

## *Memorandum*

**To:** Susan Barnes Whyte, Library Director  
**From:** The P&T Committee; Steve Bricher, Chair  
**From:** Susan Agre-Kippenhan, Dean of Faculty  
**RE:** Approval of the Library Discipline-Specific Guidelines  
**Date:** 11 April 2017



P&T Committee  
Dean of Faculty

Thank you for submitting The Library's Discipline-Specific Guidelines for review by The P&T Committee and The Dean of Faculty. We appreciate the hard work that you put into them and we feel that your discipline-specific guidelines will assist The P&T Committee in evaluating candidates from your department. Recall that The Faculty Handbook (IV.6.1.4) asks that the content of the discipline-specific guideline:

*clearly articulates departmental expectations for teaching effectiveness [professional effectiveness for librarians], professional achievement, and service.*

*Our overall Assessment.* We are pleased to **approve** them.

For your reference, the following summaries the specifics of our assessment. The summary corresponds to the *Rubric for Assessing Discipline-Specific Guidelines*, which is based on Section IV.6.1.4, *Department-Specific Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*. Just as in the rubric, the options for *Assessment* are: Satisfactory, Needs work or Missing.

### 1. Teaching Effectiveness Section.

- a. Describes the department's understanding of what constitutes teaching success both in and out of the classroom, including attention to elements included in IV.6.1.1.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* Since the 1980s, the category Professional Effectiveness has been substituted for Teaching Effectiveness when librarian faculty are evaluated. The guidelines provide a clear explanation of Professional Effectiveness. Evidence of Professional Effectiveness is discussed, including examples of how it can be demonstrated.

- b. Includes a statement identifying the role of colleague observations of actual class sessions.

*Assessment.* Does not apply.

*Comments:* This does not apply to librarians being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure.

## 2. Professional Achievement Section.

- a. Describes appropriate disciplinary standards and expectations of what constitutes professional achievement, including attention to elements included in IV.6.1.2.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* The guidelines provide an explanation of professional achievement within their discipline. Attention is given to Section IV.6.1.2, as well as items unique to their discipline.

- b. Describes the types and expected levels of scholarship, including interdisciplinary scholarship.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory

*Comments:* The guidelines describe the types and expected levels of scholarship. Collaborations both within and outside the library field are valued.

- c. Describes the particular kinds of public scholarly products.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* The guidelines describe multiple kinds of scholarly products for the discipline, reflecting the differences for faculty in this department.

- d. Describes the types of peer review that are most common and valued within their discipline.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* The guidelines identify the types of peer review that are most common and valued in their discipline.

## 3. Service Section.

- a. Defines and identifies institutional and departmental forms of service, especially those that might be unique to the department, including attention to elements included in IV.6.1.3.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* The guidelines define and identify forms of service to the department, college, community and profession. Clear examples of each are provided. Attention is given to Section IV.6.1.3, as well as to items unique to their discipline. Service is linked to the code of ethics for librarians.

- b. Describes forms of service both inside and outside of the college to the disciplines represented by the department.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* None.

## 4. Differentiation Between Promotion and Tenure.

- a. Guidelines describe a set of clear expectations for tenure and promotion within the discipline-specific interpretation of the standards in Section IV.6.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* Expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor are discussed for each of the three areas: Professional Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Service.

Illustrative examples are provided. Promotion to associate professor should be positively linked with the decision to grant tenure.

- b. Guidelines differentiate between: Tenure, Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Full Professor.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* Expectations for promotion to full professor are discussed for each of the three areas: Professional Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Service. The expectations for promotion to full professor are framed in terms of an established record of work that demonstrates advanced engagement in all three areas. Illustrative examples are provided for each that differentiate between associate/full professor.

#### 5. Review of the Document.

- a. Demonstrates the guidelines are commensurate with external institutions and agencies (such as similar institutions of higher education, professional organizations or accrediting bodies).

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* Several sources were consulted. Links are included to Trinity University and Palmetto College, as well as to their professional organization ACRL.

- b. Demonstrates guidelines are consistent with Linfield's values as stated in the strategic plan.

*Assessment.* Satisfactory.

*Comments:* The guidelines are consistent with Linfield's values as stated in the strategic plan.

Thank you for creating the Library Discipline-Specific Guidelines. We appreciate your participation in this important component of the promotion and tenure evaluation process.

Your Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee:

Steve Bricher, Chair  
 Brian Gilbert, NSM  
 Tom Love, SBS  
 Melissa Robinson, PDX  
 Dave Sumner, AH

Dean of Faculty:

Susan Agre-Kippenhan