SECTION 6
PROMOTION AND TENURE

6.1 PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE AND PROCEDURES

Governing Policies:

Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Considerations:

As required by the Faculty Handbook, deadlines and format of the promotion/tenure application process for the upcoming academic year will be announced by Academic Affairs by the end of the Spring semester. The current calendar is available at http://inside.mines.edu/Calendars.

The Faculty Handbook provides detailed process specifics for promotion and tenure of tenure/tenure-track faculty, and promotion of teaching, research and library faculty. Additional policies regarding the handling of specifics related to these processes are provided below:

1. Faculty members who are otherwise eligible to participate in a Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, but who are on sabbatical may – at their discretion – choose to not participate in Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee activities. If faculty on sabbatical choose to not participate, they are not considered an “eligible” member of the Committee as defined in item 5 below.

If faculty on sabbatical choose to participate in the promotion and tenure process, they are expected do so as full members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty members on sabbatical have identical expectations and obligations to the departmental promotion and tenure process as faculty members not on sabbatical.

2. As provided by the Faculty Handbook, the Department Head may be required to solicit external evaluations of the candidate’s credentials. All letters received from this solicitation must be added to the candidate’s application package. It is not appropriate to exclude any solicited letters.

3. All external letters are kept confidential and are not made available to promotion/tenure applicants before, during, or after the promotion/tenure process. Should the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the Department Head, in their recommendations, refer by name to a person who has submitted a reference and cited that person’s specific opinions, these references should be redacted before the recommendations are provided to the applicant at the conclusion of the process.

4. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee needs to see clear evidence of a national and international reputation for a candidate to be promoted to the rank of Professor (as noted in Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2.3). In the case of promotion to Associate Professor and/or granting tenure, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee needs to see clear evidence of “progress” toward a national or international reputation. For both, the most convincing testimonials are letters from distinguished members of the community of scholars in the candidate’s field who do not have a direct relationship with the candidate. Normally, this precludes CSM colleagues and former advisors.
5. As directed by the Faculty Handbook, the Departmental Promotion (and Tenure) Committee reviews the application package and submits its recommendation(s) in writing to the Department Head. In preparing this recommendation, the Committee should consider the criteria for tenure and or promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook and is encouraged to address the specific items listed in Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual. The letter of recommendation must list the names of all members of the Departmental Promotion (and Tenure) Committee and be signed by all members who participated in making the recommendation. At least ¾ of the eligible members of the Committee must participate in the decision (participation in the tenure/review process is a required service activity for all eligible committee members that are not on sabbatical or extended sick leave). The final vote (unanimous, or a number for or against the candidate’s request for promotion and/or tenure) should be given. This written recommendation should be added to the application package before submission of the package to the Department Head.

6. The Department Head reviews the application package and the Departmental Promotion (and Tenure) recommendation and makes his/her own written recommendation, which is added to the application package. In preparing this recommendation, the Department Head should consider the criteria for tenure and/or promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook and is encouraged to address the items listed in Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual. The complete application package is forwarded to the Provost in the format directed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

7. The Office of Academic Affairs shall make complete application packages available to the University Promotion (and Tenure) Committee for their review. Again, guided by Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual, the University Promotion (and Tenure) Committee provides a third formal, and written recommendation related to the action being sought.

8. The Provost reviews these recommendations, decides on final action and seeks Board approval in support of this action in time for faculty promotion and tenure decisions to be announced at the April Faculty Forum.

**Last Revision:**

September 30, 2014
6.2 GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF PROMOTION/TENURE MATERIAL

Governing Policies:

Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Procedure:

For additional considerations on preparing an application package that includes information relevant to the various Committees, Department Head and Provost, please see Section 6.4 of this Procedures Manual.

Application package specifics conforming to the Faculty Handbook for each type of faculty are provided below.

Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure should submit to their Department Head a promotion and/or tenure application package that includes the sections defined below. The format of, and submission date by which these materials should be submitted is communicated to campus by the Office of Academic Affairs prior to the end of the Spring semester.

Each application package must include, in the order given, the sections defined in the Package Template provided on the Academic Affairs website. Packages for consideration of promotion of Teaching, Research and Library faculty may exclude certain sections. Required and permissible package exclusions are as defined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Package Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track</td>
<td>None. All elements shown in the outline must be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Items 5c – Scholarly Activities, and 5d – Publications and Presentations may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 9 – External evaluation letters must be omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items 10b – Scholarly Achievements, 10c – External Fund Raising, and 10d – Student advising may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Item 5b – Teaching and Related Activities may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 10a – Teaching Accomplishments may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Items 5b – Teaching and Related Activities, 5c – Scholarly Activities and 5d – Publications and Presentations may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items 10a – Teaching Accomplishments, 10b – Scholarly Achievements, 10c – External Fund Raising and 10d – Student Advising may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Revision:

March 20, 2015
6.3. GUIDELINES FOR REQUESTING EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTERS

Governing Policies:
Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Procedure:
As per the Faculty Handbook, Department Heads are required to solicit evaluations letters from external reviewers for inclusion in promotion and tenure application packages of tenure/tenure-track faculty. External evaluators should be provided, for their review, the promotion and tenure package provided to the Department Head by the candidate excluding sections: 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 as defined in section 6.2 of this Procedures Manual.

Two sample letters of invitation to external reviewers is provided on the next page.
Dear Professor XXXX,

I am grateful to you for agreeing to evaluate XXXX credentials for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of XXXXX during this academic year.

At the Colorado School of Mines, advancement is based on the individual’s established professional record, indications that the individual will continue to grow professionally, and evidence that the individual will continue to be an asset to the institution. CSM expects members of the faculty to become leaders in their disciplines with strong records of scholarship, demonstrated service to their fields, and dedication to high quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The decision regarding tenure is based on the individual’s academic accomplishments and on an assessment of the potential (or likelihood) for continued growth in accomplishments and professional reputation.

We would very much appreciate your assistance in evaluating the merits of Dr. XXXXX record of scholarship and professional service. Evaluation of the candidate’s teaching is conducted internally, but if you have information about the quality of Dr. XXXXX contributions to pedagogy, we welcome comments on that aspect of the candidate’s case as well.

Please begin with a statement of whether you know the candidate and his work. In this context, address any circumstances that might raise issues of impartiality as they relate to your assessment of the candidate. We would like you to critique the quality of this work and, if possible, to assess its quantity and quality in comparison to the work of others in this discipline at comparable stages in their careers. We would particularly appreciate your evaluation of the contribution that the candidate’s work has made to the field, viewing each published work separately or in combination as seems appropriate. We are interested in your judgment of the quality of the journals and the importance of the conferences through which Dr. XXXXX has communicated this work. We are also interested in any other insights you might have about Professor XXXXX’s scholarly accomplishments. Finally, we ask that you provide your opinion of how Dr. XXXXX’s application would be viewed if the case were being considered at your home institution.

The enclosed electronic package includes (1) Dr. XXXXX’s curriculum vitae, (2) his/her personal statement, (3) a series of explanatory narratives, and (4) pertinent materials concerning the criteria for tenure and promotion. Our process requires that we receive your letter by _____________, so that it can be included in the materials that are examined internally. If you have any questions about Dr. XXXXX’s materials or experience, please contact me directly. In accordance with our procedures, we must ask you not to communicate with either the candidate whose work you are reviewing or other members of the department or college concerning your evaluation or the review process.

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your report. Neither the names of the referees nor the full contents of their letters are shared with the candidate. Your letter of evaluation will be made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in our department, and will become part of the candidate’s file reviewed by appropriate committees and administrators at the college and university levels. I should add that in light of a Supreme Court decision (EEOC vs. University of Pennsylvania), such reports may be subject to involuntary disclosure in legal proceedings.

Would you please also send me a brief biographical statement when you send your letter? As mentioned above, our departmental faculty as well as the campus committee and administrators would find your biographical sketch helpful when considering your letter.
Thank you very much for taking the time to convey your professional evaluation. On behalf of my colleagues, I offer our gratitude and appreciation for your thoughtful comments and perspectives.

Sincerely,

XXX
Dear Professor YYYYY,

Thank you for agreeing via our email correspondence to provide an external evaluation of Associate Professor XXXXXXX, who is being considered for promotion to the rank Professor in the Department of ZZZZZ at Colorado School of Mines (CSM).

At our institution promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon the individual’s established record. CSM expects an individual with this rank to be an established leader in their discipline with a strong record of scholarship, demonstrated service to their field, a dedication to high-quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate level and to have demonstrated the likelihood of continued growth in accomplishments and professional reputation nationally and internationally.

From an external reviewer, we are primarily interested in your assessment of the merits of Dr. XXXXXXX’s record of scholarship and professional service. Evaluation of the candidate’s teaching is conducted internally, but if you have information about the quality of Dr. XXXXXXX’s contributions to pedagogy, we welcome comments on that aspect of the candidate’s case. In particular, I would appreciate:

1. A statement of how you know the candidate and his/her work. In this context, please address any circumstances that might raise issues of impartiality as they related to your assessment of the candidate.
2. A critique the quality of the candidate’s work and, if possible, assessment its quantity and quality in comparison to the work of others in this discipline at comparable stages in their careers. We would particularly appreciate your evaluation of the contribution that the candidate’s work has made to the field, viewing each published work separately or in combination as seems appropriate. We would also be interested in your judgment of the quality of the journals and the importance of the conferences through which Dr. XXXXXXX has communicated this work.
3. Any other insights you might have about Dr. XXXXXXX’s scholarly accomplishments.
4. Your opinion of how Dr. XXXXXXX's application would be viewed if the case were being considered at your home institution (if applicable).
5. A brief biographical statement (one page or less is fine!). Although our departmental faculty know you and your work, the campus committee and administrators would find your biographical sketch helpful when considering your letter.

Please recall that ideally we need your letter by October XX, 20YY.

I have enclosed a copy of the Dr. XXXXXXX’s materials, including Dr. XXXXXXX’s curriculum vita, his personal statement, some recent publications, summaries of graduate students, teaching accomplishments, and research funding, and pertinent materials concerning the criteria for tenure and promotion at CSM. You may also access this material electronically by following the instructions sent in an earlier email.

If you have any questions about Dr. XXXXXXX’s materials or experience, please contact me directly. In accordance with our procedures, we must ask you not to communicate with either the candidate whose work you are reviewing or other members of the department or college concerning your evaluation or the review process. Also note that every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your report. Neither the names of the referees nor the full contents of their letters are shared with the candidate. Your letter of evaluation will be made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in our department, and will become part of the candidate’s file reviewed by appropriate committees and administrators at the college and university levels.

Thank you very much for taking the time to convey your professional evaluation. On behalf of my colleagues, I offer our gratitude and appreciation for your thoughtful comments and perspectives.
Sincerely,

XXX

**Last Revision:**

March 20, 2015
6.4 PRELIMINARY TENURE REVIEWS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Governing Policies:

Section 8.1.4, Faculty Handbook – Preliminary Tenure Review

Procedure:

Please note that according to Section 8.1.4 of the Faculty Handbook, Preliminary Tenure Reviews of tenure-track faculty should take place during (not after) the sixth semester of the faculty member’s tenure-track service.

The primary purpose of this review is to inform the faculty member and his/her department about progress toward promotion and tenure. The process used to conduct a preliminary tenure review is detailed in section 8.1.4 of the Faculty Handbook. Briefly, the candidate prepares a dossier that is forwarded to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee for review within one month of the start of the sixth semester of service. The Departmental Committee considers the package and makes formal recommendations that are forwarded to the Department Head. The Department Head, in turn, reviews the dossier, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation and makes his/her own formal recommendation. Upon completion of this process, the Department Head reviews the package, process and findings with their respective college Dean. The Department Head then meets with the candidate, provides him/her copies of all of the written recommendations and discusses the findings of the preliminary tenure review process. The Dean notifies the Provost that preliminary tenure review process has concluded and specifically informs the Provost of untenured individuals who have been identified as “at risk” in terms of performance. The Provost may subsequently require formal presentation of remediation plans for faculty at “risk.”

For additional considerations on preparing an application package that includes information relevant to the various Committees, Department Head and Provost, please see Section 6.5 of the Procedures Manual. The Office of Academic Affairs conveys the submission date by which the dossier should be submitted to the campus near the end of the Spring semester.

The content that the preliminary tenure review package must conform to the regular promotion and tenure package defined in the Package Template provided on the Academic Affairs website, with the following exceptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Package Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track</td>
<td>Item 4 - Candidate statement should focus on career progress since beginning the CSM appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 8 – External evaluation letters should be omitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Revision:

March 2, 2015
6.5 ITEMS FOR CANDIDATE, DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING AND REVIEWING APPLICATION PACKAGES FOR TENURE/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The following documentation is based on a memorandum sent to the Associate Provost and Faculty Handbook Committee on April 30, 2014. These guidelines represent the recommendations of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Mentorship and Transparency in Promotion and Tenure Processes.

CANDIDATE:
The purpose of this section is to provide the candidate with additional information that supplements the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2 Guidelines for Submission of Promotion/Tenure Material. These guidelines are intended to help the candidate prepare his/her dossier in a manner that best presents his/her accomplishments. Due to inherent differences among different fields, it is not expected that all recommendations apply to all candidates or that each candidate should rigidly follow every last recommendation herein. Furthermore, these guidelines may not be all-inclusive. Finally, candidates should be fully aware that they are ultimately responsible for the accuracy and readability of a tenure or promotion package. Packages that do not follow format or are unduly burdensome in terms of length or lack of organization may be returned without review. Note that where tables are called out or prescribed, totals should be given where appropriate.

1. Candidate Statement
Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 1 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Provide a summary – typically 1 to 3 pages – of important accomplishments (impacts and advances) related to scholarship, teaching, and service in such a way as to demonstrate a positive trajectory. Build upon facts, describe the unique strengths and circumstances of the application.
- Applications for promotion to Full Professor should provide specific examples of leadership and national/international recognition.

2. Teaching
Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 12 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- For each course, list the number of students in the class and responses to questions related to teaching methods effectiveness (questions 901 scantron-based, 1 Blackboard-based) and overall instructor effectiveness (questions 911 scantron-based, 10 Blackboard-based) from student evaluations.
- Briefly describe innovative course development activities and practices.
- Provide information other than student course evaluations that will assist the committee to determine teaching effectiveness and student learning (e.g. class visits, course portfolios).
- Provide clear data on student advising (level of effort, co-advisors, outcomes). Differentiate undergraduate research advising from conventional advising. For undergraduate research advising, list student names, research period, graduation semester, project title, and outcomes, such as conference presentations or publications. See Section 6.2 of Procedures Manual for details on graduate research advising.
- Include workshops and short courses, number of attendees, and your role (e.g., organizer, lecturer, one of two instructors for three day course, etc.).
3A. Scholarship - Publications
Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 13 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

• Provide separate lists of archival journal publications, book/book chapters, and conference proceedings. Clearly identify publications that are peer reviewed and those that are not.
• Provide information regarding the quality of journals in which the candidate has published his/her work. In particular, provide acceptance rates and/or impact factors (or any other published quality indicators or measures). This information may be listed in a table within the publications section. If acceptance rates are difficult to obtain from the Internet, candidates may consider contacting journal editors directly.
• If authors are listed alphabetically, define candidate’s role and level of contribution. Clearly mark (1) the publications where the candidate is the corresponding author and (2) all co-authors who are CSM students and CSM post-doctorals. In the example below, CSM students are underlined and the corresponding author is denoted by *.


• If appropriate, include metrics such as number of citations, h-index over entire career, and h-index while at CSM.

3B. Scholarship – Funding
Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 14 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

• Clearly state the total funding that the candidate has been involved in securing as well as the individual’s total share.
• Clearly identify the amount of funding that is credited to the candidate in each multi-investigator grant.
• Clearly identify the candidates’ role on each funding award, e.g. PI, co-PI, senior investigator, etc.
• In collaborative grants with outside institutions, identify the amount expended at CSM.
• Provide information on how the funds were utilized to support students, post-doctoral, and/or technicians.
• Identify products such as number of papers, software, workshops, book, patents, etc. that resulted from the funding generated.
• List non-funded proposals (same level of detail as funded proposals) to demonstrate track record for trying to obtain grant funding.

4. Service
Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 15 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

For all of the items listed below, note that the candidate should state his/her level of effort and the impact of the contributions. In other words, a list of service does not provide sufficient information.

• National and international committees, editorial boards, panels, review teams, etc.
• Departmental and campus committees, graduate student committees, junior faculty mentoring, etc.
• Professional societies
• Outreach activities
• Organizing conferences, sessions, workshops, etc.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE:**
The following comments and questions are intended to help provide guidance and food-for-thought to Department Heads and Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees as they review applications and construct formal recommendations of these applications.

• Provide information regarding context of candidates’ accomplishments relative to peer departments and institutions.
• What are the expectations in terms of number of publications and research funds generated?
• How do you weigh writing a textbook as a teaching or/and research contribution?
• What is the average teaching load in your department for a research active faculty member by rank?
• What are the general expectations with respect to the teaching of number of undergraduate, graduate and advanced graduate level courses in your department?
• What are the expectations in your department in relation to the number of M.S. and Ph.D. students a candidate has helped to graduate before going for tenure and promotion?
• Do you count graduate student advising and supervision of special study courses towards teaching?
• Do you count advising undergraduate research towards teaching?
• Do you consider faculty mentoring as a valuable service and how do you assess outcome?
• Are there details unique to CSM that will assist external reviewers to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments?
• For the candidate’s discipline, are other avenues used to disseminate scholarly work (e.g., writing a textbook, instructional software and videos, professional development workshops, etc.)?
• What are the expectations for service at the department, campus, and extramural levels?
• Regardless of field, the case must be made that the candidate has had a strong impact on: students and student outcomes, research appropriate to their field and appointment, and enhancement of the reputation of CSM.

**Last Revision:**

June 16, 2014
6.6  ITEMS FOR CANDIDATE, DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING AND REVIEWING APPLICATION PACKAGES FOR LIBRARY FACULTY

The following documentation is based on a memorandum sent to the Associate Provost and Faculty Senate in February, 2015. These guidelines represent the recommendations of the Library Director and the Library Faculty regarding promotion considerations for Library Faculty. These criteria were endorsed by the Faculty Senate in March, 2015.

We are providing these guidelines to help the Library Director prepare promotion dossiers that make the best case for the candidates from the Library, and to provide promotion committees and department heads/college deans with information to support a balanced view of the candidate’s application for promotion.

It is generally understood in a research university that production of new knowledge is the paramount criterion for promotion. The application of criteria for librarians cannot and should not share this emphasis. It is more appropriate and even crucial that a librarian contributes to the improvement of the practice of academic librarianship rather than exhibit a body of research. Promotion to higher ranks is based on the career growth of the librarian, as demonstrated by a balance of professional and scholarly activities and service, with professional activities holding the largest proportion of the candidate’s accomplishments.

All library faculty are expected to apply disciplinary knowledge and innovation to local practice. However, due to typical division of duties in an academic library, no one candidate is expected to exhibit achievement in all of the other areas of librarianship/professional accomplishments listed below. Consider any or all that are applicable:

1. Librarianship/Professional Accomplishments
   • Creative and/or innovative application of knowledge to local practices, grounded on expertise in academic librarianship.
     o External recognition for professional expertise including awards, consultancies, etc. Include the nature of and criteria for the award; nature of consultancy and the organization requesting the service.
   • Project management, grants, or gifts in the academic library environment. Include:
     o Scope of your project, goals and objectives, resources.
     o Impacts of this project on library mission, outcomes.
   • Teaching and/or development of information skills:
     o Information, including student course evaluations, that will assist the committee to determine teaching effectiveness and student learning (e.g. class visits, input from students and instructors, participation/use numbers, awards).
     o New courses, activities, or guides to information resources in appropriate media.
     o Creativity in instruction, as demonstrated by local innovations, adaptation of instructional content for local audiences, implementation of workshops, student-oriented seminars, exhibitions, displays.
     o Instructional books or other materials considered as a teaching and/or research contribution.
   • Research/subject-specific knowledge. Include:
     o Evidence of expertise in point-of-need support for students and faculty, including progressive development of subject expertise relevant to academic programs.
     o Ability to connect library resources with users and interpret user needs, demonstrated by improvement of services, collaborative research with faculty and students, or user needs assessment.
• Development of resources to support research/curriculum needs in appropriate media; for example, subject-based guides, web resources, reference works, seminars, etc.
  • Resource/collection management.
    o Demonstrated ability to develop collection resources to support the university’s curriculum and research needs, including user needs assessment, usage data, and collection level evaluations.
    o Development of consortia or partnership arrangements. Include the impacts of these activities on the library and campus.
    o Management of services from external vendors and publishers, including creating efficiencies in workflow; partnering to develop new products, interface modifications, and contract negotiations and implementation.
  • Access/data management:
    o Demonstrated impact on access to resources, including activities to assess users’ needs and the level at which those needs are met, metadata statistics, etc.
    o Rankings, awards, or consultation roles defining skill level for metadata creation or data management.
    o Level of expertise in project management with data imports/exports, system configuration, or migration according to industry standards and local practices.
    o Scope of access/data management projects, including impacts on the library and campus.

2. Publications & Research
  • Quality of journals in which the candidate has published his/her work. Include:
    o Level of journal importance—Top tier, second tier, etc.
    o Quality or impact indicators, publisher’s reputation.
  • In academic librarianship, identify other avenues used to disseminate scholarly work (e.g.: presentations at conferences or workshops, blogs or wikis).
    o Level of importance, scope of audience—Top tier, second tier, etc.
    o Quality or impact indicators, publisher’s reputation.
  • In the list of publications, clearly identify works that are peer reviewed.
  • Define the average expected number of publications per year of a library faculty
  • Identify the level of scholarly contribution to the discipline (include reviews, use statistics, etc.) for works in academic librarianship of:
    o Reference works, for example indexes, compilations, encyclopedias, databases, annotated bibliographies.
    o Interdisciplinary works: Works that apply aspects of librarianship to other disciplines.
    o Descriptive/analytical works based on collections, practices or assessment.
    o Software, interface design, classification systems, innovative processes.
    o Critical or review contributions to communications media (e.g., journals, newsletters, websites).
    o Presentations at professional conferences, workshops, special programs, etc. Identify scope of audience (regional, national or international audience) and impacts on the discipline.
  • Internal research reports grounded in the discipline’s literature.
    o Describe scope of your research, including goals and objectives, resources.
    o Identify the impacts of your research on library mission. Include outcomes.

3. Service
  • Level of effort and impact in serving in local, regional, national, and international committees, editorial boards, panels, review teams, conference planning groups, etc. Include:
    o Scope of activities for your position.
    o Describe outcomes, service awards, recognitions, etc.
  • Level of effort and impact of service to the Library, Mines community, and the public.
This could include committees, task forces, or service to local, state, private or public organizations.

- Describe your contributions and outcomes.
  - Library/university administrative assignments. Describe scope of activities and outcomes.
  - Development of policies, bylaws, guidelines, or standards. Describe level of involvement and impact on the organization.
  - Outreach, including participation as a representative of the library/university at public events, presentations to public and private civic organizations, K-12 education groups.

Noteworthy contributions should be highlighted and elaborated on for the consideration of the Committee. The candidate should explain the nature and significance of each emphasized contribution.

4. Reference Letters

- Provide information on the process used to solicit references (how the list was prepared; how many were requested; whether the candidate provided any input; names that were used from the candidate-provided list).
- Any information on the reviewers who wrote the letters (their credentials and standing in the field, etc.)

_Last Revision:_
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