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# 1. Philosophy

**Overview**

The goal of the establishment of Standards of Academe for librarians at Nevada State College is to provide clear expectations and guidelines for the equitable evaluation of all library faculty and successful achievement of tenure.

**Librarianship**

Library faculty are to be evaluated on the same performance areas as teaching faculty with the distinction of “librarianship” as the primary function for evaluation and assessment. Librarianship will be defined as the primary evaluation criteria for library faculty in lieu of teaching. Librarianship as an evaluation category is defined as the faculty member’s role and responsibilities within the library.

**Annual Review**

At each annual review, the faculty member and evaluator will develop annual goals for the calendar year. The annual goals will include specific goals for the faculty member to achieve in each of the three categories of librarianship, scholarship, and service.

At each annual review, the faculty member must provide a copy of the annual goals agreed upon at the previous year’s review and indicate which items from the plan were completed.

# 2. Librarianship

**2.1 Overview**

Faculty shall provide a narrative description of activities in their area of librarianship. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual’s professional effectiveness and should include evidence of projects and activities that benefited the library or college.

**Rating Librarianship in the Annual Review Process**

When rating librarianship, the evaluator will consider *what* was accomplished and *how* it was accomplished. In the Standards of Academe, *what* facultyaccomplish is measured by evaluating progress toward meeting the goals set forth in the annual performance review and by completion of the responsibilities listed in the faculty member’s position description. *How* library faculty accomplish their work is evaluated using the Library Values. The Values prioritize library faculty, staff, and students working together as a team to creatively meet the needs of the campus community.

**Library Values**

**Coachability**

*As exemplified by:*

* Uses feedback from others to make noticeable and noteworthy changes in his/her skills and productivity
* Anticipates learning needs and has a plan in place to meet those needs
* Known for valuing learning; finds time and space for helping others learn
* Shows team members how mistakes can be valuable learning opportunities
* Has a professional development plan to address ongoing short- and long-term learning needs
* Anticipates major functional changes that affect their job and takes steps to prepare for them
* Participates in leadership roles in professional organizations and conferences

**Collegiality**

*As exemplified by:*

* Actively supports and implements team decisions and ideas and gives full credit to the team for successful outcomes
* Makes special efforts to ensure that all team members are respectful of one another and work productively together
* Actively supports and implements team decisions
* Mediates and helps the team resolve team conflicts
* Volunteers enthusiastically to work on intra- and interdepartmental teams
* Influences others who are not under his/her direct authority or control to accomplish results
* Adjusts interpersonal approaches to attend to the needs of diverse groups of people
* Negotiates with others to reach a win-win outcome

**Communication**

*As exemplified by:*

* Encourages and values input; shows an interest in others’ needs and concerns even when under pressure
* Anticipates communication needs and shares information effectively with all levels of the organization
* Promotes and uses a candid and open speaking style
* Notes and reports are often forwarded and cited
* People often enjoy listening to this person talk and are influenced by him/her
* Uses exactly the right medium (e-mail, voice mail, in person) at just the right length depending on message and audience
* Resolves conflicts and opens lines of communication

**Campus Focus**

*As exemplified by:*

* Noted for displaying customer service behaviors that exceed the expectations of the campus community
* Visits or calls campus stakeholders to find out what they are doing and what they need; stays abreast of developments that may be relevant to them
* Frequently exceeds agreed-upon service levels and time frames
* Learns from mistakes so that they are not repeated in future interactions
* Works with other team members to find better qualitative and quantitative ways to track stakeholder satisfaction
* Seeks out campus stakeholder problems and complaints and removes barriers that get in the way of meeting and exceeding stakeholder needs

**Efficiency**

*As exemplified by:*

* Known for exceptional attendance record
* Produces extraordinary results in a reasonable timeframe
* Conscientious about spending and accounting for department funds and finds ways to save and recover money
* Continuously strives to improve key work processes
* Identifies benchmarks with others to find process improvement opportunities
* Helps others to develop measures for quality improvements in their own work areas

**Initiative**

*As exemplified by:*

* Significantly exceeds expectations by doing more than is required and by initiating and implementing new projects
* Recognizes and seizes opportunities even if outside of normal job duties
* Pursues solutions to problems with a sense of urgency; beats deadlines
* Ideas are adopted by the Library or the College
* Seeks new challenges and secondary responsibilities
* Formally recognized for going “above and beyond the call of duty” (thank you notes, awards)
* Takes charge and finds solutions when things go wrong
* Always does what he/she says will be done; is noted for trustworthiness and dependability

**Leadership (as applicable):**

*As exemplified by:*

* Motivates others in the organization to achieve mission
* Champions the performance evaluation process and uses it successfully to increase productivity and develop employees
* Helps team develop more collaborative and productive ways of problem solving and decision making
* Encourages employee growth and achievement by emphasizing learning from mistakes and failures and building on successes
* Teaches staff better ways of communicating with customers, peers, and each other
* Assesses talent well; people want to work with him/her

**Annual Review Ratings**

**Unsatisfactory**

• Did not meet expectations to some extent.

• Did not accomplish many individual objectives

or did not demonstrate some Library Values for the rating of librarianship.

• Made limited contributions to the Library/College.

• Must improve to perform effectively in current position.

**Satisfactory**

**•** Met expectations.

• Accomplished individual objectives and demonstrated Library Values in a consistent manner.

• Made substantial contributions to the Library/College.

• Appropriately challenged in current position.

**Commendable**

• Exceeded expectations.

• Accomplished individual objectives and demonstrated Library Values in a remarkable manner.

• Made noteworthy contributions to the Library/College beyond what was planned.

• Ready for more independence in current position.

**Excellent**

• Exceeded expectations to a great extent.

• Accomplished individual objectives and demonstrated Library Values in an exemplary manner.

• Made distinguished contributions to the Library/College well beyond what was planned.

• May be ready for a more challenging position or additional responsibility in current position.

# 3. Scholarship

**3.1 Overview**

Evidence of productive scholarship can be supported by published records as well as other original work of a professional nature. However, scholarship does not operate on a yearly cycle, but is instead marked by projects that can take multiple years. Consequently, the tenure and promotion expectations for scholarship are more independent of the annual review ratings and focus on the cumulative accomplishments of the faculty member in terms of originality, quality, and quantity. External validation (peer-review) of one’s work resulting in a published product is required for promotion and tenure at NSC.

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. Departmental evaluators are responsible for judging the quality of the faculty member’s scholarship. Quality can refer to the effect scholarship makes on advances in knowledge, the professional community, and especially, the enrichment of library practice. This concept of quality places more importance on the process and effect than on the quantity of products.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty shall provide a narrative description of their scholarly activities including how those activities have affected their practice of librarianship. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual’s scholarship.

**3.5 Rating Scholarship in the Annual Review Process**

To promote equality in ratings of scholarship performance, a unit of measure called Scholarly Effort [SE] will be utilized. One SE is equivalent to any significant scholarly contribution, such as an article in a recognized publication or a presentation with significant content.

**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), plus a timetable for completion.

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

2 SEs.

# 4. Service

**4.1 Overview**

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of service activities. 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) that reflect particular service contributions and may be asked to provide additional evidence of service contributions as requested by their supervisor during the review process.

**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)**

At least one activity from, but not limited to, the following: evidence of responsibility on or contribution to committee activity in a professional organization, the College, or the Library.

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

May include, but is not limited to additional activities as follows: evidence of significant responsibility on or contribution to committees in a professional organization, the College, or the Library.

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

May include, but is not limited to evidence of exceptional leadership on committee(s) or in a professional organization, the College, or the Library.