MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures of the

Library

Effective Date: July 1, 2023

APPROVALS (Print name)	SIGNATURE	DATE SIGNED
Jason Clark		3/15/2023 | 4:16
Department Faculty	Chair, Library Review Committee	
N/A		
Primary Administrative Reviewer	Department Head/Director	
Doralyn Rossman		3/15/2023 | 4:16 P
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	College Dean	
N/A		
College Review Committee	Chair, College Review Committee	
Durward K. Sobek II		3/15/2023 | 4:16
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	Chair, University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion	
[signature] 3/23/23		3/15/2023 | 4:16
Provost		

Role and Scope Document
for
The LIBRARY

Article I.   Role and Scope of Unit

The College of the Library supports and advances teaching, learning, and research for Montana State University and the people of Montana, by providing access to information and knowledge.

Library services are distinguished by personalized attention offered to students, faculty, and staff, and the development of collections that support the entire range of the curriculum. The Library works to create a robust information environment for Montana State University and the State of Montana.

The Library aspires to build innovative digital and physical spaces where people are able to access and

1

apply information to grow intellectually, build meaningful collaborations, and communicate ideas. The Library does this through multiple facets of librarianship, including: providing **Instruction,** managing and developing **Collections, Resource Description, and Access** to services and resources, developing and implementing **Library Processes and Operations**, providing **Research Support,** and through **Community Engagement and Outreach.**

Librarianship, the discipline we practice, arises from the professional training and the resultant work we do in specific institutional settings. At its base, librarianship is responsible for supplying the lifeblood of the rest of the academy—access to information for the advancement of knowledge, invention, and teaching.[1]

The terminal degree in the profession of librarianship is an American Library Association (ALA) accredited Master of Library Science degree or equivalent library degree.[2]

The Library's Standards for Successful Faculty Appointments are:

1. A Master's degree from an ALA accredited graduate program or terminal degree in a field appropriate to the position;
2. Demonstrated potential to practice librarianship in an academic environment in support of and partnership with undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and the general public; and,
3. Potential to be effective in scholarship and service.

Article II.   Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Section 2.01 Appointment and Evaluation

Research faculty in the Library are non-tenurable faculty whose assignment principally involves research. Their primary responsibility is to contribute to the research mission of the University and to the scholarly productivity of the Library.

---

[1] Lowry, C. B. "Research and Scholarship Defined for portal: Libraries and the Academy." *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, vol. 4 no. 4, 2004, pp. 449-453. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/pla.2004.0068

[2] http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/employment/foreigncredentialing/forjobseekers

2

They are appointed using the processes and procedures of the Department and following University policies outlined in the Faculty Handbook: Appointment and Employment of Faculty, Section 6. The title of a research faculty member is determined at the time of hire and is dependent upon the experience and qualifications of the appointee.

In particular, the initial level of appointment of a research faculty member is consistent with the standards and expectations for scholarship found in Articles 8, 9 and 11, and may be as Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, or Research Professor. In order for a research faculty member to be appointed, there must be funding available to support the appointment through grants, either their own or those of a tenurable faculty member, or other external funding sources. Appointment is also based on evidence that the research faculty member's work contributes to the furtherance of the Library's goals in scholarly productivity.

Research faculty appointees are to be evaluated annually by their Department Head or supervisor in the Library, and the evaluation is to be conducted in accordance with the timetable for NTT faculty evaluations.

The dean shall include the result of the review in the faculty member's personnel file.

Article III. Annual Review Process

The annual review will evaluate the performance of each tenurable faculty member in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service as defined in the Faculty Handbook, their letter of hire, position description and/or goals from previous reviews. Each non-tenurable faculty member who is not in the collective bargaining unit shall receive an annual review as appropriate to their appointment, letter of hire, position description and goals from the previous year, if applicable. The Library will use the University's annual review form. Non-tenure track faculty who are part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) will be evaluated annually according to the procedures in the CBA and receive a written evaluation.

The faculty member, their supervisor, the associate dean, and/or the dean annually review the faculty member's performance relative to the faculty member's assigned percentages of effort and current assigned responsibilities. Reviews assess the faculty member's performance in each of the major areas of responsibility (teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service) over the preceding calendar year.

An annual review is an assessment of the faculty member's performance over a one-year period. This is in contrast to retention, tenure, and promotion reviews which are based upon the cumulative performance of the faculty member in each area (teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service) over the review period appropriate to the review. Thus, a record of having favorable annual reviews does not guarantee the candidate has assembled and demonstrated a cumulative record that meets the standards for retention, tenure or promotion.

Each faculty member shall be assigned specific duties and responsibilities that meet the Library's needs and enable the faculty member to fulfill the responsibilities of the position. The dean shall ensure that, taken collectively, the assignments of the faculty shall meet the Library's obligations to the University.

3

The dean of the Library, with input from the faculty member's supervisor, rates the performance of each faculty member using the rating system on the annual review form, including comments.

The faculty member and the dean of the Library will be provided with a copy of or access to the annual review, ratings and any revision of the assigned percentages of effort. Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member will be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the Library.

A faculty member who disagrees with an annual review or individual rating may appeal by submitting a rationale for their disagreement and forwarding it to the dean of the Library. The rationale must be filed with the dean of the Library within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the annual review. The dean of the Library shall consider the appeal and may support or assign a different performance rating in any area of responsibility. The dean of the Library shall notify the faculty member and their supervisor, in writing, of the decision regarding the appeal within ten (10) business days of receipt of the request.

Article IV.   Primary Review Committee and Administrator

The College's formal reviews are conducted at the following levels in the following order: The Library Review Committee (Section Article IV, Section 4.01), associate dean of the Library (Article IV, Section 4.02), and dean of the Library (Article V).

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

The Library Review Committee (LRC), which serves as the Library's Primary Review Committee, shall consist of three (3) tenured faculty members who shall be elected by plurality. In March or by an earlier date if established by the provost, the Library Faculty Advisory Council (LFAC) shall prepare a ballot listing eligible faculty for the term beginning April 1 and distribute it to the faculty for voting. Since the Faculty Handbook states that "Normally, at least one-half of the members will have attained the rank of professor," rank will be identified on the ballot. Due to the small size of the College of the Library, at least one third of the LRC members will have attained full professor rank in a normal year. The Library encourages diversity in the composition of the LRC. A run-off election shall resolve a tie vote. The LRC shall select a chair from among the members. There is no limit to the number of times an individual may be elected to the LRC. The LRC will follow the provisions as designated in the Faculty Handbook (section 2).

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The associate dean of the Library shall serve as the Primary Review Administrator. The associate dean of the Library, when serving as the primary review administrator, shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, conduct an independent and substantive review of the candidate's dossier and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The recommendation shall include a written rationale. If the administrator's recommendation does not concur with those of the LRC, the administrator's rationale must explain the point(s) of difference.

Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities

(a) The LRC shall be elected by the Library faculty as outlined above in 4.01 and facilitated by LFAC.

4

(b) The LRC shall select external reviewers and solicit review letters in a timely manner to meet deadlines as outlined by the provost.

(c) Internal review writers shall be selected and solicited by the LRC. The candidate may not solicit reviews. It is permissible for the candidate to inquire of potential reviewers in order to determine the reviewer's availability before submitting their name(s) to the LRC.

(d) The LRC shall ensure that the following materials are included in the Dossier:

> (i) Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer.

> (ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document.

> (iii) Letter of hire and any position description(s) (formerly called "role descriptions"), any changes to percentages of effort, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU. In some cases, the candidate's only position description is what was included in their letter of hire.

> (iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period (if applicable). If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the Library will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.

(e) The associate dean of the Library shall be responsible for maintaining copies of all LRC evaluation letters and internal (if applicable) and external review letters after the review has been completed.

Section 4.04 Next Level Review

See the beginning of article IV for an outline of the levels of review.

Article V. Intermediate Administrator

The dean of the Library shall serve as the Intermediate Administrator. When serving as the intermediate review administrator, the dean of the Library shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, conduct an independent and substantive review of the candidate's dossier and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The recommendation shall include a written rationale. If the dean of the Library's recommendation does not concur with those of the LRC or the associate dean of the Library, the dean of the Library's rationale must explain the point(s) of difference.

The candidate's Dossier will proceed to the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC). The Library faculty shall vote to select a representative and alternate member for the URTPC from the eligible tenured members of the faculty. They shall serve a three-year term, as is dictated by the URTPC charge.

5

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate

A full list of materials should be prepared based on the Faculty Handbook's outline of a Candidate's rights and responsibilities. As of January 2019, the Faculty Handbook's full list is as follows(a-n):

a. Candidates are responsible for reading and familiarizing themselves with the requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and the Role and Scope Documents.

b. Candidates are responsible for attending training regarding retention, tenure, and promotion offered by the provost's office.

c. Faculty members who wish to initiate a review for early tenure or promotion to professor must notify the associate dean of the Library by the date established by the provost. For mandatory reviews (*i.e.*, retention and tenure), the provost will notify candidates, heads, and deans of the faculty scheduled for mandatory reviews each year.

d. Candidates will submit materials for External Review, if required by the type of review, to the associate dean of the Library by the deadlines established by the provost. These materials must include:

i. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.

ii. Letter of hire and any position description(s). In some cases, the candidate's only position description is what was included in their letter of hire.

iii. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of Scholarship.

iv. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their Scholarship.

e. Candidates will prepare and submit their materials for the Dossier to the primary review administrator by the deadlines established by the provost. These materials must include:

i. The "Cover Sheet", obtained from the Provost's office.

ii. A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.

iii. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of Scholarship.

iv. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.

v. For tenure and promotion reviews, only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered. For retention reviews, departments will establish within their Role and Scope documents requirements regarding publication status. Candidates will provide documentation of the acceptance for publication, performance, or exhibition.

Scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but not yet published or published in a journal not readily available through university databases must be included among the candidate's materials. Creative scholarly products, such as works of art or films, must be made available to reviewers by means specified in the applicable Role and Scope Documents.

For each scholarly activity or product that involves collaboration, the candidate will briefly specify their contribution to the activity or product.

f. The candidate is solely responsible for the preparation, organization, and submission of materials in the Dossier and is responsible for any negative result caused by incomplete submission.

g. A candidate who fails to submit required materials for a retention or tenure review by the established deadlines forfeits the opportunity for review and will be denied retention or tenure and will receive a terminal employment contract for the following year.

h. The candidate may not solicit letters for retention, tenure, or promotion review. External and internal letters will be solicited by the LRC.

i. The candidate will promptly report any perceived conflicts of interest with members of review committees (see Faculty Handbook; Annual Review, Retention, Tenure & Promotion section; RTP-Rights and Responsibilities subsection; number 3).

j. The candidate will comply with requests for additional information and/or materials from a review committee or reviewing administrator and provide the requested material to the requesting committee or administrator within five (5) days of the request. The information and/or materials shall be added to the Dossier by the appropriate administrator with notice to the preceding review committees and reviewing administrators.

k. Candidates shall notify the associate dean of the Library of any unavailability during the review period. A candidate may request an extension of the deadline for responding to requests for information or to Evaluation Letters only if there are unanticipated, extenuating circumstances. Any request for extension must be submitted to the Chair of the URTPC at least one (1) day before the deadline expires.

l. The candidate may not add, alter, or remove any materials after the submission deadline unless requested by a review committee or administrator. A candidate may submit a written request to the Chair of the URTPC to correct any factual error(s) in Evaluation Letters. The URTPC Chair will take the action necessary to correct any identified factual errors.

m. If a candidate receives a negative recommendation (or tie vote) from a review committee or an administrative reviewer, they may submit a response to the entity that issued the Evaluation Letter(s) within five (5) days of delivery of the Evaluation Letter. The response must be limited to matters raised in the Evaluation Letters.

n. The candidate has the right to pursue a formal grievance as outlined in the Grievance Policy if they receive a negative recommendation from the provost.

For retention reviews, candidates should submit scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the review period and scholarly projects in process that illustrate their effectiveness in scholarship and progress toward tenure (see section 6.01 e. v.). For tenure, and promotion reviews in the Library, candidates may submit only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the review period. In the separate evaluation of teaching, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (see section 6.01 e. iv.), Library candidates shall address the multifaceted aspects of teaching/librarianship. Teaching/Librarianship includes library- specific responsibilities such as providing access to information through **Instruction, Collections, Resource Description, Access, Library Processes and Operations,** or **Community Engagement and Outreach**, or through teaching credit bearing courses.

For internal reviews, the candidate shall present to the LRC the following materials by an appropriate date set by the LRC each year in advance of the deadline set by the provost:
- The name of one potential internal reviewer (internal to MSU, though not necessarily internal to the Library).
- The candidate's comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- The candidate's letter of hire and any position description(s). In some cases, the candidate's only position description is what was included in their letter of hire.

In addition, for external reviews (**d.** above), the LRC shall require that the candidates present to the LRC:

- The name and contact information for one potential external reviewer, as well as an explanation of your relationship with that person, if any.

For external reviews, the candidate shall present to the LRC the following materials by an appropriate date set by the LRC each year:
- The candidate's comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- The candidate's letter of hire and any position description(s). In some cases, the candidate's only position description is what was included in their letter of hire.
- A statement describing the candidate's contribution to the scholarly record and the impact of the 5 scholarly products that, in the candidate's judgment, best represent their Scholarship. Statements should not be more than 1,500 words in length.
- Brief statement of their research focus, not to exceed 50 words.
- Copies or links to the candidate's top 5 examples of their research and creative output
- A statement explaining the candidate's contribution to any collaborative scholarly work, not to exceed one page.

These external review materials must be clearly requested by the LRC in writing from each candidate in advance of the deadline set by the provost. Candidates shall prepare these materials in advance of the full dossier and may submit updated materials (e.g. adding new items to their CV, extending or revising their personal statement) for submission at the later date.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The role played by the candidate in collaborative or multi-authored publications, creative works and grant proposals should be described. Candidates shall annotate their CVs and describe in their research sections their roles in collaborations and/or their contributions to projects with multiple authors. Descriptions of roles and contributions may include:

- Conception or design of the work
- Data collection, data analysis and/or interpretation
- Drafting the article
- Major revisions

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 7.

For all levels of review, the LRC shall solicit internal peer review letters from at least three (3) MSU-Bozeman faculty, a minority of which may be from one (1) name submitted by the candidate. At least one of the internal reviewers shall be from within the MSU Library. The areas to be addressed by each reviewer shall be determined by the LRC based upon library standards and indicators.

For retention reviews, the LRC will provide internal reviewers with the following materials:

i. The library standards and indicators relevant to the level of review, as found in this role and scope document. The candidate's comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.

ii. The candidate's letter of hire and any position description(s). In some cases, the candidate's only position description is what was included in their letter of hire.

For tenure and promotion reviews, external peer reviews, (see 6.01 d. for a list of the materials that shall be reviewed) are required from at least four (4) respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of Scholarship who will provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's Scholarship. Brief biographical information about each external reviewer shall be included with their review. The LRC may invite one recommendation from the candidate and that committee shall select the remaining reviewers. The name of the candidate-recommended reviewer shall be noted in the Dossier if the LRC solicits and receives a review from that individual.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope document by notifying the LRC.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII.   Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

(a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and

(b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and

(c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Productivity should be consistent with the expectations of rank and the profession of librarianship and should take into account the quality and percent effort assigned to the candidate in the area of the standard. Scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period shall be listed.

For retention, candidates should show effectiveness in teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service, integration of two areas, and progress toward tenure (Section 8.02). (See Faculty Handbook; Annual Review, Retention, Tenure & Promotion section; RTP-Definitions subsection, Effectiveness).

The quality of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service should be considered beyond the mere number of works or occurrences.

Effectiveness in **Scholarship** for retention is measured by, at minimum, one scholarly contribution to the field of librarianship from Group 1, as outlined in Section 9.03.

Further expectations for **Scholarship** are described in Section 9.04

10

Effectiveness in **Teaching/Librarianship** is as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in **Service** is as described in Section 9.04.

Candidates are expected to show **integration** of two of the three above areas.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The documentation for teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service should address the attainment of standards outlined in Section 8.04.

Evidence of performance indicators for **teaching/librarianship, service** and **integration** are listed in Section 9.05.

Scholarship: The candidate shall list full and accurate citations for scholarly products that include links to digital copies of that work (See 6.01 e. v.). All work should be listed chronologically, with the most recent first. Peer-reviewed publications should be identified. The candidate shall provide the full text of up to 5 examples of their research and creative output. Both funded and unfunded grant applications should be listed, with status clearly demarcated. Research or creative work outside the field of information science should also be listed here. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For tenure and promotion reviews in the Library, candidates may submit only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the review period. For retention, *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

(a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
(b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service, and,
(c) accomplishment in scholarship.

11

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Teaching/ Librarianship: Performance indicators for academic teaching in the field of librarianship are multiple and varied. **A candidate should address the following as appropriate to their position description. Indicators that address a candidate's duties as outlined in their position description(s) for the review period will be given most weight.** It is not expected that each candidate will address every indicator. Candidates should insert bold headings to reference their work, as applicable; activities may fit into more than one indicator. If additional activities do not fit under listed headings, candidates should clearly define that activity's support of the Library's mission, vision, and/or values. Indicators include:

- **Instruction:** Teaching information, research skills, and critical thinking; integrating information literacy into the curriculum; developing and teaching credit courses that facilitate critical engagement with information and knowledge creation; research consultations; pedagogical innovation; use of open educational resources (OER) in instruction. OER are defined as "teaching, learning, and research e-resources that are free of cost and access barriers, and which also carry legal permission for open use. Generally, this permission is granted by use of an open license (for example, Creative Commons licenses) which allows anyone to freely use, adapt and share the resource—anytime, anywhere."

- **Collections:** Developing, selecting, or maintaining the Library's digital and print collections.

- **Resource Description:** Developing and/or implementing methods of organizing, classifying, and cataloging information resources; applying and developing metadata and structured data.

- **Access:** Innovating, providing, and enhancing access to information resources; developing useful physical and digital spaces; designing and developing software and electronic resources for knowledge discovery.

- **Research Support**: Providing research consultations; advancing researcher profiles and identity services; offering publication and author services; providing copyright advising and consultation; providing data services and advising.

- **Library Processes and Operations:** Creating, implementing, and evaluating collections, services, methods, procedures, and workflows; managing human resources, material/financial resources.

- **Community Engagement and Outreach:** Developing and promoting Library services, partnerships, or projects.

This list is representative, but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching/librarianship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The LRC will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Scholarship: The diverse nature of Library faculty encourages a wide variety of scholarly activity, including work in other fields and areas of study. While Library faculty are encouraged to pursue their interests in research and creative activities wherever they lie, their publication record is expected to include contributions to the field of Library and information science.

Appropriate scholarly products and activities for Library faculty are weighted into groups. The types of scholarly products and activities could include but are not limited to the items below. The indicators

12

listed in Group I are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Group II also contribute to performance but carry less weight.

Products that fulfill advanced degree requirements will not count toward the scholarly record, however, products that are a result of that research including, but not limited to, items from Groups 1 or 2, may be counted towards an individual's scholarly record.

Those scholarly products and activities that contribute to the field of Library and Information Science, yet do not appear on these lists shall be clearly defined and described by the candidate. Candidates who feel that Group 2 items should be given more weight shall make the case for impact in the field of Library and Information Science.

Group 1

- Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, book chapters, textbooks, or reports and associated supplementary materials (datasets, charts, code)
- Peer-reviewed presentations at state, regional, national, or international conferences
- Awards of external grant funding
- Editorial work that includes original authorship or visioning
- Invited talks, colloquia, and seminars

Group 2

- Published (non-peer reviewed) articles, books, book chapters, textbooks, or reports and associated supplementary materials (datasets, charts, code)
- Presentations at state, regional, national, or international conferences
- Internal grants funded
- Grant proposals submitted (external and internal)
- Works of scholarship that use digital evidence, digitally enabled methods of inquiry, digital publication, and digital preservation to achieve scholarly and research goals (i.e. Digital Scholarship)

Service: Library faculty are expected to engage in meaningful service and collectively participate in meeting the land grant mission of the university. All indicators are considered primary Service indicators. The LRC will determine the weight of each indicator. Service indicators include but are not limited to:

- Participation in the shared governance of the university at the departmental, college, or university levels
- Service to the profession through activities such as committee participation or acting in leadership positions
- Service and outreach to the people of Montana and the public including delivery of knowledge and scholarship
- Formal or substantive mentoring of faculty, staff, student employees or other library employees
- Serving as a reviewer of scholarly papers or proposals
- Editorial work that serves the profession and advances knowledge

Integration: the creation of synergistic relationships among the teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service contributions of faculty. As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate

integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching/librarianship, and service. The LRC shall determine the weight of each integration. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

Examples of integration may include:

- Integration of Teaching/Librarianship and Scholarship: developing grants, articles, or other scholarly products that innovate the practice of Librarianship.
- Integration of Service and Scholarship: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of Teaching Librarianship and Service: collaborating with the community to provide librarianship/teaching resources and events.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Productivity should be consistent with the expectations of rank and the profession of librarianship and should take into account the quality and percent effort assigned to the candidate in the area of the standard. Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered.

The quality of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service should be considered beyond the mere number of works or occurrences.

Teaching/Librarianship: Candidates are expected to describe competent execution of activities and products as appropriate to the candidate's job assignment, and as outlined in the candidate's Letter of Hire and Position Description.

Effectiveness in teaching/librarianship is shown by competent and satisfactory levels of performance as demonstrated by active engagement in ongoing efforts tied to job assignments.

Scholarship: *Accomplishment* is measured by a record of scholarship that demonstrates an impact on the profession at the national level. It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure that demonstrate Accomplishment. (see Faculty Handbook; Annual Review, Retention, Tenure & Promotion section; RTP-Definitions subsection, Accomplishment).

At a minimum, an average of one scholarly contribution to the field of LIS per year, for the duration of the tenure review period, is expected of faculty. Candidates should identify prestige of venue, scope of audience, and impact on the field as appropriate to the contribution. For example, national or international venues often demonstrate greater impact than local or regional ones. The candidate shall demonstrate and describe their impact in the profession and a continuing record of work through measures such as citation impact, community engagement, national recognition, etc. and describe efforts, if any, to provide open access to scholarship. Open access materials, including Open Educational Resources (OER), are provided through a licensing model for scholarly communication that makes research information available to readers at no cost.

In cases where the work is a joint effort with others, candidates should refer to Section 6.02. In cases

14

where the product lies outside of the field of LIS, candidates should explain their relevance to the field. It is expected that some scholarly products are published in LIS venues.

External grant funding is Group 1 product, and like other works of scholarship, not specifically required. Funded and unfunded grants should be listed, though external funded grants demonstrate greater impact in the field. Candidates should demonstrate what they have learned from unfunded grants as professional progress.

Editing journals or books is a varied task that may be considered scholarship or service, and candidates may make a case for this activity in one of those categories. For those aspects of the work for which scholarship is chosen, candidates should demonstrate how the work furthers their impact on the LIS field or expands their scholarly reputation.

Service: *Effectiveness* in Service shall be demonstrated by a candidate's continuing record of service in at least two of the criteria outlined in Section 9.03. Candidates should demonstrate active participation and competent execution of tasks.

Library committees may count as service or librarianship. Candidates should explain/differentiate how those tasks fulfill commitments.

Editing journals or books is a varied task that may be considered service or scholarship, and candidates may make a case for pieces of their activity in one of those categories. For those aspects of the work for which service is chosen, candidates should demonstrate how their activities serve the profession and enable the spread of new knowledge.

Integration: Candidates are expected to show integration of two of the three above areas.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The documentation for teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service should address the attainment of standards outlined in Section 9.04.

Teaching/Librarianship: In an expository manner, the candidate should emphasize how and what was accomplished and its importance and relevance to the University and the field of Librarianship.

Scholarship: The candidate shall list full and accurate citations for any scholarly products. All work should be listed chronologically, with the most recent first. Peer-reviewed publications should be identified. The candidate shall identify five (5) of their best research or creative activities by placing an asterisk before the items. At a minimum, these five contributions shall be included as part of their dossier. Both funded and unfunded grant applications should be listed, with status clearly demarcated. Research or creative work outside the field of information science should also be listed here.

Service: The candidate shall list all service for the review period making note of the type of service as listed in Section 9.03. Products of such activities should be included as a representative sample rather than a cumulative collection. The candidate shall emphasize those activities that had the greatest impact, importance, and relevance to each community.

Integration: The candidate shall list the activities and products that show clear examples of integration, as outlined in 9.04. This list need not be exhaustive, but the candidate shall demonstrate the process,

15

benefits to each area, and outcomes of at minimum one integration of two of the above categories.

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

(a)   sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
(b)   sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
(c)   excellence in scholarship.

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document, with the following two exceptions. In teaching/librarianship expectations, an additional weight is placed on projects that benefit the Montana State University Library. In service expectations, an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Teaching/Librarianship: The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching/librarianship as defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that the candidate shall demonstrate the sustained effectiveness over the review period.

Scholarship: *Excellence* is measured by a record of scholarship that demonstrates a considerable impact on the profession through the national or international recognition of work that contributes to the field and a substantial body of work that represents contributions to the field. (see Faculty Handbook; Annual Review, Retention, Tenure & Promotion section; RTP-Definitions subsection, Excellence).

Sustained contributions to the field of LIS during the review period are expected of candidates at this

16

review level. Candidates should provide evidence to support the university standard (Section 11.02 (a)). in reference to their position description and the performance indicators and weighting outlined in Section 9.03. Candidates should identify prestige of venue, scope of audience, and impact on the field as appropriate to the contribution. Further expectations are documented in Section 9.04.

Service: The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service as defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that the candidate shall have a continuing record of service in at least two of the criteria outlined in Section 9.03.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The documentation for teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service should address the attainment of standards outlined in Section 11.04.

Teaching/Librarianship: In an expository manner, the candidate should emphasize how and what was accomplished, its importance, record of continuing effectiveness, and relevance to the University and the field of Librarianship.

Scholarship: The candidate shall list full and accurate citations for any scholarly products. All work should be listed chronologically, with the most recent first. Peer-reviewed publications should be identified. For promotion reviews, the candidate shall identify approximately five (5) of their best research or creative activities by placing an asterisk before the items. At a minimum, these five contributions shall be included as part of their dossier. Funded grant applications should be listed, with funding source clearly demarcated. Research or creative work outside the field of information science should also be listed here.

Service: The candidate shall list all service for the review period making note of the type of service as listed in Section 9.03. Products of such activities should be included as a representative sample rather than a cumulative collection and support the candidate's record of sustained effectiveness in service. The candidate shall emphasize those activities that had the greatest impact, importance, and relevance to each community.

Integration: The candidate shall provide evidence of integration of two of the above areas sustained for a period of time, normally at least the five (5) years prior to review for promotion to Professor.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

The LFAC shall update, as needed, a written role and scope statement that clearly defines The Library's responsibilities. The statement must be consistent with and contributory to the role, scope and mission of the university. Library faculty shall participate in the development and adoption of this statement; the final version shall be approved by majority vote of all full-time tenure track faculty.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

(a) Tenurable faculty and dean of the Library;
(b) LRC;
(c) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and

17

(d) Provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

(a) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC);
(b) Faculty Senate;
(c) Deans' Council; and
(d) Provost.