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I. Introduction

Zach S. Henderson Library is the chief mediator between the community of Georgia Southern University scholars to which it belongs; the ever growing student body it serves; and the corporate conveyors of information. The Library serves as conservator of traditional knowledge forms and cultural legacies, and is at the heart of a rapidly evolving system of scholarly communication. Continuing technological advances have changed the delivery systems of information, and have added, via the internet, a cyberspace learning environment that transcends geographical borders.

In fulfilling the Library's mission, Henderson librarians practice the profession of librarianship as clinical faculty, as distinct from being teaching and research faculty in a school of library science. For this reason, performance expectations emphasize excellence in librarianship, service to the profession and university, and scholarship, in that priority order. As a result, the following guidelines and criteria apply to all tenure track library faculty to help meet performance expectations.

II. Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Committees.

The Tenure Committee will conduct all pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure reviews, and the Promotion Review Committee will review promotion candidacies. With the exception of the Dean of the Library and the department head or supervisor of the candidate under review, the Tenure Committee will be composed of all library faculty members who have received tenure and the Promotion Review Committee will consist of all associate and full professors. A simple majority of committee members will constitute a quorum. No votes on any personnel action will be taken by either committee unless there is a quorum, and only faculty members in attendance may vote.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will consist of the P&T committee. The P&T committee will elect a member of the committee to be chair. A faculty member is not eligible to serve during a year in which he/she is a candidate for post-tenure review. For the specific activities and deadlines associated with Post-Tenure review, see the Georgia Southern Faculty Handbook, Section 213 and the Board of Regents Policy Manual, (8.3.5.4) Post Tenure Reviews take place at every five year interval from the last promotion and/or post tenure review.

III. Procedure.

Prior to fall semester the Dean of the Library will set the deadlines for submitting documentation in support of promotion, tenure, pre-tenure, or post-tenure candidacies. The schedule will allow for an adequate time period for the review of documentation prior to the meeting when the tenure and promotion committees will act upon the candidacies. Candidates
for promotion must declare themselves in the spring prior to when their applications will be reviewed, in order ensure there is enough time to to select external reviewers. Post-tenure materials are submitted in January and pre-tenure materials are due February 1 (see sections 212 and 213 of the Faculty Handbook (http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/handbook/), and the committee consideration of those candidacies will be scheduled accordingly. The Dean of the Library will stipulate the deadline by which committee recommendations must be submitted to the Dean.

In cases of promotion or tenure reviews, after full discussion of a candidate each member of the appropriate committee will submit one vote, and the votes will be tallied on a single sheet of paper. Individuals will not be identified according how they voted. Abstentions are permitted. The tally and written comments constitute the report to the Dean of the Library. If more than 50 percent of the ballots are in favor of tenure or promotion, a positive recommendation is forwarded to the Dean. Otherwise, the committee will forward a negative recommendation. A candidate has seven days from receiving the written notification of the committee’s recommendation to appeal that recommendation to the committee. The Dean of the Library, after also considering input from the candidate’s department head/supervisor, will forward a written decision, either positive or negative, to the Provost, and will inform the candidate, in writing, of the decision (see Appendix I). The candidate will have ten days to submit a written appeal of a negative decision to the Dean.

In cases of a pre-tenure or post-tenure review, the committee will meet and discuss the faculty member’s merits and weaknesses. If it is a pre-tenure review, the committee will then vote on whether the probationary candidate is on schedule to meet tenure requirements, ahead of schedule to meet tenure requirements, or not on schedule to meet tenure requirements. If 50% or more vote that the candidate is not on schedule to meet tenure requirements, the committee will include in its report the area(s) in which it believes the candidate is lacking. If it is a post-tenure review, the committee will vote on whether the candidate’s performance since her/his last promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review has met expectations or has not met expectations. If 50% or more of the committee members vote that the candidate has not met expectations, the committee will include in its report the area(s) in which it believes the candidate is lacking. The committee may also vote that the candidate is deserving of special recognition for meritorious achievement, and if the committee so finds the rationale will be included in the committee report. A pre-tenure or post-tenure committee report is given to the candidate’s supervisor, who will review the results with the Dean of the Library before discussing the report with the candidate. Post-tenure reviews are subject to the same appeal process as tenure reviews.

IV. Timetable.

The timetable for promotion and tenure evaluation, as described in sections 208 and 209 of the Faculty Handbook (http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/handbook/), will be followed. The timetable for post-tenure reviews shall also conform to the Faculty Handbook, section 213, in which the Board of Regents policy states that each tenured faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, as defined below, and at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, a written declaration to retire within five years (submitted to the appropriate dean), or a leave of absence. Section 212 of the Faculty Handbook stipulates a pre-tenure review will take place in a tenure-track faculty member’s third year, but Henderson Library will conduct a full pre-tenure review in all six probationary years (see Appendices II and III). Additionally, Section 214 of the Faculty Handbook outlines the
requirements for non-tenure appointments (e.g. lecturers and senior lecturers). Evaluation and promotion guidelines for non-tenure track appointments are also described in this section.

V. Criteria for Evaluation

Faculty undergoing tenure or post-tenure review must demonstrate effective performance in Category A below, and substantial achievement in Categories B and/or C. Candidates for promotion who are already tenured must demonstrate that since the last increase in rank they have achieved an effective performance record in Category A and accomplishments in Categories B and/or C commensurate with the rank being sought. Appendix IV contains a description of the documentation that must be provided for pre-tenure, post-tenure, promotion, and tenure reviews.

Concerning general professional and scholarly qualifications, and the rank of the library faculty, Henderson Library has consulted but has not adopted the entire language used in A Guideline for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians published by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) (see http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/promotiontenure.cfm). This statement defines the criteria for review of librarians in American institutions of higher education, and is designed so as to be adaptable to the rules and guidelines established by individual colleges or university systems.

A. Contributions to the educational function of the University. In this category, librarians will be evaluated on their areas of professional responsibility within the Library. This corresponds to the area defined as Teaching in the University System of Georgia guidelines for tenure and promotion. Teaching is the most fundamental description of the work done by faculty in their daily job responsibilities (see Appendix V).

B. Research, scholarly, and creative activities. In this category are activities that serve to create or disseminate knowledge, entertainment, or aesthetic and cultural enrichment.

C. Service: In this category are activities undertaken for the benefit of the Henderson Library, the university, the community, and the library profession through professional organizations at the national, regional, state, or local level.

Examples of activities which may be included in Categories A, B, and C are listed in Appendices VI-VIII.

Appendix IX, "Research, Scholarship, and Professional Development Service Activities for Tenure and/or Promotion" provides a measure of the library faculty's consideration of the value of various activities by candidates for promotion or tenure. These are listed in order of rank, 3 as highest and 1 as lowest. Candidates should strive to complete relatively high-ranking activities.
VI. External Peer Review Guidelines

All applications for tenure and/or promotion require external peer review. There will be a total of four external reviewers solicited. The candidate will provide a list of two reviewers and the P&T committee with the consultation of the Dean will submit two names. **This will be done during the Spring semester preceding the Fall semester tenure and promotion process.** In an effort to minimize biases for or against the candidate in the selection of qualified reviewers, the final list will include the names from the candidate and the P&T committee in consultation with the Dean of the Library. (The Dean of University Library has the option to inform the candidate of the identities of the external peer reviewers.)

The Dean’s Office will prepare and send packets to the external peer reviewers. The packets will consist of the candidate’s curriculum vita and narrative statement (see Appendix X).

In most cases, letters of evaluation should come from faculty employed at institutions with Doctoral Research University status. The Dean can grant special permission to accept letters from other colleges and universities and/or from non-academic individuals with acknowledged professional standing. A letter from a person who has served as a candidate’s major professor for a graduate degree or postdoctoral advisor is unacceptable. No more than one letter may come from any institution. The potential reviewers should have sufficient expertise to perform an informed review of the candidate’s scholarship and service. The external reviewers will review the same portfolio that the P&T committee review, but will only be asked to evaluate the candidate’s scholarship and professional contributions.

The documentation from the external reviewer should be in the Dean’s office two weeks prior to the P&T deliberation. The P&T committee will use the documentation from the external reviewer as part of the deliberation. Regardless of whether or not any external review documentation is received, the P&T Committee deliberations will proceed as scheduled.

**This information must be provided for each reviewer:**

Name  
Title/Rank  
Address  
Phone Number  
Fax Number  
E-mail  
Address  
Brief statement of their qualifications

The Tenure & Promotion Committee Chair requests that the faculty submit names of potential external reviewers before the established deadline (see Appendix X: Sample Letter to External Evaluator)
VII. Amendments to Promotion and Tenure Policies

Faculty members hired into the tenure track shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the Library promotion and tenure criteria in effect at the time their employment begins. For all subsequent promotions, faculty members shall be responsible for meeting the Library promotion criteria in effect at the time of their application for promotion. Then-existing procedural provisions regarding the composition and responsibilities of Library personnel review committees for promotion and/or tenure and required application materials shall apply to all faculty at the time of their application for promotion and/or tenure.
APPENDIX I: PROTOCOLS FOR REPORTING PRE-TENURE, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE DECISIONS TO THE DEAN OF THE LIBRARY

Cautionary Note
The person who will act as the recorder at the meeting should be elected or volunteer to perform this service BEFORE proceedings begin. This person will also sign the official letter/s that the Dean sends on to the Provost.

Format
Memo format on located at v:/ Forms/memo-template1.doc (see Examples 1-4 on the following pages)

Sample memos for use as templates
Samples for each type of memo may be found in a folder named by the Dean and located on the v:/drive or the library wiki.

Quorum
Always state the date and time of the meeting. Include a list of those in attendance. Always mention the number of eligible faculty attending and the number that are absent.

Paper Ballots:
Be sure to keep them separate if more than one candidate has submitted a portfolio. Conduct a re-count to verify the final vote taken in the meeting regarding each person up for consideration. Gather the paper ballots for each candidate, carefully separate them, and identify them by candidate name. Do include them all in one sealed envelope that goes to the Library Dean.

Distribution of Memorandum/a
A draft or drafts of the memorandum/s should be sent by e-mail to each committee member for input. Please be considerate and respond in a timely manner to allow the recorder to make necessary changes or additions before submitting final copies to the Dean.

Distribution of Final Copy or Copies
Electronic and paper copy should be sent to the Dean for each candidate under review. Both formats should also be sent to each person’s immediate supervisor as well.

Turnaround Time
The Dean would like notification of the decisions within two days of the T and P meeting for himself as well as the supervisors involved.
TO: Dr. W. XXX YYYYYYYYYY
Dean of the Library and University Librarian

FROM: Mr. AAA BBBB
Associate Professor, Information Services Department

DATE:

SUBJECT: Pre-tenure review for Ms. LLI RRRR

The Henderson Library Promotion and Tenure Committee met at 2:30 P.M. on Thursday, February 14, 2008, to consider the pre-tenure review portfolio of LLI RRRR (2nd year). I was elected to convey the Committee’s comments to you.

Eleven faculty members were eligible to participate; nine members were present.

After reviewing Ms. RRRR’s documentation, the Committee voted unanimously to confirm her satisfactory progress toward tenure.

In regard to her responsibilities within the Library, the Committee continues to commend Ms. RRRR on her collegiality within her own and other Library departments and her work on specific department projects and Library committees. The Committee applauds the collaborative relationships she has established with classroom faculty across campus.

Ms. RRRR’s documentation this year shows more presentations. Developing additional presentations based on her collaborative experiences is recommended. These would highlight her growing expertise and share valuable information with a wider audience. The Committee suggests further efforts toward publishing articles as a single or co-author. The same themes that are addressed in her presentations could be adapted for submissions to professional journals.

Further involvement in state, regional and/or national professional organizations is encouraged as she moves into her third year. Ms. RRRR would be an excellent candidate for service on a Faculty Senate Committee.
The Henderson Library Tenure Committee met at 2:00 PM on Monday, February 4, 2006, to consider the tenure application of Mr. QQQ SSSS. I was elected to convey the Committee’s vote to you.

Eleven tenured faculty members were eligible to participate in this review, and ten were present at the meeting. Based on Mr. SSSS’s documentation, annual reviews, and the personal observations and interactions of committee members, the committee does not recommend that Mr. SSSS be awarded tenure. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. SSSS’s annual reviews from his department head and his peers consistently noted weaknesses in performance, and these shortcomings were clearly identified as areas that needed to be improved in order for him to earn tenure. In the Committee’s judgment, he failed to show such improvement.
Example 3:

TO: Dr. W. XXX YYYYYYYYYYY
    Dean of the Library and University Librarian

FROM: III CCCC
      Serials Librarian, Collection & Resource Services

DATE:

SUBJECT: Promotion Review for Mr. PPP GGGG

The Henderson Library Tenure Committee met at 2:00 PM on Monday, February 7, 2008, to consider the promotion review of Mr. PPP GGGG. I was elected to convey the Committee’s vote to you.

Eleven tenured faculty members were eligible to participate in this review. Eight were present at the meeting. Based on Mr. GGGG’s documentation and the personal observations and interactions of committee members, the committee recommends that Mr. GGGG’s be promoted to the rank of associate professor. The vote was seven in favor and one opposed.

In considering Mr. GGGG’s record and the requirements for promotion, we note:

- His excellent annual reviews and the positive assessments of those with whom he works
- His excellent performance of assigned duties and willingness to assume new responsibilities
- His outstanding service record, particularly with regard to national library association offices
- His acceptable record of scholarship

One Committee member felt Mr. GGGG’s scholarly record was weak, but others judged his scholarship to be acceptable, as was communicated to him in his annual reviews. Since the criteria for promotion to associate professor require excellent performance in librarianship and either professional service or scholarship, the majority of Committee members agreed Mr. GGGG merits promotion.
Example 4:

TO: Dr. W. X. Y
   Dean of the Library and University Librarian

FROM: III CCCC
      Serials Librarian, Collection & Resource Services

DATE:

SUBJECT: Post-tenure review for Mr. GGG PPPP

The Henderson Library Tenure Committee met at 2:00 PM on Monday, February 5, 2007, to consider the post-tenure review of Mr. GGG PPPP.

Eleven tenured faculty members were eligible to participate in this review. Ten were present at the meeting.

Based on Mr. PPPP's documentation and the personal observations and interactions of committee members, the committee determined that Mr. PPPP's performance since his last review has met expectations. The vote was nine in favor with one abstention.

The Committee particularly commended the following:
- His excellent record of scholarship
- The positive comments of those he supervises
- His outstanding job performance, as documented in his annual reviews
- His service to the Library, the University, and the community

The Committee did discuss the desirability of Mr. PPPP engaging in more professional development, as some concerns have been noted in annual reviews regarding his need to catch up with certain new trends, but this issue was not deemed serious enough to warrant an unfavorable overall recommendation.

Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information.
APPENDIX II

Faculty Member Post-Tenure Evaluation Target Dates
Zach S. Henderson Library

Faculty Member:

Rank:
Last Review Apart from Annual Review:
Next Post-Tenure Review*:
Elective Promotion Review Eligibility:

*Subject to change if the faculty member elects to apply for promotion before the scheduled post-tenure review takes place.

Faculty Member __________________________ Date __________________________

Department Head _________________________ Date __________________________

Dean _________________________________ Date __________________________

(To Be Signed and Placed in Personnel File)
APPENDIX III

Faculty Member Pre-Tenure Evaluation Target Dates
Zach S. Henderson Library

Faculty Member:

Rank:
Last Review Apart from Annual Review:
Next Pre-Tenure Review*:
Elective Promotion Review Eligibility:

*Subject to change if the faculty member elects to apply for promotion before the scheduled pre-tenure review takes place.

Faculty Member ________________________ Date ________________________
Department Head ________________________ Date ________________________
Dean ________________________ Date ________________________

(To Be Signed and Placed in Personnel File)
APPENDIX IV. CONTENTS OF FACULTY PORTFOLIOS

The portfolio submitted by the candidate should follow the outline below:

A. Brief letter stating the purpose of the portfolio’s submission, e.g., to apply for promotion to the rank of Professor.

B. Explanation/Table of Contents of Portfolio contents

C. Job Description

D. Vita

E. Narrative (6 pages maximum) which describes what the faculty member has done to fulfill his/her responsibilities, the faculty member’s accomplishments, and the reasons why the faculty member believes he/she has met the relevant performance requirements in the areas of job responsibilities, scholarship, and service.

F. Annual Reviews.

G. Self-evaluations & Annual Goals.

H. Documentation of contributions to the educational function of the University, scholarship, service, and professional development activities. Examples include initiatives and accomplishments related to principal job responsibilities, completion of special projects and assignments, copies of publications, programs of presentations, descriptions of service in committee assignments.

I. Optional: Letters of support from supervisor, colleagues that work with the candidate, library patrons, colleagues from other institutions.
APPENDIX V: Faculty Annual Review and Workload Assignment Process

Step One: Faculty members and department heads discuss goals and objectives for the upcoming year. Goals should be congruent with the mission and goals for the department, library, and university. Guidelines should follow the Task Force on Goals and Rewards Report. Goals, objectives, and workload assignments should facilitate promotion and tenure expectations. Time frame: No later than April 15.

Step Two: Department heads submit the proposed workload for each faculty member for upcoming academic year (fall and spring semesters) to dean for approval. Time frame: No later than April 30.

Step Three: Dean discusses faculty workload proposals with department heads and makes final approval and revisions as appropriate. Time frame: No later than May 15.

Step Four: Faculty members and department heads discuss and review revisions regarding workload assignments due to revised responsibilities, workloads, and/or goals (e.g., acting administrative positions, revised service assignments, etc.). Time frame: May 16 – 30.

Step Five: Written summary of faculty performance activities submitted to department heads for annual review. Time period of review is July 1 - June 30. Time frame: No later than January 31.

Step Six: Annual review meeting between faculty members and department heads followed by annual performance letter submitted to each faculty member. Faculty will be reviewed in the areas of job performance, scholarship, and service; and each review will contain a section on the department head’s assessment of the faculty member’s progression toward promotion and tenure. Time frame: No later than March 31.
APPENDIX VI. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY: EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES

Activities may include (but are not limited to):

- selecting and acquiring informational resources (collection development, departmental liaison activity)
- describing resources so that they can be located and retrieved (bibliographic organization, control, and maintenance)
- helping library users to obtain resources (circulation and interlibrary loan)
- training and assisting people to use library resources (reference and research services, bibliographic instruction, teaching)
- acquiring and maintaining information technology (technical support and programming)
- coordination and management of services (administration and supervision)
- authoring of library orientation and instructional materials
- completion of significant professional development activities
- outreach to other university departments in the form of classes, one-on-one instruction, seminars, and campus-wide conferences increasing the candidate's own knowledge or skills, such as degree programs, course work, or workshops and conferences attended
- collaborate with faculty in researching and facilitating grants
APPENDIX VII. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES: EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES

Activities may include (but are not limited to):

- research projects
- grant proposals
- publications (e.g., books, chapters in books, periodical articles, reviews, in-house publications such as guides to library resources, or web-based publications)
- creation of reference tools or other informational resources, whether in print or in electronic form
- presentations
- workshops conducted
- exhibits
- performances
- work toward additional educational degrees
- courses taken
- workshops or professional conferences attended
- editorships

Scholarship, as classified by Ernest Boyer in his book Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate and expanded upon by others, may consist of discovery, integration, application, artistic creativity, or pedagogy. To be of lasting benefit to society, scholarship must be communicated to others. The kinds of scholarship summarized below are particularly appropriate to the field of academic librarianship:

**The Scholarship of Pedagogy** develops and communicates understanding and skills to individuals, develops and refines new teaching methods, and fosters lifelong learning behavior. Through classroom and reference service instruction, librarians teach the ability to find, assess and use information resources effectively, regardless of information format or medium. Such scholarship should be evaluated for depth and duration of understanding, lifelong benefits to past and present learners, and benefits to broader communities.

**The Scholarship of Discovery** generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding, and develops and refines new methods. Librarians apply a wide range of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies to discover new means of managing library services and functions effectively, to analyze how people seek and use information, to construct models for organizing bodies of data and information, and to design methods for precise and efficient information retrieval. Such scholarship should
be evaluated for originality, scope, significance, and applicability and benefits to education.

**The Scholarship of Integration** synthesizes and communicates a new or different understanding of information and its relevance. Academic librarians draw upon a wide range of work from other disciplines in order to develop new knowledge that informs and transforms library work. Such scholarship is evaluated for originality and usefulness in advancing our understanding, and for the application of new insights.

**The Scholarship of Application** develops and communicates new technologies and applications, fosters inquisitiveness, and builds and refines new methods. Librarians apply the theory and knowledge gained through discovery, integration, and pedagogical experimentation to the challenges of meeting the research and learning needs of the academic community. Such scholarship is evaluated for breadth, value, and persistence of usefulness and impact.
APPENDIX VIII. SERVICE: EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES

Activities may include (but are not limited to):

- advisement or consulting with other libraries, academic or scholarly institutions, community groups or organizations
- editorships
- offices held
- service on committees or boards
- courses taught outside the library, such as "Introduction to College Life" (FYE 1210)
- promotional or recruiting activities
- mentoring of fellow professionals
- participation in professional organizations
- establishing or assisting new programs or activities beyond normal expectations of a person’s position
- organization or planning of workshops or conferences
- journal peer reviewer
Appendix IX: Research, Scholarship, and Professional Development and Service Activities for Tenure and/or Promotion

Note: The value of these items will be reviewed annually by library faculty.

Recommendations –

- **High** - 2.5 - 3.00 (blue): valued the most among library faculty.
- **Medium** - 2.0 - 2.49 (orange): valued somewhat among library faculty.
- **Low** - 0 - 1.99 (yellow): valued the least among library faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Value Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a research article published in a referred journal.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a book in the field of librarianship published.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a scholarly article of any type in librarianship published.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding a major office in SELA.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing an American Library Association (ALA) division, committee, or roundtable.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting at a national library conference.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an online teaching module.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing a Georgia Southern committee.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing a division of GLA.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorship of journal in librarianship or related field.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being president or chair of another library-related professional organization (Ex: Society of GA. Archivists).</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding an office other than chair of an ALA division, committee, or roundtable.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The separate tenure and promotion scores were averaged into a single score resulting in the ‘value average’.*
Winning an award for outstanding service.  
Applying for a small (less than $20,000) grant and having it funded.  
Being a Senate Executive Committee member.  
Serving on an ALA division committee or roundtable.  
Chairing a division or section of SELA.  
Chairing a Georgia Library Association committee, interest group, or roundtable.  
Chairing a GIL or GALILEO committee.  
Presenting at an international library conference.  
Chairing a Southeastern Library Association committee or roundtable.  
Being appointed to an editorial board of a journal in librarianship or related field.  
Holding an office other than chair of a division or section of SELA.  
Holding an office other than president or chair of another library related professional organization such as the SGA.  
Earning a doctorate.  
Presenting at a regional library conference.  
Creating computer applications to support library operations.  
Chairing a conference planning committee.  
Holding a major office in ALA.  
Presenting at a state library conference.  
Applying for a grant and getting it approved by the office on campus which assists with grant preparation, whether it gets funded or not.
Performing modification and customization. 2.44
Consulting with other libraries (unpaid). 2.33
Sharing computer applications you created
with other libraries and providing them
with support for installation and use. 2.33
Having a short (less than 2 pages) news, feature, or other
non-scholarly article published in a professional publication. 2.31
Chairing a Henderson Library committee. 2.28
Holding an office other than chair in a division of GLA 2.28
Community Service: Serving as an officer in a community
organization where a background in librarianship applies,
such as a literacy association. 2.28
Having a news, feature, or other non-scholarly article
published in a professional publication of medium
(2 pages) length or longer. 2.22
Consulting with other libraries (paid). 2.22
Holding an office other than chair in
a SELA committee or roundtable. 2.19
Holding a major office in GLA. 2.17
Moderating or facilitating a professional meeting
(a single one or two hour meeting). 2.11
Being a faculty senator. 2.06
Earning a second masters. 2.06
Presenting at a conference not related to librarianship. 2.01
Holding an office other than chair of a GLA committee,
interest group, or roundtable. 2.0
Having a scholarly article published in a field other than
librarianship or archives work. 2.0
Writing a computer program not directly job related.
Example: Program which tallies employees leave hours.
Serving as a webmaster.
Being listed as an author on a paper not in librarianship because you assisted with the research.
Having a book review of medium length (300 words or longer) published in a professional publication.
Teaching the First-Year Experience (FYE) course.
Teaching a credit course in another field other than FYE or library science.
Indexing a conference proceedings or a comparable document.
Managing a weblog.
Advising a student organization.
Participating in a Faculty Learning Community.
Being a member of a Georgia Southern committee.
Being a member of a GIL or GALILEO committee.
Attending a continuing ed. workshop in librarianship, such as a SOLINET workshop.
Having a short book review (fewer than 300 words) published in a professional publication.
Authoring a resolution for a professional association.
Creating an exhibit.
Planning and arranging for a speaker to come on campus.
Attending a national library conference.
Attending a regional library conference.
Chairing the Library’s Day for Southern or Charitable Contributors drive. 1.50

Maintaining or moderating a listserv but not reviewing every post. 1.50

Taking a credit course. 1.50

Recording or reporting for a conference proceedings. 1.45

Community Service: Serving as an officer in a community organization in which being a librarian is not a factor. 1.39

Being a member of a Henderson Library committee. 1.39

Planning and arranging for an exhibit to be provided to the library. 1.33

Attending a state library conference. 1.12

Taking a continuing ed. course not library related. 1.0
APPENDIX X: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

To: Dr. W. XXX YYYY
Dean of the Library and University Librarian
From: Name
Position title
College and School/Department
Subject: Request for External Reviewers

Dear [ ]: [Librarian's Name here], who is currently an associate professor in the Zach S. Henderson Library, is being considered for promotion to Full Professor. We would appreciate your assistance in serving as an external reference for [her/him]. I would appreciate your help in evaluating [his/her] scholarship/professional achievements and service through your response to the following.

A. State if you know the candidate personally. If so, how long and in what capacity have you known the candidate?

B. Please provide a thorough, objective assessment of the candidate’s accomplishments as a scholar and an opinion as to whether the degree of accomplishment is appropriate for the level of [associate/full professor] at a doctoral research university with high standards of achievement expected of its faculty.

C. Comment on the candidate’s contributions to professional practice and service in [his/her] discipline. Comment on the significance of the work produced and its impact on the field.

For your convenience, I have enclosed [candidate name]’s curriculum vita and narrative statement. I would appreciate reply by [date]. I am grateful for your help in this matter. If you need further information, please contact me at phone#, fax #, or e-mail.

Sincerely,

Name of requestor
Requestor's contact information