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I. Initial Appointment

A. As per the Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process the initial appointment for Professional Librarians is four years. If the appointment begins after September 30, in most cases the librarian will maintain visiting status until July 1.

B. Soon after the initial appointment, in separate meetings, the supervisor, and the Dean of University Libraries, will meet with the new librarian to discuss job responsibilities, goals for the coming year, and expectations for reappointment and tenure.

II. Annual Reviews and Post-Tenure Reviews

Policies and procedures are described in a separate document “Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty” available at: http://libshare.uncg.edu/sites/bts/CGTP/Pages/pet.aspx

III. Reappointment

All calendars, review forms, and review policies are available at http://libshare.uncg.edu/sites/bts/CGTP/Pages/pet.aspx

A. Basic Information

1. The calendar is developed by the Chair of the PE&T Committee in early July and later modified once the Provost’s official calendar is received (usually in early September).

2. The Dean and the Chair of the PE&T Committee meet in late summer with any librarians eligible to seek reappointment that year and their supervisor(s). They provide information and answer questions about the process from the candidate(s) and supervisor(s). The reappointment review schedule is given to candidates, to their supervisor, and posted on the University Libraries PE&T website.

3. The reappointment process is similar to that for tenure, not only because it is designed to be evaluative, but also because it is an early indicator of
progress towards tenure. The UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form is used as the template for the reappointment file.

4. External reviewers are not utilized for reappointment.
5. All components of the reappointment process are considered confidential.

B. Role of the Peer Evaluation and Tenure Committee

1. The Chair, in consultation with the Dean, creates Reappointment and Tenure calendars.
2. The Committee makes suggestions for changes in this document and the Evaluation Guidelines document. Small procedural changes may be made without consulting the Library Faculty; major changes must be brought before a vote of the Library Faculty.
3. The Committee acts in an advisory capacity as requested by the candidate.
4. The Committee encourages candidates to solicit help from other tenured librarians with portfolio development and proofreading.

C. Preparation of the Reappointment Materials

1. The UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form is used to organize the online reappointment portfolio. It is available at: http://Provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/Online_PT_Format.pdf
2. Sections A. I-III each should have approximately three narrative paragraphs providing an overall context for the contents of that section. Statements should be written in the first person, be factual, and be objective. Subjective or evaluative statements should not be included.
3. Descriptions should be as free as possible of library jargon, acronyms, etc. so that someone outside of the profession could understand the information.
4. Preferably lists of activities should be in reverse chronological order.
5. When applicable include relevant dates and locations.
6. Collaborative efforts should be acknowledged although detailed lists of names and titles are unnecessary.
7. The name of the supervisor who wrote each of the evaluative sections should be written at the beginning of that section.
8. Information on publications and presentations completed prior to the appointment at UNCG may be included, but must be noted as such.
9. Supporting material may be placed in Appendices in Canvas Stable, persistent links to online tutorials or other “born digital” supporting materials may be used in text as a substitute for some appendices.
10. The candidate notifies the Department Head or supervisor and the Chair of the PE&T Committee that the candidate’s part of the portfolio has been uploaded into the portfolio management system (currently Canvas).

D. Role of the Department
1. Review of the candidate must be consistent with the clear and specific unit and departmental criteria for promotion and tenure, and reflect the feedback that the candidate has received in his or her annual reviews.

2. The Departmental Review Committee members have access to the candidate’s portfolio.

3. The Departmental Review Committee will have a minimum of three tenured librarians. If the department does not have a minimum of three tenured librarians (excluding the Department Head), the Dean shall confer with the Department Head and the candidate to determine the composition of the review committee. Following the consultation specified above, if the Dean determines that agreement on the members cannot be reached, the Dean, with the approval of the Provost, will specify the composition of the committee. A memorandum of agreement between the candidate, the Department Head, and the Dean will specify the final membership.

4. The Department Head assembles and consults with the Departmental Review Committee. The Dean is also invited to this meeting which is presided over by a Chair (not the Department Head). The Chair assures that the meeting is divided into evidence-gathering and deliberative phases, conducts a secret ballot, counts the votes, prepares a written summary of the results of the deliberative phase (including a summary of any dissenting opinion), and forwards the summary and the result of the vote to the Department Head. The Department Head and Dean may not be present during the deliberative phase and vote of the faculty members.

5. Upon receiving the materials from the Chair as described above, the Department Head prepares his or her independent recommendation and summary and forwards it along with the Department Review Committee’s recommended action, a summary of the committee’s deliberations with their votes both for and against the nomination, and the candidate’s current CV to the Dean.

6. Decisions:
   a. Department level decides to reappoint:
      When the department’s recommended action is to reappoint to a further term of three years, review by the Unit and University Promotion and Tenure Committees is not required. Instead, the recommendation of the departmental faculty, including a record of their vote, and the independent recommendation of the Department Head shall be conveyed, along with a copy of the faculty member’s current CV, to the Dean for review. The Dean shall send his or her recommendation, along with a copy of the departmental reviews and a copy of the faculty member’s CV, to the Provost. The Provost shall send his or her recommendation, along with copies of all lower-level reviews, and a copy of the faculty member’s CV, to the chancellor for a final decision on reappointment. The role of the chancellor and all other levels of review are laid out in section 4.D of the Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (http://Provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/tenure.pdf).
b. Department level decides not to reappoint:  
The department recommends not to reappoint when the majority of  
the voting faculty and the Department Head concur in this decision  
based on their independent reviews. In all other cases the  
recommendation of the department must be to reappoint (see 4.B.i.b).  
All provisions of sections 4.B.ii. and 4.B.iii. (Unit and university reviews) shall be followed, except that the documentation forwarded  
from the department need only consist of the recommendation of the  
departmental faculty, including a record of their vote, the independent  
recommendation of the Department Head, and a copy of the  
candidate’s current CV. The candidate may submit additional  
documents that support his or her reappointment. These documents  
are submitted to the Dean, and are for consideration by the Unit and University Committees on Promotion and Tenure, the Dean, and the  
Provost.

7. The Department Head, after sending information to the Dean notifies the  
Candidate of the department’s recommendation (4.B.i.a)

E. Unit Review if Negative Review from Departmental Level

1. If the Departmental Review Committee’s recommended action is not to  
reappoint the librarian to an additional term of three years, review  
proceeds to the unit level. The Unit Review Committee is comprised of all  
of the tenured librarians except for the Dean, Department Head and  
members of the Departmental Review Committee.

2. The Chair of the PE&T Committee adds departmental documents,  
including the Department Head’s independent recommendations, to the  
portfolio and any additional documents given to the Dean. The Chair then  
notifies the tenured faculty when the departmental review has been  
completed and that the candidate’s portfolio is ready for review, and also  
sets the time and place for the faculty to meet.

3. Unit Review Committee should review all materials prior to the scheduled  
meeting. The portfolio is available to the Committee on the Portfolio  
Management System (currently Canvas). Each librarian by signing his/her  
name on the form provided at the unit meeting by the Chair of the PE&T  
Committee (see E.I.a) also indicates he/she has viewed the materials.

4. On the designated date and time the tenured library faculty will assemble  
to deliberate and vote on their recommendation. The Chair of the PE&T  
Committee should bring the signature page from the P&T form (E.I.a) and  
paper ballots to the meeting. The meeting will be divided into an  
evidence-gathering phase and a final deliberative phase. These phases will  
be presided over by a temporary chair elected by the assembled members  
eligible to vote. Those not eligible to vote are the candidate’s Department  
Head, the Departmental Review Committee, and the Dean. No tenured  
faculty member may vote more than once. When the first phase of the  
meeting is determined to be over by a majority vote, the Dean and those
not eligible to vote will leave the meeting and the final deliberations will proceed.

5. A written ballot will be taken with the temporary chair counting the ballots and reporting the vote to the Dean. Additionally, the temporary chair must write a summary of the views of the assembled faculty, including any dissenting opinions, and give it to the Dean.

6. Following the completion of his/her own review, the Dean shall make the text of that evaluation available in the Portfolio Management System for the perusal of the candidate and members of the unit Promotion and Tenure Committee.

F. Dean’s review

1. The Dean will forward to the Provost his or her recommendation and the independent summary and recommendation of:
   a. The Departmental Review Committee including the number of votes for and against a nomination
   b. Department Head review
   c. the Unit Review Committee (if necessary) including the number of faculty votes for and against a nomination
   d. a copy of the candidate’s current CV

2. When the Departmental Review Committee or the Unit Review Committee recommend reappointment for a candidate but have concerns about the person’s ability to achieve tenure in three years, a written statement is given to the candidate’s supervisor to discuss with that person after she/he has been notified of the recommendation for reappointment by the Dean.

3. When there is a majority of negative votes from the Departmental Review Committee and the Unit Review Committee along with negative evaluations by the Department Head and the Dean, this would constitute a negative recommendation that will not be reviewed further except as may occur in accordance with Section 4 of the Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process. The Dean sends a letter to the candidate, with a copy to the Provost, indicating non-reappointment. The unsuccessful candidate has twelve months from July 1st of the year of the reappointment decision to vacate his/her position.

4. Mixed recommendations: When the Departmental Review Committee, the Unit Review Committee, the Department Head, and the Dean disagree on reappointment, the final decision rests with the Dean.

5. The Dean also notifies the candidate of the Unit’s recommendation.

G. Announcement of the Decision

1. Usually sometime in February the Provost and the Chancellor will review the reappointment letter sent by the Dean of University Libraries. The Provost’s Office will notify the Dean when they are submitting a
recommendation for reappointment to the Board of Trustees at which time the Dean may inform the candidate verbally of the recommendation. The candidate will receive a letter from the Provost and subsequently from the Board of Trustees after the recommendation has been formally approved.

IV. Tenure

All calendars, review forms, and review policies are available on http://libshare.uncg.edu/sites/bts/CGTP/Pages/pet.aspx

A. Basic Information

1. The calendar is developed by the Chair of the PE&T Committee in December of the preceding year and later modified once the Provost’s official calendar is received.

2. The Dean of the University Libraries and the Chair of the PE&T Committee meet in late January/early February with any librarians eligible to seek tenure that year and their supervisor(s). They provide information and answer questions about the process from candidate and supervisor. The tenure review schedule is given to candidates, to their supervisor, and posted on the University Libraries PE&T website.

3. External reviewers are used for tenure. Reviewers are selected on the basis of their expertise to review an applicant’s accomplishments. To ensure objectivity, external reviewers may not have had a close personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate such as a co-author, co-presenter, or co-worker. The candidate may not contact potential external reviewers at any time during the tenure process.

B. External Review

1. The candidate submits a list of up to four potential external reviewers to the Department Head for consideration. The Department Head creates a list of no fewer than four additional potential external reviewers; this may be done in consultation with senior department faculty and professional contacts. All external reviewers must be tenured librarians. The Department Head selects no fewer than three reviewers from the combined lists; at least one of those selected names must be from the tenure candidate’s list. The Department Head sends letters to all of the potential external reviewers to gauge their willingness to participate in the external review. For details, see Appendix: External Reviewer Guidelines. If the candidate works with or supervises SPA or non-faculty EPA staff whose input would be valuable, the Dean requests letters and/or meets with those individuals. While input from these specific individuals is kept confidential, the Dean provides an oral summary of their comments for the Departmental Review Committee and the Unit Review Committee.
C. Preparation of the Tenure Materials

1. The online *UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form* is used to organize the tenure portfolio.
2. Sections A.I-III each should have approximately three narrative paragraphs providing an overall context for the contents of that section. Statements should be written in the first person, be factual, and be objective. Subjective or evaluative statements should not be included.
3. Descriptions should be as free as possible of library jargon, acronyms, etc. so that someone outside of the profession could understand the information.
4. Preferably lists of activities should be in reverse chronological order.
5. When applicable, include relevant dates and locations.
6. Collaborative efforts should be acknowledged although detailed lists of names and titles are unnecessary.
7. The name of the supervisor who wrote each of the evaluative sections should be indicated at the beginning of that section.
8. Materials used for the reappointment process may be incorporated into the tenure package.
9. Supporting material may be placed in Appendices in Canvas. Stable, persistent links to online tutorials or other “born digital” supporting materials may be used in text as a substitute for some appendices.
10. Information on publications and presentations completed prior to the appointment at UNCG may be included.
11. Subsequent publications and presentations should be listed under the heading “Since Coming to UNCG.” The items in this section will be weighted more heavily.
12. When the completed portfolio with accompanying appendices is loaded in the portfolio management system, the candidate notifies the Chair of the P&T Committee.

D. Role of the Peer Evaluation and Tenure Committee

1. Members of the PE&T Committee act in an advisory capacity as requested by the candidate.
2. The PE&T Committee encourages candidates to solicit help from other tenured librarians with portfolio development and proofreading.

E. Role of the External Reviewer

1. After the candidate has made final changes to the tenure portfolio, the Human Resources Librarian grants the external reviewers access to the candidates portfolio in the portfolio management system.
2. After each external reviewer has reviewed the candidate’s portfolio, she/he prepares a letter evaluating the material and sends it to the Department Head. These letters are added to the portfolio. A copy of each external reviewer’s vita is also placed in the candidate’s portfolio.

F. Role of the Department

1. Review of the candidate must be consistent with the clear and specific unit criteria for promotion and tenure, and reflect the feedback that the candidate has received in his or her annual reviews.

2. Members of the Departmental Review Committee are given access to the candidate’s portfolio and external reviewers’ comments (4.B.i.a (1)).

3. The Departmental Review Committee must have a minimum of three tenured librarians. If the department does not have a minimum of three tenured librarians (excluding the Department Head), the Dean shall confer with the Department Head and the candidate to determine the composition of the review committee. A memorandum of agreement between the candidate, the Department Head, and the Dean will specify the composition of the review committee. If following the consultation specified above, the Dean determines that agreement cannot be reached, the Dean, with the approval of the Provost, will specify the composition of the committee. (4.B.i.f.)

4. The Department Head assembles and consults with the Departmental Review Committee. The Dean is also invited to the meeting which is presided over by a Chair (not the Department Head). The Chair assures that the meeting is divided into evidence-gathering and deliberative phases, conducts a secret ballot, counts the votes, prepares a written summary of the meeting (including a summary of any dissenting opinions), forwards the summary and the results of the vote to the Department Head, and ensures that all present sign the appropriate page of the UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form. The Department Head and Dean may not be present during the deliberative phase and vote of the faculty members.

5. Upon receiving the materials from the Chair as described above, the Department Head prepares his or her independent recommendation and posts it along with the Departmental Review Committee’s recommended action and a summary of their deliberations, their votes both for and against the nomination, and the candidate’s current CV, to the candidate’s organization on the course management system (currently Canvas).

6. The Department Head, after posting this information on the course management system, also notifies the candidate of the Departmental Review Committee recommendation.

7. Descriptive material may be added to a candidate’s portfolio, either by the candidate or the department, at any time prior to the departmental vote.

8. If there is a negative departmental vote the candidate may submit additional documents that support his or her tenure. These documents are
G. Unit Review

1. The Chair of the PE&T Committee then notifies the tenured faculty that the departmental review has been completed and that the candidate’s portfolio is ready for review, and sets the time and place for the faculty to meet.

2. The Unit Review Committee should review all materials prior to the scheduled meeting. The portfolio is available to the Committee on the portfolio management system (currently Canvas). Each librarian by signing his/her name on the form provided at the unit meeting by the Chair of the PE&T Committee (see E.I.a) also indicates he/she has viewed the materials.

3. On the designated date and time the tenured library faculty, who now constitute the Unit Review Committee, will assemble to deliberate and vote on their recommendation. The Chair of the PE&T Committee should bring paper ballots and the signature page from the online UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form to the meeting. The meeting will be divided into an evidence-gathering phase and a final deliberative phase. These phases will be presided over by a temporary chair elected by the assembled members eligible to vote. Those not eligible to vote are the candidate’s Department Head, the Departmental Review Committee, and the Dean. No tenured faculty member may vote more than once. When the first phase of the meeting is determined to be over by a majority vote, the Dean, and those not eligible to vote will leave the meeting and the final deliberations will proceed.

4. A written ballot will be taken with the chair counting the ballots and reporting the vote to the Dean. The chair must ensure that all present sign the appropriate signature page of the UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form. Additionally, the chair must write a summary of the views of the assembled faculty, including any dissenting opinions, and give it to the Dean.

5. Following his or her review, the candidate is permitted to review the entire file including the recommendations of the Departmental Review Committee, the Department Head, the Unit Review Committee and the Dean, and any dissenting opinions on the course management system (currently Canvas). The candidate must sign the top of the signature page from the UNCG Promotion and Tenure Form confirming he/she has reviewed all the materials included in the file. The candidate may elect to write a brief statement commenting on the portfolio or on opinions expressed in it in order to draw attention to points that the candidate believes have been overlooked, are inaccurate or given inappropriate emphases or to rebut dissenting opinions. The candidate sends the Dean
his/her optional statement and the signature page. No other new material can be added to the file.

6. The Dean will forward to the Provost his/her recommendation, the unit chair’s summary of the Unit Review Committee’s recommendation which will include the number of faculty votes for and against a nomination, the department level votes and recommendations, and the candidate’s portfolio.

H. Decisions of the Departmental Review Committee, the Unit Review Committee, The Department Head, the Dean, the Chancellor, the University Promotions and Tenure Committee and the Board of Trustees

1. The Dean will make the text of his/her recommendation to the Provost available for the perusal of members of the Unit Review Committee.

2. Positive Recommendation: A majority of positive votes or a tied vote from both the Department Review Committee and the Unit Review Committee, along with a positive evaluation by the Department Head and Dean would constitute a positive recommendation. The Dean sends the Provost the candidate’s entire tenure file along with his/her own evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications for tenure. The Provost and Chancellor always have the option to send the tenure file to the University P&T Committee. If the Chancellor decides to recommend that permanent tenure be granted, he/she shall forward the recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The Board of Trustees shall decide whether to confer tenure.

3. Negative Recommendation: A majority of negative votes from both the Departmental Review Committee and the Unit Review Committee, along with a negative evaluation by the Department Head and by the Dean, would constitute a negative recommendation. Normally all negative reviews will not be reviewed by the University P&T Committee; however, the Provost may forward any portfolios to the University P&T Committee to be reviewed.

4. Mixed recommendations:
   a. When the Departmental Review Committee, the Unit Review Committee, the Department Head and the Dean disagree on tenure, the Dean will send the entire tenure package to the Provost along with his/her own evaluation and summary. The file will move through all stages of consideration at the University level regardless of who in the library made the negative recommendation.
   b. If the Chancellor decides not to recommend permanent tenure, the decision is final, even if the candidate opted to seek tenure earlier than the usual seven-year time frame.

5. The Chancellor’s notification to the faculty member of a negative decision is conveyed by a simple, unelaborated written statement. The faculty member may seek a review of that decision by the Board of Governors’ Committee on Personnel and Tenure in accordance with Section 301D of
The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina and with the procedures stipulated in Section 609D of The Code. The unsuccessful candidate has twelve months from July 1st of the year of the tenure decision to vacate his/her position.

I. Announcement of the Decision

1. Usually by the end of March, after the University Promotions and Tenure Committee has made its recommendations, the Provost’s Office notifies the Dean of University Libraries that they are submitting a recommendation for permanent tenure to the Board of Trustees, at which time the Dean of University Libraries may inform the candidate verbally of the recommendation.

2. The candidate will receive a letter from the Provost and subsequently from the Board of Trustees after the recommendation has been formally approved.

3. Tenure normally takes effect July 1 of the same year in which the Board of Trustees letter is received.

Appendix

External Reviewer Practices

Requests should be for letters of assessment, not for letters of recommendation.

Request letters from diverse sources.

Do not request external assessments from the candidate’s former teachers or students, those who have collaborated significantly with the candidate or others whose relationship to the candidate may make objective assessments difficult.

Assessments should be requested from external reviewers who have gone through the tenure process. It is inappropriate to send requests for assessments to librarians who do not participate in the tenure system for librarians.

The candidate should submit 3-4 names in priority order. Each external name submitted must be accompanied by a short description of the person’s credentials, including title, tenure status and professional accomplishments.

The candidate is not to contact the potential external reviewers him/herself to ask for permission to submit their name.

The Supervisor will request letters of evaluation from one or more “blind reviewers.” These evaluators often would not know the candidate personally.
External evaluators assess research and contributions to the profession
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