

**IULFC PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT**  
**October 6, 2003**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction

General Observations

Specific Recommendations

1. Promotion and Tenure Criteria
2. Standards for Documentation
3. Mentor Program
4. Mid-Tenure Review
5. Role of the Ruth Lilly University Dean of University Libraries
6. Role of the Libraries Human Resources Office
7. Role of the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee
8. Role of the IULFC (Indiana University Library Faculty Council)
9. Promotion to Full Librarian

Conclusion

Appendices

**INTRODUCTION**

On September 17, 2002, Suzanne Thorin, Ruth Lilly University Dean of University Libraries, appointed the following individuals to serve on the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Review Committee:

Lora Baldwin, Richmond;  
Diane Bever, Kokomo;  
Yolanda Cooper, Libraries Human Resources Office (Ex officio);  
Erika Dowell, Bloomington;  
Linda Fisher (Co-chair), South Bend;  
Vania Goodwin, Indianapolis;  
B. J. Irvine (Co-chair), Bloomington;  
Chris Long, Indianapolis;  
Gwen Pershing, Bloomington;  
Marty Rosen, New Albany;  
Carol Rusinek, Gary;  
Mary Stanley, Indianapolis;  
Richard Vaughan, Bloomington;  
Judie Violette, Fort Wayne; and  
Gary Wiggins, Bloomington (resigned August 2003).

The Dean's charge to this system-wide Committee was "to review tenure and promotion procedures and to issue a report and recommendations" (see Appendix I, "Charge 8/19/02"). She further stated that, as part of the review process, "the committee should:

- Review the current P&T criteria for IU Librarians and determine if the current criteria meets the criteria in the Academic Handbook and the current policies and practices of the various campuses;
- Assess the current documentation required for P&T, and insure that new forms of documentation, i.e., electronic, are included as appropriate;
- Review the criteria for full librarian;
- Assess the effectiveness of the P&T system-wide."

The charge also directed the Committee to "contact as appropriate, tenured and untenured librarians, past P&T committee members, promotion and tenure candidates, and faculty, including faculty P&T committee members, deans of the faculties and their offices, and library directors." Considerable documentation has been consulted by the committee including the following: Academic Handbook, IU, August 2001; Promotion & Tenure Review Committee Report, January 27, 1988; Library Faculty Handbook; IU Librarians Promotion & Tenure Committee, Committee Manual 2002/2003; "Preliminary Report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee", October 2002, and earlier annual committee reports back to 1998; promotion and tenure guidelines from all IU campuses; Scholarship Reconsidered, by Ernest Boyer; and other relevant materials.

At its first meeting, October 23, 2002, Dean Thorin reviewed the charge to the Committee and explained that this review was the result of various concerns noted over the past several years, that it was time to review the process since the last review had occurred fourteen years ago (1988), and that the review would serve to strengthen the "one voice" that is reflected by our system-wide promotion and tenure process. This first meeting also included a review of the 1988 report and presentations by Yolanda Cooper, Human Resources Office, and Fran Brahmi, Chair (2002), Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee. Next, brief presentations were made by each committee member regarding what they perceived as campus as well as system specific concerns.

In order to begin the information gathering process, the Committee agreed to schedule forums in Bloomington, Indianapolis, and South Bend beginning in November to open discussions about this topic. After these forums, each committee member would conduct individual interviews with approximately ten librarians to discuss their concerns. Additional meetings also would be scheduled with the current IUL Promotion and Tenure Committee and previous chairs for the past five years, as well as campus library directors and campus vice chancellors or deans as appropriate. It was further agreed that all working documents would be available on an e-reserves site created by Pershing and made available to all librarians. Concluding this very productive first meeting, the Committee agreed that a final report should be completed by the end of June 2003. During the Committee's second meeting on November 15, a meeting schedule through May 22, 2003 was outlined. By mid-November, Dean Thorin had agreed to an extension of this final report date. Due to system-wide representation on this committee, this meeting as well as future meetings would be conducted on the IUPUI campus and would require conference call arrangements.

The first IUPUI forum was held on November 15 with additional forums on November 22 (Bloomington and South Bend) and January 10 (Indianapolis). These forums were held without a set agenda as an opportunity for librarians to share any of their concerns or ideas about promotion and tenure. Issues raised at the forums provided the basis for the telephone interviews which were conducted from December through February. On December 19, an e-mail was sent to all IU librarians soliciting their individual input either in writing or in a direct interview with a committee member (Appendix II). All responses were confidential. (For the complete outline of topics used in interviews with librarians, see Appendix II.)

By early February 2003, committee members had interviewed or received email responses from 111 of the 182 librarians (61 percent). Over eighty pages of interview summaries were compiled for committee review including a brief summary--all of which was discussed at the February 26th meeting (see Appendix III). The Committee then identified the five areas to be addressed and assigned members to each subcommittee (see Appendix IV):

1. Criteria and related issues, including the balanced case;
2. Mid-tenure review, mentoring, and support, including the role of the Human Resources Office/Officer;
3. Documentation, including annual reviews in dossiers for campuses that require them;
4. Promotion to full librarian; and
5. Effectiveness of the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee, including the role of the Dean, the IULFC and continuity of requested actions, and the mentoring role of the Committee.

Brief updates on committee activities were provided at the Council of Head Librarians meeting, February 21, and Librarians' Day, April 25. Questions and topics were developed for the interviews with campus head librarians, vice chancellors and deans as appropriate. Given that every campus had a representative on this committee, those representatives proceeded with interviews with their library heads, or other campus officers.

Another aspect of the Review Committee's work which was addressed at several meetings was that of the distribution of ranks and tenure recommendations by campus and throughout the system. Numerous statistical summaries were prepared for this data (see Appendix V). This summary documented a highly successful rate of tenure and promotion for all campuses from 1980/81 through 2001/02. For example, among all campuses, during this time period, 156 tenure dossiers were presented with 152 (97%) librarians tenured, 2 (1.3%) not tenured, and 2 (1.3%) dossiers withdrawn from the process. Of 229 promotion dossiers, 198 (86%) librarians were promoted, 17 (17%) were not promoted, and 14 (6%) were withdrawn. It should be noted that 50% of the withdrawn promotion dossiers were for full rank and 50% for associate rank.

As part of its review of rank distributions, the Committee also devoted attention to whether there were any significant differences in the promotion rate from Associate to Full Librarian among the various campuses. Due to the small number of dossiers presented outside the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, the figures for all regional campuses have been analyzed together. Generally, there were relatively minor differences in the promotion rates between the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses and the differences that did exist appear to be related more to dossiers being withdrawn rather than to not being promoted to full rank (Appendix V). For example, from 1980/81 through 2001/02, for Bloomington full-rank dossiers, 32 dossiers were presented with 69 % (22) promoted, 19 % (6) not promoted, and 12 % (4) withdrawn. For Indianapolis full-rank dossiers, 17 dossiers were presented with 53 % (9) promoted, 29 % (5) not promoted, and 18 % (3) withdrawn. Among all regional campuses, four dossiers were presented for full rank and four were promoted (100%). Overall, by July 2003, 22% (20) of Bloomington, 21% (11) of Indianapolis librarians, and 9% (4) of Regional Campus librarians were at full rank (Appendix VI).

Review of librarians at all campuses in the Associate rank indicates that relatively high percentages of librarians have remained at this rank for an extended period of time (Appendix VII). For example, an analysis of the number of years in the Associate rank as of July 2003, shows the following distribution: 59% (54) of the librarians at the Bloomington campus, 54% (28) at Indianapolis, and 62% (26) at Regional Campuses are still in this rank. Although further investigation may be necessary to determine why librarians remain at the Associate rank, this data seems to support the widely-held perception that too few librarians are pursuing full rank promotions. At the same time that we uphold high standards for promotion, we encourage our colleagues to pursue promotion to the Librarian rank.

**Average Years in Current Rank and Average Years of Professional Experience for all Ranks and for Associate and Full Rank Librarians**

**ALL RANKS:**

	No. of Librarians	Yrs. in Current Rank	Years Prof. Experience
Bloomington	91	9.0	17.4
Indianapolis	52	5.5	15.8
Regional Campuses	41	7.7	16.1

**ASSOCIATE RANK:**

Bloomington	52	11.7	19.0
Indianapolis	28	7.1	17.0
Regional Campuses	26	9.9	18.6

**FULL RANK:**

Bloomington	20*	8.4	24.1
Indianapolis	11	5.2	25.5
Regional Campuses	4	3.0	22.8

\*It should be noted that since 1997, four librarians on the Bloomington Campus have been hired at full rank while only one at all other campuses were hired at this rank. (see Appendix VIII).

We were aware of differences in promotion and tenure practices on some campuses and local documentation was collected when available. For example, the following patterns for campus committee representation were identified.

- IU Bloomington does not have a separate promotion and tenure committee. There is a Peer Review Committee which makes recommendations regarding merit evaluation for the purpose of salary increments (see Appendix IX.a).
- IU East has a local faculty committee consisting of six elected, tenured faculty. Librarians are eligible for election (see Appendix IX.b).
- At the IPFW (Fort Wayne) campus, there are two committees, one a library peer review committee that includes all of the librarians, and one, a campus committee that may or may not include librarians when a library case is reviewed (see Appendix IX.c).
- The IUPUI (Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis) campus has a local promotion and tenure committee which reviews all dossiers. This committee includes representatives (some are appointed and some elected) from the professional schools, the IUPUI Library Faculty, and the IUPUI Faculty Council, and the Dean of Faculties as ex officio. All committee members are tenured and preferably at the rank of Professor or Librarian. In addition, the IUPUI University Library and Medical School Library have peer review committees and the Dental and Law School Libraries do not (see also Appendix IX.d).
- The Kokomo campus has an elected Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee (see Appendix IX.e).
- At Northwest, there is a campus committee composed of one representative appointed from each Division, and three representatives appointed from the Arts and Sciences. There also are one or two elected representatives dependent upon whether a library faculty member is appointed to the Committee in a given year. All committee members have to be tenured at the Associate rank or above. Librarians are only on this campus committee when a librarian will be considered for promotion and/or tenure or sabbatical leave (see Appendix IX.f).
- On the South Bend campus, there is an Academic Senate Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee of elected tenured and non-tenured faculty (see Appendix IX.g).

- On the Southeast campus, there are campus-wide committees that deal with promotion and tenure. When there is a candidate for either promotion and/or tenure, the library faculty also functions as a review committee. Librarians and teaching faculty serve together on the campus promotion and tenure committee (see Appendix IX.h).

As is apparent from the preceding summary, we have various procedures and practices on each campus relating to the selection and composition of promotion and tenure committees. Only the Fort Wayne campus and the IUPUI University Library and the Medical School Library have library peer review committees.

### **GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

During the course of its meetings with various groups, campus representatives, and individual librarians, the Committee concluded that most librarians were generally satisfied with promotion and tenure but that various aspects of the process could benefit from improved documentation and guidelines. For example, most agreed that the level of specificity of the criteria was adequate but that better guidelines and examples were needed. A major concern noted was that the campus or library mission statement should be central to each promotion and tenure case. Regarding the mentor program, most agreed it was a good program but that it needed to be better publicized and revitalized. Most agreed that mid-tenure review should be optional but that it should more closely resemble the promotion and tenure process. Support on each campus for research leaves, support grants, and sabbaticals seems to vary even though many librarians considered such support very important. There appear to be many opportunities but it is difficult to obtain staffing support for leaves, especially at the smaller campuses or in smaller departments.

Several observations were made about the promotion and tenure process. The differences in routing procedures among campuses were noted during the interviews as well as the relationship of the dossier to its campus mission. Although without consensus regarding resolution, some campuses do require inclusion of annual reviews in the dossier and that policy is campus specific and conforms to local guidelines for teaching faculty and librarians' dossiers. The role of the supervisor is important and requires more training and support through mentoring and workshops. Further clarification regarding the role of the Human Resources Officer was considered desirable. Many perceived this role as that of a facilitator for the process. There was general support for the role of the IULFC to be more of an advocate for librarians, to be more proactive, and to have a more clearly defined role in promotion and tenure.

The Committee agreed that in addition to making recommendations for improvements and changes regarding promotion and tenure guidelines, documentation, and related matters, it also would prepare some of the revised documents. These recommendations and their accompanying documentation are presented as part of this report.

## SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the major issues identified by the Committee's review of promotion and tenure.

### 1. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The criteria for both promotion and tenure have been revised and written as a single set of guidelines rather than as two separate statements (see current *Library Faculty Handbook*). This document also incorporates principles for promotion and tenure of librarians from the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*, 2001, and recommendations regarding the balanced case. The Committee was especially aware of the need for expanded guidance of what constitutes excellence in librarians' performance, professional development, research, and/or creativity, and service. This need has been met through the addition of sections entitled "indicators of quality" and "criteria for assessment" which follow each area to be evaluated.

The subcommittee also tried to emphasize the importance of the individual campus mission, both in constructing a case for promotion and/or tenure and in evaluating a case.

We recommend that the revised document, "Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Librarians" be adopted by the library faculty (see Appendix X).

### 2. Standards for Documentation

The recommended changes in the "Promotion and Tenure Criteria" required a review and revision of two existing documents, *Instructions for Dossier Preparation* and *Recommendations on Preparing Your Dossier*. The subcommittee decided that these two documents should be incorporated into one document and revised to comply with the new criteria. This document is entitled *Instructions/Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*. In addition, the *Promotion and Tenure Checklist Form* required minor revisions to comply with this new document. Both documents are in Appendix IX.

We recommend that the *Instructions for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* and the *Promotion and Tenure Checklist Form* be approved by the library faculty.

We recommend that the documents referred to in the *Instructions/Guidelines* be linked to as a Word and/or PDF files in the web copy.

We recommend that a review of the *Librarian's Annual Review Form: Preparation Guidelines* be conducted by the IULFC.

### **3. Mentor Program**

We recommend that the IULFC create a committee whose responsibility will be to manage a system-wide, voluntary, Mentor Program. This committee should include representatives from a variety of IUL libraries and should include past members of the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Committee should establish a program that insures that new librarians are given the opportunity to have a mentor, and that those who want to mentor others may do so. The Committee should annually contact participants to monitor the success of the program.

In addition to contacting new librarians, we urge the Committee to create a web site that will allow mentors and those in need of a mentor to register for the program at any time. Registration should include the ability to request a mentor based on a particular preference (i.e., type of library work, campus location, etc.) We also recommend that the Committee continue regularly to present programs at Librarians' Day to inform librarians about the program, as well as to educate prospective mentors about the mentoring relationship.

If the preceding recommendations are accepted, the following documents will need to be revised appropriately.

- (1) The "Goal", "Role of Mentor", and "Responsibility of the Librarian" descriptions found in the "Indiana University Libraries Mentor Program" sections of the *Library Faculty Handbook* would remain the same.
- (2) The "Implementation" section would change to describe the new procedures for requesting a mentor. The IULFC will need to document the details of the Committee's responsibilities and composition in the "IULFC Operational Guidelines".

### **4. Mid-Tenure Review**

We recommend that the current Mid-Tenure Review process be revised so that it more closely mimics the full promotion and tenure process. We also recommend that librarians who choose to be reviewed be required to submit a brief written statement documenting their professional experience to the date of the mid-tenure review (similar to the Summary Statement in the promotion and tenure dossier). Additionally, a similar statement from the librarian's supervisor shall be required. If a campus requires annual reviews be included in the promotion and tenure dossier, they also should be included in the Mid-Tenure Review process. Those working on campuses that do not require annual reviews, may choose to exclude annual reviews.

This process also will require that the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee provide a similar level of feedback to librarians going through the Mid-Tenure Review, as they do with candidates going through the full promotion and tenure process. Due to the increased work this process may require, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may want to consider reviewing mid-tenure dossiers at a time other than during the traditional promotion and tenure week.

If the preceding recommendations are accepted, the following documents will need to be revised appropriately:

- (1) Mid-Tenure Review for Librarians  
(<http://www.indiana.edu/~libpers/MIDTENRV.pdf>);
- (2) Mid-Tenure Review Form (<http://www.indiana.edu/~libpers/midtenfm.doc>);  
and the
- (3) Mid-Tenure Review Checklist form  
(<http://www.indiana.edu/~libpers/reviewlist.doc>).

## **5. Role of the Ruth Lilly University Dean of University Libraries**

The Dean has two distinct roles, one as system-wide Ruth Lilly University Dean of University Libraries, the other as head of the libraries in Bloomington. Thus, the Dean provides overall leadership, direction, communication, coordination, and assessment of the library system as a whole as well as for the individual units of the Bloomington Libraries. The Dean's role for the system as well as for Bloomington is to seek excellence for the Indiana University Libraries and to make certain that the librarians and staff work together to ensure Indiana University's pre-eminence in higher education. Another role for the Dean is to communicate the importance of faculty status for librarians to those both inside and outside the IU Libraries.

The Dean, with approval from the Vice Chancellor, and the Dean of Faculties, appoints librarians from all campuses to the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee. We recommend that a roster of Promotion and Tenure Committee members, including the years they served, be maintained by the IU Libraries Human Resources Office. It is highly desirable that the composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee reflects the diversity of the IU Library Faculty, and care should be taken to ensure that the same members do not serve repeatedly. The Dean should take into consideration previous years of service on the committee as new appointments are made.

On the Bloomington campus, the Dean should be thoroughly involved in the promotion and tenure process of a new librarian from the first day of employment, communicating library goals, articulating expectations, and providing encouragement, support, and guidance. On a system-wide level, the Dean should reinforce the active involvement of the other library deans, directors, and supervisors because they play a very important role in guiding, mentoring, and educating untenured librarians. The Dean is in charge of the integrity and effectiveness of the promotion and tenure process. We recommend that the Dean speak to each IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee about the importance of their role and about the procedures to be followed.

## **6. Role of the Libraries Human Resources Office**

As documented in the IULFC "Operational Guidelines" and the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee "Organization and Procedures", the Libraries Human Resources Office/Officer [current title is Assistant Dean for Libraries Human Resources] serves "as

administrative support" in the promotion and tenure process, keeping IUL librarians up to date with relevant deadlines and forms. We recommend that this role of the Assistant Dean for Libraries Human Resources be maintained as currently stated in the IULFC documentation and that this position serve in a supporting role during IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings.

## **7. Role of the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee**

We strongly recommend that the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee be limited to tenured librarians. Having untenured librarians on the Promotion and Tenure Committee runs counter to the faculty model. Furthermore, untenured librarians may lack the necessary experience to make informed judgments.

If this recommendation is not accepted and untenured librarians remain on the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee, we recommend that untenured librarians not be appointed to chair this committee.

We recommend that the Committee continue to offer and actively promote attendance at workshops for supervisors and candidates. We also recommend that the Committee carefully read the previous year's annual reports and check the status of action items from each of those reports. In regard to the latter, the Committee should work closely with the IULFC Faculty Standards Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee should look at the templates (letters) to determine if they need to be revised to describe more accurately the candidate's ability to meet the criteria. The Committee needs to be aware that a local promotion and tenure committee composed largely of non-librarians will read their recommendations on most campuses and will be looking for guidance from them.

We recommend that past Committee members should be asked to advise individuals on tenure and promotion matters. Although we recognize the commitment of time that this requires of outgoing members, past members of the Committee are well placed to offer advice gleaned from their recent service without appearing to violate the Committee's impartiality, as might be the case if current committee members offer advice.

## **8. Role of IULFC (Indiana University Library Faculty Council)**

We have discovered repeated instances where recommendations made in the Promotion and Tenure Committee's annual report were not addressed by the IULFC in subsequent years. We strongly recommend that the out-going and in-coming Secretaries of the IULFC meet each year prior to the first convening of the IULFC to ensure that issues raised the previous year are addressed in the current year by the appropriate IULFC committee.

Furthermore, we recommend that, prior to the Promotion and Tenure Committee's first meeting, the IULFC Secretary provide the Chair of the Committee with a report detailing issues raised during the previous year and actions that have been taken to address them.

The language in all documents must be kept up to date, so changes in wording need to move quickly through the appropriate approval mechanisms.

## **9. Promotion to Full Librarian**

The recommendations for promotion to full librarian rank have been incorporated into the first section on "promotion and tenure criteria" (see "3. Promotion from Associate Librarian to Librarian" in Appendix X). The Committee expanded the original guidelines with the following statement:

"The librarian's performance and contributions to the secondary area must be carefully documented so that the quality is unquestionable and extraordinary in relation to peers."

In addition, the Committee recommends that a list of at least four references should be provided by the candidate. These persons should be acknowledged experts who know the candidate and his/her work well enough to write an evaluative statement and should have agreed to serve as references. At least three of the referees should not be currently affiliated with Indiana University. Referees would not normally be current or former co-workers or supervisor(s) of the candidate.

We recommend that a stronger mentoring role is needed to encourage librarians to pursue full rank. This role should be provided by supervisors, directors, deans, and other full-rank librarians. The Committee focused on areas to which we could contribute most directly; however, it was acknowledged that the responsibility for local budgets that might provide release time for staffing coverage during research and/or sabbatical leaves varies by campus.

## **CONCLUSION**

The IULFC Promotion and Tenure Review Committee has prepared this report in fulfillment of its charge from Dean Suzanne Thorin. We met numerous times over the past year gathering information and listening to concerns of librarians. During this time, the Committee has interviewed over sixty percent of the librarians in the entire system, held four forums, reviewed and evaluated promotion and tenure documentation (including annual Promotion and Tenure Committee reports, statistical reports, manuals, and related documentation).

From this documentation we selected the five areas that we thought could be addressed with actionable outcomes and developed appropriate recommendations. While many librarians expressed concerns regarding some aspects of our current system of promotion and tenure, it was clear in the Committee's interviews with librarians that support for the system is strong. However, the process needed to be clarified and strengthened in some ways. The new criteria and documentation documents seek to define expectations more clearly both for candidates and evaluators, without becoming overly specific. Changes in the way the mentor program is administered are designed to make librarians more

proactive in supporting their colleagues. Recommendations regarding the roles of the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Human Resources Office, the Ruth Lilly University Dean of University Libraries, and the IULFC are intended to improve the overall health and effectiveness of the process.

To paraphrase one of the librarians interviewed, the library faculty make a lifetime commitment to a colleague when it grants tenure to him or her. It is important to make the system strong and to have high standards, and yet provide the flexibility to accommodate the wide variety of activities present in an academic library.

The Committee looks forward to discussing this report with librarians during the fall 2003 semester. Unless substantial revisions are necessary, we hope that the IULFC will present the recommendations to the library faculty for approval early in 2004.