1, 2020. Service for the period of review prior to July 1, 2020 will be assessed with the previous criteria, while service after July 1, 2020 will be assessed with the updated version. See the Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status for details.

The total number of pages (double-spaced, 12-point font, 1" margins) may not exceed 10 pages. Within that 10-page limit the Review Committee wants to allow candidates flexibility to make their best case. The only thing that must be in this section is the Service Statement. Most evidence for this part of the review will be found in other parts of the file such as the Committee Documents section.

- Service Statement - recommend 2000-2500 words or no more than 8 double-spaced pages. *Files that include the Spring 2020 and/or Fall 2020 term may include 500 additional words or 1 additional page to the service statement to address challenges incurred by the COVID-19 pandemic.*
- Selected evidence of service activities, such as:
  - letters from committee or department chairs, program directors, or school deans recognizing important service contributions if not included in Committee Documents;
  - letters from external sources discussing professional service activities and describing the type and magnitude of the activities if not included in Committee Documents; and
  - copies of documents substantially authored by the review candidate as part of service work or a letter from another committee member describing a specific contribution to materials authored.

Note: It is not appropriate to include e-mail exchanges or other data dumps as evidence of having made service contributions.