Seattle University
Committee for Librarian Evaluation and Promotion

V. Guidelines for File Preparation and Presentation

A. Definitions

1. **Annual Evaluations**
   An evaluation of work performance completed annually by the supervising librarian.

2. **Comprehensive Vita**
   A curriculum vita that covers the candidate's entire professional career, not just the portion served at Seattle University.

3. **Cover Letter**
   A letter, written by the candidate, which requests consideration for promotion. The letter should indicate the candidate's current rank and length of service at that rank, as well as the rank to which the candidate aspires. The letter should also state the candidate's date of hire and indicate which editions of the *Faculty Handbook* and *CLEP Handbook* should be used for evaluation.

4. **Position Description**
   A comprehensive description of the candidate's current duties.

5. **Recommendations**
   Statement endorsing or disapproving of a candidate's petition for advancement in rank (see section D. Recommendations).

6. **Solicited Evaluative Letters**
   Substantive, evaluative letters from library faculty and/or faculty or professional colleagues, whether at Seattle University or other institutions, who have worked with the candidate and who can substantiate the candidate's professional accomplishments. Testimonials should be discouraged. At least two letters are desirable with at least one from a faculty colleague or library faculty colleague preferred. The candidate will supply the Chair with names of those who will write evaluative letters. The Chair is required to furnish to each individual from whom an evaluative letter is solicited a copy of *Appendix B: Guidelines for Solicited Evaluative Letters*. The Chair is responsible for following up as needed for completion of this requirement. Service on CLEP during a candidate's

promotion does not disqualify that member from writing a solicited evaluative letter concerning that candidate.

7. **Statement of Qualifications**
A summary (1-3 pages), written by the candidate, which condenses and highlights the academic and professional activities or accomplishments in the areas of professional responsibilities, scholarly activity and/or professional development, and service to the library, University, profession, and community.

8. **Supporting Documentation**

   a. **Professional Responsibilities**
   Criteria will be applied within the context of the candidate's home library and considering their unique role and job responsibilities in that organization. Examples of documents provided could include sample learning outcomes, lesson plans, assessments, research guides, and online tutorials; documentation of workflows, processes, outcomes, and comparative evidence of improvement in systems; and documentation of activities designed to improving library resources, services and policies, including workflows, policies, procedures and workflow documentation, manuals, reports, and meeting minutes.

   b. **Scholarly Activity and/or Professional Development**
   Criteria will be applied within the context of the candidate's home library and considering their unique role and job responsibilities in that organization. Examples of documents provided could include copies of manuscripts, typescripts, publications and articles, reviews, computer applications, symposia contributions, library/curricular or grant proposals, reports, files, etc.; pertinent supporting documents generated from professional development and scholarly activity. If activities include coursework or continuing education courses, then supporting documentation should be included.

   c. **Service to the Library, University, Profession, and Community**
   Criteria will be applied within the context of the candidate's home library and considering their unique role and job responsibilities in that organization. Examples of documents provided could include documents exhibiting substantive assessment of work on/for professional library organizations and committees, library and University committees, community organizations; copies of programs from conferences, workshops, seminars, copies of reports produced from committees, taskforces; summaries of consulting projects;

outlines/summaries of public speaking activities outside the library. Testimonials should be discouraged.

    d. Miscellaneous Supporting Documents
This optional category should include materials that the candidate believes are essential, but that are not included elsewhere in the file. The candidate should be selective about this material.

9. Testimonial
A statement that, in general terms, praises a candidate for personal or professional skills, attitudes, behaviors or aptitudes but that does not provide concrete details that ground the statement in observed activities related to professional responsibilities, scholarly activity and/or professional development, and service.

B. Candidate's Promotion File

1. Physical Form
The file for promotion shall consist of an electronic file that adheres to the preparation standards set out in the CLEP *Electronic Promotion File Guidelines*.

2. Contents

    a. The following documents must be included in the candidate's review file: cover letter, statement of qualifications, comprehensive vita, position description, annual evaluations, recommendations, solicited evaluative letters.

    b. The following documents may be added to the candidate's review file: supporting documentation, unsolicited evaluative letters. The candidate should include substantial supporting documentation that reflects verifiable evidence of professional responsibilities, scholarly activity and/or professional development, and service to the library, University, profession, and community, so that the Committee may fairly assess the candidate's achievements in these areas. Documents that clearly verify the candidate's work or participation, such as letters of appointment or publications bearing the candidate's name, are highly desirable. Examples of other acceptable documentation are provided in section A.8 (above).

    c. The majority of supporting documentation should reflect work completed since the candidate's last promotion at Seattle University or

other institution. While primary focus should be on work completed in the most recent years, this does not preclude inclusion of documents from another institution or that fall outside the promotion timeline. Candidates should refrain from submitting documentation that has already been reviewed by the Committee during a previous promotion process.

3. **Housing of Files**
The candidate's print files are housed in the Dean of the Lemieux Library's or Law Library Director's office and eventually returned to the candidate without letters of recommendation and other confidential material.

C. Confidentiality

1. **Confidentiality in Evaluation**
The University believes that the confidentiality of certain communications and materials is essential to a full and fair consideration for reappointment and promotion in that it promotes candor and honesty among the participants reviewing the various candidates. Therefore, all statements of fact and all statements of judgment (whether oral or written) made during (or for use in) any formal consideration of promotion (including, without limitation, recommendations and opinions made by persons outside the University) are and shall remain confidential. Only those involved directly in the consideration processes (but not including the candidate) shall have access to the confidential communications and materials. In addition, the percentage of Committee members voting yea or nay, at any level of the review process, shall remain confidential. However, while the confidentiality of individual Committee members is to be protected, candidates shall be informed of the final decision of the Committee, and of the reasons for a negative decision as outlined in the *Timeline for Evaluation and Promotion of Library Faculty*.

2. **Access to the File**
The candidate shall have access to their file(s) up to the point at which the file is forwarded to the Provost, with the exception of the recommendations and solicited evaluative letters.

3. **Recommendations or Solicited Evaluative Letters**
Recommendations and/or solicited evaluative letters should be submitted directly to the Committee.

4. **Unsolicited Evaluative Letters**

Unsolicited evaluative letters will be accepted as part of the file, but will not receive the same consideration as solicited letters.

D. Recommendations

1. **Department Head**
   The Department Head's written and dated recommendation should be based on a thorough assessment of the candidate's performance in the areas of job effectiveness, professional growth, and service to a department, the University or the community. The recommendation should specifically address criteria delineated in the document entitled *Standards for Promotion in Rank of Library Faculty* and relevant *Faculty Handbook* sections.

2. **Committee for Librarian Evaluation and Promotion**
   The Committee's recommendation is authored for the Committee by the Chair and should reflect a full analysis of the candidate's file. The written recommendation should relate the candidate's suitability for advancement in rank to the characteristics enumerated in the document entitled *Standards for Promotion in Rank of Library Faculty* and relevant *Faculty Handbook* sections. The Committee's vote, the date of action, and the signatures of all Committee members should be a part of the recommendation. The Committee's memorandum should be drafted according to *Appendix D: Format for Letter of Recommendation*. The file should be forwarded with a copy of *Appendix C: Timeline Checklist*.

3. **Dean of the Lemieux Library's or Law Library Director's Recommendation**
   The Dean of the Lemieux Library's or the Law Library Director's written and dated recommendation should be based on observation, and a review of the file materials. The candidate's performance should be assessed on the basis of the characteristics enumerated in the document entitled *Standards for Promotion in Rank of Library Faculty* and relevant *Faculty Handbook* sections.

4. **Law School Dean's Recommendation**
   This subsection applies to law library faculty only. The Law School Dean's written and dated recommendation should be based on observation and a review of the file materials. The candidate's performance should be assessed on the basis of the characteristics enumerated in the document entitled *Standards for Promotion in Rank of Library Faculty* and relevant *Faculty Handbook* sections.

5. **Provost's Recommendation**
   The Provost's written and dated recommendation to the President should be based on a review of the full file. The candidate's performance should be

assessed on the basis of the characteristics enumerated in the document entitled *Standards for Promotion in Rank of Library Faculty* and relevant *Faculty Handbook* sections.