

LIBRARY FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW FOR 2019: REVIEW SCORING GUIDELINES

The Illinois Library Faculty Review Committee is charged with peer evaluation of Library faculty. The guidelines below are used by the committee to score the librarianship, research, and service of Library faculty.

Under current procedures, all FRC Committee members read each individual faculty member's annual report or dossier plus cover sheet. Using the criteria listed below, committee members assign a score of between 0 and 10 for each of the three areas of the annual review, allowing for 0.5 increments within categories. The scores for the three areas of evaluation are weighted, with **librarianship** receiving a **50%** weight, **research** receiving a **30%** weight, and **professional service** receiving a **20%** weight. The end result is that each faculty member receives an aggregate score between 0 and 10.

FRC members do not score their own annual reports, nor those of faculty members related by blood or marriage. Committee members score each report individually on its own merits using these guidelines and do not consult with other committee members during that process. Scores are recorded by the Chair of FRC in a format that shows the full score range recorded per category for each faculty member. FRC then meets to review the scores. During this discussion members of the committee can adjust the score they assigned to each Library faculty either up or down by increments of .5.

Once the scoring process is completed the aggregate scores are forwarded to the University Librarian. The scores are reported in three different group tables: 0Y to 2Y Tenure Track Faculty, Visiting Faculty, and 3Y to Tenured Faculty. The University Librarian's office uses these scores to determine merit salary increases. The FRC is not directly involved in salary administration or in determining how the scores are used.

In all of the categories a score of 10 is intended to recognize unusually high achievement and would require all of the FRC members to assign a score of 10 in that area.

Scoring Criteria

LIBRARIANSHIP: 50%

Evaluation factors:

Evaluation of librarianship is based on an assessment of the information provided in the faculty member's annual report. Evidence of truly exceptional leadership, innovation, productivity, and creativity in one's librarianship responsibilities would contribute to scores of 8 to 10. Please note: The librarianship section of annual reports is restricted to three pages. FRC will only read the first three pages of the submitted Librarianship section.

- 0-2 Performance is clearly below expectations in multiple areas of librarianship
- 3-4 Performance is satisfactory in one or more areas but unsatisfactory in others
- 5-6 Meets expectations of performance in most areas of librarianship
- 7-8 Above expectations of performance in most areas of librarianship
- 9-10 Notable achievement in all areas of librarianship

RESEARCH: 30%

Evaluation factors:

Evaluation of research is based on an assessment of the information provided in the faculty member's annual report but considers factors beyond simply counting a listing of publications or editorships. Some of the factors that affect the scoring of research include the prestige of the publications in which papers are published, the overall quality of the research, and whether or not articles are peer reviewed. For books, the committee considers type of book including the amount and nature of writing involved. For articles, the type of article is considered including scholarly contribution and the amount of research underlying the article. If an article in a journal is also published as a chapter in a book it will be counted only once. Committee members will have the prerogative of assessing the relative importance and prestige of peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, and other venues for publication. Examples listed for each score range are not exhaustive or exclusive and are intended only as a guide.

0-2 None to very little visible research activity in the past three years

3-4 Some research activity in the past three years.

Examples might include presentation of a paper at local or state conferences, a book review, an article submitted or accepted for publication.

5-6 Evidence of a developing research agenda that has a clear trajectory.

Examples might include at least one article published and at least one other in progress during the past three years.

7-8 Evidence of an active and ongoing research agenda.

Examples might include multiple articles, conference proceedings, or book chapters during the past three years; evidence of progress on books with contract; or support through research grants;

invited papers or lectures, conference proceedings.

9-10 Evidence of a very high level of scholarship and an active and on-going research agenda.

Examples might include more than two articles in a major or peer-reviewed journal plus conference proceedings, the publication of a book during the last three years and/or support through campus and outside research grants. To achieve a score of ten, it is expected that the faculty member would have some combination of the following: peer-reviewed and/or prestigious publications, heavily cited publications or seminal works, and significant recognition and/or outside support through honors or significant research grants.

SERVICE: 20%

Evaluation factors

Evaluation of service is based on an assessment of the information provided in the faculty member's annual report but considers factors related to the level of effort and the nature of the professional activities. Factors that affect the scoring of service include the prestige and scope of an organization in which one serves as well as the significance of the positions or activities in which one engages. Consideration is given to the degree of difficulty or level of professional achievement associated with appointments or positions within an organization, the amount of work involved in the service provided, the impact of the service on the organization or profession, or the impact of the service on the state, the Library or the University. Examples listed for each score are not exhaustive or exclusive and are intended only as a guide.

0-2 None to very little service activity

3-4 Some level of regular involvement in service activities.

Examples include membership on a Library committee, membership in a regional/national/international professional organization, attendance at a national/international conference, participation in local workshops, coursework or workshop taken to enhance work-related professional development, or community activities related to professional service.

5-6 Clear and ongoing involvement in service activities.

Examples might include active participation in a national/international committee, active participation in a local/state/regional committee, and/or membership on and contributions to a campus committee or Library committee.

7-8 Demonstration of progressively more responsible service activities.

Items in this category assume recognition of the individual involved as an expert in a particular

field. Examples include appointment to a prestigious campus committee; acting as a reviewer for grant proposals, formal consulting, paid or unpaid; presenting workshops, demonstrations, or lectures; serving as an outside evaluator or referee (e.g. for promotion and tenure); service on thesis or dissertation committees; papers read at a conference; or significant public engagement related to professional service.

9-10 Higher level contribution to service.

Examples might include being chair of a state, regional, national, or international committee; significant contribution to the work of a committee (e.g. preparation of bylaws or reports for committees or other professional groups); editorship of journals, prestigious newsletters or columns in newsletters/journals; papers at a major conference; or invited papers.