

# The Faculty Review Cmte: Annual Report FY20

**Charge:** The Faculty Review Committee provides the first level of review for promotion and tenure or for promotion to a higher rank. The Committee is also responsible for monitoring visiting committee reports, and peer evaluation of Library Faculty for merit. In addition, it is responsible for insuring that appropriate channels of communication exist among the Committee, the University Librarian, and the Library Faculty regarding the work of the Committee and its decisions.

**Cmte page:** <https://www.library.illinois.edu/staff/committee/faculty-review-committee/>

## 2019-2020 membership

- Merinda Kaye Hensley, Co-Chair (Dec 2019 - Nov 2022) Second Consecutive Term -- Central Public Services
- Cindy Ingold, Co-Chair (Dec 2019 - Nov 2022) -- Social Sciences Division
- Shuyong Jiang (Dec 2018 - Nov 2021) -- International and Area Studies
- Mary Schlembach (Dec 2019 - Nov 2022) Second Consecutive Term -- Physical Sciences and Engineering Division
- Wendy Shelburne (Dec 2018 - Nov 2021) -- Technical Services Division
- Marek Sroka (Dec 2019 - Nov 2022) Second Consecutive Term -- Arts and Humanities Division
- Caroline Szyłowicz (Dec 2019 - Nov 2022) -- Special Collections Division
- Sarah Williams (Dec 2017 - Nov 2020) -- Life Sciences Division

Note: The committee responded to feedback provided by faculty during faculty meetings and from several one-on-one conversations to address concerns regarding the FRC scoring process. In order to address concerns, the FRC took three measures in FY 2019-2020:

1. The co-chairs designed and held a new workshop to be as transparent as possible regarding the scoring process including how the rubrics are applied, especially to research and service. What was covered: 1. Reviewed the Library and campus tenure and promotion documentation, 2. Provided an overview for how librarianship is scored and valued by the committee, 3. Led discussion on how we (as a faculty) present the diversity of our responsibilities and how to show appropriate impact, 4. Briefly reviewed rubrics for research and service and how to highlight items within the dossier and annual report documents, and 5. Emphasized the difference between self-reporting in an annual report and how that differs from the dossier/tenure process. We also provided examples of annual reports (with permission) and encouraged questions.
2. At the suggestion of a tenured faculty member, the committee conducted an evaluation of scores to examine the possibility of impact of bias on scoring. The co-chairs conducted a re-calculation of five faculty members scores using last year's numbers (2018) minus the highest and lowest scores for each faculty member in the categories of research and service. Results indicated that deleting these scores

made little difference in the overall final score, only adjusting scores to the tenth of a point in any direction.

3. The co-chairs designed and piloted a norming exercise before the annual review scoring process. This included having all FRC members submit scores for four reports and then discussing the reasons for the scores. The committee did respond positively to this exercise, it was noted that this will help new members to the committee each year, and suggests this exercise continue as part of the annual workflow.

## **Accomplishments**

1. September: The FRC voted on four promotion and tenure cases on September 30, 2019. Votes were sent to the University Librarian (UL) via email with formal letters for each candidate.
2. October: Voted and submitted recommendations for all candidates for tenure and/or promotion (5Y, Q contract, and Associate to Full) for the UL.
3. October: With representatives from the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Cmte (PTAC) and the AUL for Digital Strategies (in his role as representative for academic affairs), co-chairs (Merinda Hensley and Marek Sroka) of the FRC attended tenure-track luncheon with the Dean.
4. November: Co-chairs (Merinda Hensley and Marek Sroka) invited to EC meeting with representatives from PTAC, Heidi Imker (AUL for Research) and Chris Prom (AUL for Digital Strategies) to discuss Research Challenges and Options for Tenure Evaluation and Mentoring on November 11, 2019.
5. November: Merinda Hensley and Cindy Ingold were chosen by the committee to serve as co-chairs for 2019-2020; Cindy Ingold replaced Nancy O'Brien as the Social Sciences Divisions representative; Mary Schlembach began a second term as the Physical Sciences and Engineering Division representative; Marek Sroka began a second term as the Arts and Humanities Division representative; Caroline Szyłowicz replaced Ellen Swain as the Special Collections Division representative.
6. November: Updated documentation for the annual reporting process and sent 2019 Annual Review Letter, 2019 Annual Report Guidelines, and 2019 Annual Review Scoring Guidelines to Library faculty on November 26, 2019.
7. November: Co-chairs reorganized and updated the FRC files in the G Drive.
8. December-January: Held open office hours with PTAC on December 9 and January 9 with 0 attendees.
9. January: Held an open workshop on January 10, 2020 with 8 attendees.
10. January: Annual reports from every library faculty member were due on January 27, 2020. As per usual, the FRC accommodates extension requests on an individual basis.
11. February: Prior to the annual review process, performed the norming exercise outlined above.
12. February: The co-chairs worked with PTAC, the supervising head of the unit, and Chris Prom (who consulted with Associate Provost William Bernhard and the relevant Provost communications, EC, and the Dean) to develop a review process for a specialized faculty member and research associate professor. The weights for librarianship, research, service are 20/60/20 and there is recognition that the process for specialized faculty may change over time.

13. February-March: Reviewed 70 annual reports. The annual scoring process includes each member of FRC scoring every annual report. The committee schedules three scoring meetings over the course of three weeks. In each meeting, the committee looks over the scores for each candidate and members are given the opportunity to adjust scores accordingly. The discussion revolves around questions members may have regarding a specific report with divisional representatives chiming in when they can provide context for a faculty member's work, particularly in librarianship e.g., a grant project is particularly prestigious or a project took a significant amount of collaboration or expertise. In this year's review, the committee paid specific attention to the rubrics for research and service and did re-count or re-examine across the submitted documentation to calibrate scores. The FRC members are not in the room for discussion of their own annual report with co-chairs managing each other's scoring process.
14. March: Provided scoring to Library Dean for consideration on March 30, 2020. One member of FRC and a mentee work together to finalize the scoring process and the committee would like to thank these members for their additional work. Final scores are used by the University Librarian to determine merit raises, should there be allocated funds from the campus.
15. March: The co-chairs worked with PTAC and the University Librarian's Office to collect a set of redacted dossiers to be shared with the tenure-track faculty. These examples no longer need to be requested on an individual basis, they are located in a Box folder. There are three redacted dossiers for assistant to associate, three redacted dossiers for associate to full, and one redacted dossier for Q contract. <https://uofi.box.com/s/w5o6szt7j2sbox1c3attqnn84upjusfj>
16. March: The co-chairs were consulted along with PTAC and Chris Prom regarding an update to the current year's rollback process as impacted by COVID-19. As a reminder, rollbacks were granted with generosity and the Library neither encouraged nor discouraged COVID-19 rollback requests. Tenure-track faculty members were encouraged to make their own choice, based on how individuals felt that COVID-19 affected their librarianship, research, and/or service. The process did not require documentation or justification. Requesting a rollback will not affect a candidate's ability to go up for tenure on the existing schedule, should they choose to do so. Rollbacks will have no effect on how a case is considered during the tenure review process; the same set of standards will be applied as if no rollback had been granted.
17. 3rd Monday of April: Submitted FRC assessment to University Librarian of two 5Y candidates readiness for Promotion and Tenure review.
18. End of April: The committee reviewed the 2019 paperwork for four 4Y candidates and two 5Y candidates and held discussion in order to construct detailed feedback letters for each candidate. Members of the FRC were assigned to draft the letters. The committee reviewed each letter and made final suggestions on the drafts with co-chairs doing the final read to ensure feedback was detailed and accurate. The co-chairs also reviewed the 2018 4Y feedback for the current 5Y candidates to make sure the committee's advice was consistent from year to year. We would recommend the committee continue to do this in the future.
19. Mid-May: Annual review letters were sent to faculty via email.

20. May: All inquires are directed to be sent to the FRC in care of the University Librarian's Office. The co-chairs addressed one letter to a faculty member's inquiry regarding scoring and the annual review process.
21. June: The committee discussed the charge of the Mentoring and Evaluation Task Force and provided feedback to the task force. Membership: Chris Prom (chair), Mary Laskowski (PTAC Rep), Merinda Hensley (FRC Rep), Jennifer Teper (EC Rep), and Dan Tracy (6Y Faculty Member).
  - a. The Mentoring and Evaluation Task Force is charged with:
    - i. Consulting the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, Faculty Review Committee, untenured librarians, Executive Committee, and other groups to gather information about the current operation of PRCs.
    - ii. Studying and documenting positive and negative aspects of the current evaluation and mentoring ecosystem, limited to tenure progress reviews. (NOTE: the FRC-led annual evaluation process is not included in this working group's charge.)
    - iii. Identifying improved models for research mentoring and tenure progress evaluation.
    - iv. As appropriate, and based on the work completed in steps 1-3, recommending revisions to our structures and processes.
    - v. The Executive Committee will review drafts and provide feedback to the task force.
    - vi. Reporting the work of the group to the Faculty as a whole.
22. Throughout the year, the FRC collaborates with PTAC to meet with potential job candidates to discuss the annual review and tenure track process. For FY2019-2020, the FRC met with 3 candidates for the Planning, Landscape Architecture, and Agriculture Librarian position and 4 candidates for the Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Librarian and submitted formal co-authored letters to the search committee chairs.

7/30/2020