

# Renewal, Permanence, and Promotion Criteria for Librarian Members at the University of Windsor

Approved by ULAC: November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023  
Approved by UCRPPLM: March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

---

## INTRODUCTION

This document establishes the evaluation criteria for renewal, permanence, and promotion (RPP) of librarian members at the University of Windsor. What follows is consistent with the collective agreement between the Board of Governors of the University of Windsor and the Windsor University Faculty Association<sup>1</sup>. Members of the RPP Committee shall make themselves familiar with the relevant articles in the collective agreement.

Candidates hired prior to the adoption of these criteria may elect (at the time of application for renewal, permanence, or promotion) to be assessed according to these criteria or the criteria in place at the time of their hiring.

The total contribution of candidates will be assessed in three general areas of activity, as per section I: professional practice, service contributions, and research. As per the collective agreement<sup>2</sup>, paramount consideration in the granting of reappointment or permanence and the awarding of promotion shall be given to the candidate's performance and service in the candidate's assigned position. This has been reflected in the descriptions of the evaluation levels, and the overall minimum levels for each rank.

This document sets out minimum standards for renewal, permanence, and promotion, however, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make a strong case that they have met or even exceeded the criteria for renewal, permanence, and promotion. These criteria are set out in sections II, III, and IV.

Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the candidate to include in their submission the documentation and evidence they feel is relevant to presenting their case for renewal, promotion, or permanence.

## EQUITY-INFORMED APPROACH

RPP Committee members will take an equity-informed approach in its assessments<sup>3</sup>. Diversity is to be honoured as integral to the quality of the university's intellectual mission, in both discipline and methodology<sup>4</sup>. Thus, contributions to the university mission, as well as service and research, in non-

---

<sup>1</sup> [2021-2025 collective agreement](#)

<sup>2</sup> As per [Article 13:11](#)

<sup>3</sup> It is recognized by the 2023-2024 LC Committee that additional work needs to be done in the coming months. The principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion must be further integrated in these criteria. Additionally, work must be done to indigenize and decolonize the criteria. Future LC Committees will continue this work with the Office of the Vice President People, Equity, and Inclusion, the Office of the Provost and AVP-Academic, the Office of the Senior Advisor to the President on Indigenous Relations and Outreach, and other campus partners.

<sup>4</sup> Aspects of the section "Equity-Informed Approach" have been adapted from the Windsor Law RTP Criteria, approved by UCAPT on March 1, 2021.

traditional areas and methodologies and/or by members of historically disadvantaged and/or designated groups will be considered equitably.

Academic libraries in Canada are recognized to be founded on principles of colonization. Throughout the process, committee members will evaluate work that does not conform to colonial practices and values. The Committee will be cognizant of and value various teaching and research methodologies, Traditional Knowledge Systems, and recognize that candidates may work with more than one methodology. Interdisciplinary scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching and learning, Indigenous Studies, and/or studies of race/ethnicity will be treated equally.

When asked to do so by candidates and provided with an explanation of the interruptions, the Committee will take into consideration both career interruptions and special circumstances that have affected the performance or productivity of the candidate during the period under consideration. This includes instances where a candidate is taken away from normal work for an extended period(s) of time due to health, family, administrative, or other applicable circumstances.

Social context (this may include social markers of race, gender, indigeneity, disability, and sexuality) will also be considered with respect to student perceptions of effectiveness and other measures of assessing institutional competence. Finally, the professional contributions, research, and service records of candidates who have held previous permanence-/tenure-track positions will also be taken into consideration, with primary consideration given to contributions to the University of Windsor and contributions while working at the University of Windsor.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

This document contains the following sections:

- I. Librarian Ranks: Evaluation Level Expectations
- II. Evaluation of Performance in the Candidate's Assigned Position(s) and Professional Practice
- III. Evaluation of Contributions to the University and to the Academic Profession Through Service
- IV. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity
- V. Evaluation Form

# I. LIBRARIAN RANKS: EVALUATION LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

Review of an application should consider the rank applied for when determining whether the application is successful. In each criteria category, a description of evaluation levels is given from 1-4. The table below indicates the **minimum overall scores** that would be required for a successful application to that rank across the main librarian criteria.

The main criteria categories include performance in the assigned position and professional practice (see section II); contributions to the library, university, and profession through service (see section III); and if applicable, research, scholarship, or creative activity (see section IV). Evaluation of research, scholarship, or creative activity is only applicable if the candidate has research in their workload, or if they elect to be evaluated on research as well (see section IV for more details).

Rank	Rank performance markers <sup>5</sup>	Submission type	Main criteria categories		
			Performance in assigned position and professional practice	Service	Research, scholarship, or creative activity
<b>Librarian I</b>	Appropriate professional requirements and demonstration of potential for further successful performance	Renewal	2	2	1
<b>Librarian II</b>	A record of successful performance as a librarian. Demonstrated capacity to develop and extend their professional and related academic expertise.	Promotion	3	2	2
<b>Librarian III</b>	Continuing effective and efficient performance. Increased responsibility and specialization. Academic and professional achievement, and leadership.	Promotion	3	3	3
<b>Librarian IV<sup>6</sup></b>	Distinguished service, high professional or related academic achievement. Outstanding performance and demonstrated initiative, leadership, and creativity.	Promotion	4	4 OR 4	

<sup>5</sup> As per [Article 13:13](#)

<sup>6</sup> For consideration of promotion to Librarian IV, a candidate must achieve evaluation level 4 in professional practice, and in addition, a level 4 in service or research, scholarship, or creative activity. Please refer to [Article 13:13](#) for more information.

## II. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE IN THE CANDIDATE'S ASSIGNED POSITION(S) AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

### A. COMMITTEE'S SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Sources of evidence could include but are not limited to librarianship personal statements, equity, diversity, and inclusion statements, teaching dossiers, demonstrated outcomes of projects and services provided, colleague and patron perceptions of and/or feedback on professional practice, external reviewers' comments, contributions to development of professional practice and leadership.

### B. EVALUATION LEVELS

These descriptions are only guidelines to understand the broad differences between evaluation levels. These descriptions are for illustration only, and not all may apply.

Relevant Collective Agreement Language: [13:12 \(1\)](#)

Evaluation level (1-4)	Description
<b>Criterion 1: Professional approach, competence, and methods <sup>7</sup></b>	
<b>1</b>	The methods and approaches employed may be inappropriate or inadequate. There is little or no demonstration of initiative. Little or no evidence of design and planning in assigned responsibilities.
<b>2</b>	The methods and approaches are appropriate and generally fulfil the intended outcomes. They demonstrate initiative and are responsive to opportunities and library needs. They provide evidence of design and planning in meeting those goals.
<b>3</b>	The candidate demonstrates deepening professional specialization and innovation in their methods and approaches. The candidate demonstrates consistent initiative and is highly responsive. The candidate's work shows evidence of thoughtful design and planning. They take on increased levels of responsibility and leadership in their work. They may demonstrate their leadership through mentorship and support to colleagues.
<b>4</b>	The methods and approaches employed demonstrate a high level of expertise. The candidate's work consistently demonstrates thoughtful design and careful and planning. They demonstrate consistent initiative and are highly responsive to the needs of the library, campus, and their academic community. As a result of their expertise, their work plays a vital role within the institution and has a broader impact on their larger academic community.

---

<sup>7</sup> As per [Article 13:13 \(1\) A,D,E](#)

Criterion 2: Professional development	
1	The candidate has demonstrated little or no initiative to improve professional work through self-assessment, additional training and/or mentorship opportunities, nor have they acted on meaningful feedback.
2	The candidate has conducted some self-assessment, is aware of opportunities to improve practice through additional training (e.g., workshops), or participated in mentorship opportunities, but may have only participated in limited opportunities.
3	The candidate regularly assesses their practice and participates in continuing education, mentorship, or professional development and demonstrates evidence of applying new learnings to enhance existing and future professional practice.
4	The candidate has a record of extensive professional development, mentorship, or education and demonstrates evidence of applying these skills to enhance existing and future professional practice.
Criterion 3: Collaborations and partnerships <sup>8</sup>	
1	The candidate has not established effective working relationships with faculty, students, staff, or the broader community. Collaboration with students, faculty, and colleagues are limited.
2	The candidate has begun to establish effective working relationships with faculty, students, staff, or the broader community. They work effectively alongside colleagues, students, and collaborators.
3	The candidate has developed numerous or deep effective working relationships with faculty, students, staff, or the broader community. This may be evidenced by effective leadership, administration, or project management. They are highly effective working alongside colleagues, students, and faculty.
4	The candidate has developed numerous or deep effective working relationships with faculty, students, staff, or the broader community. In addition, they have established a strong working relationship within the larger consortial, academic community, or communities they serve. They are highly effective working alongside colleagues, students, and faculty.

---

<sup>8</sup> As per [Article 13:12 \(1\) B](#)

Criterion 4: Strategic alignment with the library and university mission <sup>9</sup>	
<b>1</b>	They do not effectively align and relate their work to overall goals of the library and of the university.
<b>2</b>	They have developed a focus on user needs and have begun to effectively align and relate their work to overall goals of the library and of the university.
<b>3</b>	They demonstrate a high level of user-focus and are effective at aligning their work with goals of the library and of the university. They may also recognize initiatives and opportunities for the library across campus that align with the strategic goals of the university.
<b>4</b>	They are not only effective at aligning their work with the goals of the library and of the university, but demonstrate vision, leadership, and initiative within the institution and the profession.

---

<sup>9</sup> As per [Article 13:12 \(1\) C](#)

### III. EVALUATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND TO THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION THROUGH SERVICE

#### A. COMMITTEE'S SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Sources of evidence could include, equity, diversity, and inclusion statements, CV, colleague, student, staff evaluations of and/or feedback on service, external reviewer comments, contributions to the unit, institution, field/discipline, and service leadership. Candidates are encouraged to clearly express the unique contributions they made within the service in which they were involved.

#### B. EVALUATION LEVELS

These descriptions are only guidelines to understand the broad differences between evaluation levels. These descriptions are for illustration only, and not all may apply.

Relevant Collective Agreement Language: [Article 13:12 \(2\)](#)

Evaluation level (1-4)	Description
<b>Criterion 1: Service in affairs related to the library, the university, the profession, and/or service in support of equity, diversity, and inclusion</b>	
<b>1</b>	The candidate has not made efforts to acquaint themselves with service opportunities or demonstrated an interest in service to the library, university, profession, or in support of equity, diversity, and inclusion.
<b>2</b>	The candidate has become familiar with service opportunities available to them. The candidate has moderate involvement in service activities. Engagement is somewhat varied, with involvement in a few areas, but not extensively. Contributions are generally task oriented.
<b>3</b>	<p>The candidate is actively engaged in service activities with significant contributions. The candidate engages in various areas, including service work external to the university, demonstrating a commitment to diverse service opportunities. The candidate's contributions have a positive impact and show a sustained commitment to service.</p> <p>Examples may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Involvement in related professional associations.</li><li>• Evidence of impact of service initiatives.</li><li>• Conference organizer or panel chair.</li><li>• Leadership on project teams and initiatives within areas of expertise.</li><li>• Receipt of internal or external awards.</li><li>• Grant recipient to sponsor professional events or conferences.</li><li>• Community service contribution by virtue of professional or academic expertise. Mentorship to new professionals.</li></ul>

4	<p>This evaluation level is not a recognition of long service, but rather exceptional involvement in service work with substantial contributions. The candidate actively engages in a wide range of service opportunities, both within and outside the university. The candidate demonstrates exceptional initiative and leadership in service initiatives. Contributions are highly impactful, leading to meaningful changes and demonstrating a sustained, proactive commitment to service.</p> <p>Examples may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of programs and initiatives that garner sustained adoption and engagement from numerous institutions on regional, national, or international scales.</li> <li>• Pioneering, leading, and successfully implementing library technology solutions that have been embraced on a provincial, national, or global scale.</li> <li>• Leadership on provincial, national, or international library organizations with significant impact and involvement.</li> <li>• Initiating and providing leadership for a professional journal that maintains a lasting and influential presence within the field.</li> <li>• Exercising influential leadership and assuming significant responsibilities on university or union committees or projects.</li> <li>• Demonstrating impactful service, collaboration, and leadership in advancing equity, diversity, and inclusion.</li> <li>• Demonstrating impactful service, collaboration, and leadership in advancing decolonization and indigenization efforts.</li> </ul>
---	---



## IV. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

### A. APPLICATION OF THIS SECTION

As per [Article 5:55](#) in the collective agreement, a librarian workload may include research, scholarship, or creative activity when agreed upon by the member and University Librarian or Law Librarian. As such, an evaluation of research, scholarship, or creative activity is applicable according to these standards if agreed upon as part of the librarian's workload. Like the assignment of percentages assigned to reference desk duties, the following criteria is based upon an assigned percentage of 10% allocated to research, if included in the workload.

This does not preclude librarians from conducting research if it is not agreed to in their workloads, but according to [Article 13:11](#), such contributions would be made outside of normal working hours. Such contributions would not have to be evaluated in this section. It is up to the candidate to decide if these contributions should be evaluated in the context of their professional practice or service criteria, or to be evaluated as research and scholarly activity.

### B. COMMITTEE'S SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Sources of evidence could include research statements, colleague evaluations of and/or feedback on research, external reviewers' comments, contributions to research, research leadership, sample writing, article level metrics.

### C. EVALUATION LEVELS

These descriptions are only guidelines to understand the broad differences between evaluation levels. These descriptions are for illustration only, and not all may apply.

Relevant Collective Agreement Language: [Article 13:12 \(3\)](#)

Evaluation level (1-4)	Description
Criterion 1: Research, scholarship, and creative activity	
1	The candidate has not yet articulated clear goals and strategies for disseminating their research, scholarship, or creative activity. Additionally, they have not developed and communicated specific areas of research interest that are relevant to their professional and related academic activities.

2	<p>The candidate articulates an area of research, scholarship, or creative activity interest and has begun to make progress on this area. The candidate has articulated goals and strategies for dissemination. The candidate can articulate how their research and scholarly work is relevant to professional and related academic activities.</p>
3	<p>The candidate articulates an area of scholarly interest and has made contributions in this area in the form of scholarly publications. The candidate can articulate how their research and scholarly work is relevant to professional and related academic activities.</p> <p>Furthermore, the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has authored or co-authored one to two peer reviewed publications (e.g., journal articles, chapters); or,</li> <li>• Has presented at multiple academic conferences, panels, or workshops; or,</li> <li>• Has completed another form of research contribution (e.g., a dataset usable for research, which itself is disseminated in some way, a contribution to data analysis as part of a research team); or,</li> <li>• Has found and can demonstrate impactful means of dissemination through other alternative venues to share research, or to create new scholarship.</li> </ul>
4	<p>The candidate articulates an area of research, scholarship, or creative activity interest and has made impactful contributions in this area. The candidate can articulate how their research and scholarly work is relevant to professional and related academic activities.</p> <p>Furthermore, the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has authored or co-authored four or more impactful peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal articles, chapters); or,</li> <li>• Has authored or co-authored a book accepted for publication.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to peer-reviewed publications, some indicators that can also demonstrate impact and equivalencies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is an active member of an editorial board of a journal or has launched a new journal in collaboration with colleagues.</li> <li>• Invited to present at provincial, national, or international conferences or given keynote addresses.</li> <li>• Contribution to the creation of other important scholarly projects or works whose impact can be demonstrated (e.g., developing a data mining project on a significant collection, or developing a digital archive and exhibit, code, etc.)</li> <li>• Recognition through receipt of external grants and awards</li> </ul>

## V. EVALUATION FORM

### A. CRITERIA SCORING

Criterion	Summary of Evidence Used in the Evaluation	Evaluation Level (1-4)
<b>Performance in the Candidate's Assigned Position(s) and Professional Practice</b>		
<i>Criterion 1</i> Professional approach, competence, and methods		
<i>Criterion 2</i> Professional development		
<i>Criterion 3</i> Collaboration and partnerships		
<i>Criterion 4</i> Strategic alignment with the library and university mission		
Overall evaluation for this section  Clearly state and comment on how the candidate has performed with respect to specific RPP criteria.		
<b>Contributions to the Library, University and Profession Through Service</b>		
<i>Criterion 1</i> Service in affairs related to the library, the university, the profession, and/or service in support of equity, diversity, and inclusion.		
Overall evaluation for this section  Clearly state and comment on how the candidate has performed with respect to specific RPP criteria.		
<b>Research and Scholarly Activity <sup>10</sup></b>		
<i>Criterion 1</i> Research, scholarship, and creative activity		
Overall evaluation for this section		

<sup>10</sup> Evaluation of research and scholarship is only applied if the candidate has research in their workload, or if they elect to be evaluated on research as well.

Clearly state and comment on how the candidate has performed with respect to specific RPP criteria.		
---	--	--

## **B. OVERALL SUMMARY**

### **1. Final overall assessment of the candidate by the RPP Committee.** [for candidates in the Leddy Library and Law Library]

The RPP Committee recommends/does not recommend renewal/permanence/promotion

### **2. Overall assessment by the Associate University Librarian or Law Librarian. Clearly state if the candidate meets the RPP criteria.** [for candidates in the Leddy Library and Law Library]

The Associate University Librarian / Law Librarian recommends/does not recommend renewal/permanence/promotion

### **3. Overall assessment by the University Librarian. Clearly state if the candidate meets the RPP criteria.** [for candidates in the Leddy Library only]

The University Librarian recommends/does not recommend renewal/permanence/promotion