

# AP #: University Library Promotion, Tenure, & Review Expectations

## 1 Overview and Philosophy

Tenure is a privilege granted to recognize excellence and an expectation of sustained high-quality performance in the future on the part of academic faculty. Promotions, in the form of advancement in academic rank or level, recognize and compensate full-time academic faculty with demonstrated records of excellence in librarianship and/or other professional duties and appropriate levels of performance in service and scholarship.

The unit-level expectations for tenure and promotion provide guidance to academic faculty to assist them in preparing for tenure and/or promotion evaluations. They also guide evaluators (e.g., the NS Promotion & Tenure Committee) as they review application materials from faculty within the unit.

## 2 Guidelines and Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Rank III)

The only areas evaluated for promotion and tenure decisions will be librarianship and/or other professional duties, scholarship, and service.

Library faculty at Nevada State hold 12-month appointments. Given the variety of possible assignments, Library faculty responsibilities are outlined in individual position descriptions. The standard annual assignment for the librarianship category comprises approximately 80% of a librarian's role, with the remaining 20% assigned to scholarship and service categories. A master's degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association is the [terminal professional degree for academic librarians](#).

To receive tenure and promotion, the NS P&T Committee must assign a candidate's portfolio a rating of "Excellent" in librarianship and/or other professional duties and a minimum rating of "Satisfactory" in scholarship and service. These ratings are based on the NS P&T Committee's review and are distinct from ratings in annual reviews.

### 2.1 Librarianship and/or Other Professional Duties

Faculty must have a record of excellence in performing assigned duties in the position description, including demonstrated effectiveness, efficiency, and professional growth and improvement over the course of the probationary period. Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of excellence in librarianship. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's

performance. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

## 2.2 Scholarship

One published peer-reviewed article or peer-reviewed, discipline-appropriate equivalent in a scholarly journal or outlet is required for a “Satisfactory” rating and tenure. For publications with multiple authors, faculty members should be able to justify their contribution. A consistent rating of satisfactory on a faculty member’s annual review is not equivalent to a rating of satisfactory on the tenure review. Research, scholarly, creative, or other activities related to the faculty member’s professional or work-related discipline will be evaluated on its quality and significance, regardless of publication format.

## 2.3 Service

The applicant must have a record of meaningful, active service, including service in capacities that benefit professional organizations, the University, or the Library. Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor shall provide a brief narrative of their service in the tenure application. This narrative contextualizes the list of accomplishments. The evaluators have some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative. Service assignments and other professional activities will be evaluated on their quality and significance.

# 3 Guidelines and Expectations for Promotion to Professor (Rank IV)

In the evaluation of a candidate’s qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor, accomplishments occurring during the period since the last promotion will be considered. The applicant must demonstrate evidence of continued effective performance in librarianship and/or other professional duties, scholarship, and service that exceeds criteria outlined for granting tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Library faculty at Nevada State hold 12-month appointments. Given the variety of possible assignments, Library faculty responsibilities are outlined in individual position descriptions. The standard annual assignment for the librarianship category comprises approximately 80% of a librarian’s role, with the remaining 20% assigned to scholarship and service. The master’s degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association is the [terminal degree](#) for academic librarians.

To be eligible for promotion to the rank of professor, the NS P&T Committee must assign a candidate’s portfolio a rating of “Excellent” in librarianship/other professional duties as well as a “Commendable” in either scholarship or service; the candidate may

not have a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in any area. These ratings are based on the NS P&T Committee’s review and are distinct from ratings in annual reviews.

The rank of professor is awarded to those who demonstrate the following:

- Cumulative and ongoing professional achievements.
- Significant contributions to advancing the mission of Nevada State.
- Continued innovation and dedication in librarianship and/or other professional duties.
- Leadership and sustained contributions in service that benefit the Nevada State community in significant ways.
- Professional growth and improvement over time.
- Scholarly contributions.

### 3.1 Librarianship and/or Other Professional Duties

The applicant must provide evidence of consistent, sustained activities and contributions that benefit the Nevada State community. Candidates should demonstrate continued innovation, professional growth, and improvement that builds on evidence-based practices and the candidate’s own evolving methods or practices. It is expected that the candidate will share successful efforts with other faculty and their professional community through leadership in campus initiatives related to their position and fulfillment of Nevada State’s mission.

Applicants for promotion to the rank of professor shall provide a brief narrative description of excellence in librarianship and/or other professional duties. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual’s performance. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

### 3.2 Scholarship

Faculty members shall provide a brief narrative describing scholarship activities in the promotion application. One published peer-reviewed article or peer-reviewed, discipline-appropriate equivalent in a scholarly journal or outlet is required for a “Satisfactory” rating. For publications with multiple authors, faculty members should be able to justify their contribution. All scholarly work under consideration for application to professor must be produced since the time of successful application to associate professor and while the applicant is affiliated with Nevada State.

Research, scholarly, creative or other activities related to the faculty member’s professional or work-related discipline will be evaluated based on its quality and significance.

### 3.3 Service

Applicants must show evidence of consistent, sustained, and meaningful service, including serving in capacities that benefit Nevada State, the profession, the community, and NSHE.

Faculty members shall provide a brief narrative of their service activities in the promotion application. This narrative contextualizes the list of accomplishments. The evaluators have some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of unusual circumstances as presented in the narrative.

Service assignments and other professional activities will be evaluated on their quality and significance.

## 4 Guidelines and Expectations for Annual Reviews

Library faculty at Nevada State hold 12-month appointments. Given the variety of possible assignments, Library faculty responsibilities are outlined in individual position descriptions. The standard annual assignment for the librarianship category comprises approximately 80% of a librarian's role, with the remaining 20% assigned to scholarship and service.

### 4.1 Librarianship

Library faculty are evaluated annually on three core competencies in librarianship: collaboration, impact, and job duties. These competencies are evaluated through a combination of the following sources: evaluator observations, faculty self-evaluation, faculty submitted artifacts, and peer/direct report feedback from colleagues in the Library. These sources provide a holistic view of the faculty member's work during the evaluation period. Evaluators use these sources to apply a "best fit" approach to determine the overall evaluation rating.

#### 4.1.1 Librarian Competencies

##### **Collaboration**

*Enhances individual work by soliciting contributions from others and enhances others' work by contributing to their success to more effectively meet the unit's mission.*

Examples:

- Highly inclusive; seeks-out, encourages, recognizes, and incorporates diverse points of view.
- Actively supports and implements team decisions and ideas and gives full credit to the team for successful outcomes.
- Involves and informs campus stakeholders in an appropriate manner.

- Creates a culture of balancing one's own interests with others' while facilitating open dialogue with a wide variety of contributors and stakeholders.
- Prioritizes teamwork to deliver results and builds a culture of appreciation and recognition for team effort and success.

### **Impact**

*Uses knowledge, skills, and professional experience to make demonstrable improvements.*

Examples:

- Moves beyond traditional ways of doing things and pushes past the status quo.
- Tries multiple, varied approaches to seek efficiencies and improve work outcomes.
- Exercises sound judgment in evaluating impact when balancing workload and competing priorities.

### **Job Responsibilities**

*Demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and abilities that result in high performance and contributions within the scope of the position description.*

Examples:

- Effectively pursues opportunities to improve current skill set or obtain new skills and applies them to enhance performance contributions without supervisor intervention.
- Demonstrates expert decision making and consistently promotes and enables sound decisions across the organization.
- Takes ownership of development, embraces and seeks feedback, highly coachable, anticipates guidance and direction, improves performance through the integration of stakeholder feedback.
- Consistently fulfills commitments.

## **4.1.2 Overall Rating Rubric**

### **Excellent**

- Contributions have significant and consistently exceptional impact and value to the Library and/or the University.
- Makes unique, often one-time achievements that measurably advance progress towards organizational goals and/or result in major improvements.
- Easily recognized as a role model by peers.
- Viewed as an excellent resource to provide expertise, guidance, advice, mentorship, or support to others.
- Demonstrates a range of high-level capabilities and actively takes on higher levels of responsibility.

### **Commendable**

- Consistently demonstrates meaningful impact through accomplishments and contributions.
- This level of performance is reflective of a competent and experienced individual in this role.
- Viewed by peers as someone who gets the job done and effectively prioritizes work and produces strong results.
- Contributes positively to the overall objectives of the Library and /or the larger organization.
- Achieves valuable accomplishments in several important areas of the job and/or on assigned projects.

### **Satisfactory**

- Needs to gain proficiency and/or productivity in the position to achieve consistent impact.
- Stronger or additional knowledge, skills and abilities need to be demonstrated for consistent success in the role.
- This rating is typically utilized when an employee is still coming up-to-speed with their job responsibilities based on limited tenure in the role.

### **Unsatisfactory**

- The quality of performance is below expectations for the role.
- Knowledge, skills, abilities and/or productivity have not been demonstrated at the appropriate levels.

## **4.2 Scholarship**

Evidence of productive scholarship can be supported by published records as well as other original work of a professional nature. In annual reviews, evidence of scholarship in-progress (e.g., data collection, manuscripts under review, etc.) serves as an indicator of the faculty's intent to complete the scholarship and/or creative activity. Statements of scholarship in-progress, supported by evidence, are required. Faculty may provide a narrative description of their scholarly activities to provide context for the annual review.

### **4.2.1 Rating Scholarship in the Annual Review Process**

To promote consistency in ratings of scholarship, a unit of measure called Scholarly Effort (SE) will be used. An SE is equivalent to any quality scholarly contribution, such as a conference presentation with significant content. Quality can refer to the effect scholarship makes on advances in knowledge, the professional community, and especially, the enrichment of library practice. One accepted peer reviewed publication or its equivalent is equal to 2 SE. Consult with your evaluator early in the development of your scholarship plan to ensure that your completed work would meet these standards.

**Level 1: Fails to meet expectations (Unsatisfactory)**

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level 2.

**Level 2: Meets expectations (Satisfactory)**

Tangible evidence of one SE in process (e.g., a completed IRB application, submitted presentation proposal, significant progress on a publication draft, etc.), plus a timetable for completion.

**Level 3: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)**

One completed SE and tangible evidence of one additional SE in process (e.g., a research plan, submitted presentation proposal, significant progress on a publication draft, etc.), plus a timetable for completion.

**Level 4: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)**

2 SEs.

## 4.3 Service

When evaluating faculty contributions in service, both the quantity and quality of service are important considerations. Quantity in the absence of quality is insufficient to earn high ratings in service. Faculty members are encouraged to submit relevant evidence (e.g. documents created, revisions or edits made, feedback from committee chairs) that reflect particular service contributions. Consult with your evaluator early in the development of your service plan to ensure that your activities would meet these standards.

### 4.3.1 Rating Service

**Level 1: Fails to meet expectations (Unsatisfactory)**

Performance at a level less than that specified in Level 2.

**Level 2: Meets expectations (Satisfactory)**

Evidence of contribution to committees and/or service activities in a professional organization, the University, or the Library.

**Level 3: Exceeds expectations (Commendable)**

Evidence of significant contribution to committees and/or service activities in a professional organization, the University, or the Library.

**Level 4: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner (Excellent)**

May include, but is not limited to, evidence of exceptional service leadership to committees and/or service activities in a professional organization, the University, or the Library.

## 5 Related Information

- Board of Regents [NSHE Code, Chapter 5](#).
- Board of Regents [NSHE Code, Chapter 7](#).
- Tenure expectations for each academic unit.
- Provost's Yearly Memorandum on P&T Timeline.
- Raoul A. Arreola. (2007). *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Guide to Designing, Building, and Operating Large-Scale Faculty Evaluation Systems*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. San Francisco: Anker Publishing (now Jossey-Bass).

### 5.1 Revision History

- Approved by Dean Nathaniel King on 5/10/2023 and by Provost Vickie Shields on 6/06/2023.
- Approved 9/10/2025 by Dean Nathaniel King.