

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP FOR READING COMMITTEES AND OTHERS INVOLVED IN THE REAPPOINTMENT/PROMOTION PROCESS

The role of the reading committee is to review the candidate's scholarly work solely and in all its manifestations and is set forth in the annual Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions that emanate from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and are delivered to Provosts, Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs. The Report of the Reading Committee lays the groundwork for the Departmental narrative on Scholarship which follows. The language in the current Instructions stipulates

The function of a reading committee is to review the candidate's scholarly work and prepare a written assessment of that work for the department's consideration. The reading committee shall not make a recommendation on the reappointment or promotion.

Based on the above language, the Personnel Policy and Affirmative Action Committee of the Rutgers University Libraries' faculty recommends that individuals appointed to reading committees for Library personnel actions and others engaged in the evaluative process consider the following, as appropriate, in assessing the materials presented to them (the context of the work, the impact of those materials, and any innovation demonstrated) and in developing the report of the committee:

Context of the work:

- ? How do the candidate's works fit into the larger context of the available body of literature in the area of study under review?
- ? Where does the candidate's work fall within current applications, theories, and trends in this area of study?
- ? To what degree does the work draw upon the ideas and efforts of others either inside or outside the field?
- ? Does the scholarship reveal historical aspects of the field which have not heretofore been uncovered or described?
- ? If the work was a collaborative effort, what part did he/she contribute? What percent effort?

Impact of the work:

- ? What is the impact of the candidate's work on users and/or colleagues in that librarian's immediate working environment?
- ? Has the work had a positive impact outside the immediate work environment?
- ? Has there been sufficient time for the work to be cited by others, and, if so, by whom?
- ? How has a particular item, or the entire body of work, been critically received by others in the field?

Innovation demonstrated by the work:

- ? To what degree does the work represent a pioneering effort?
- ? Does the work advance knowledge or practice beyond what already exists?
- ? Does the work provide an important synthesis of existing knowledge or practice in a way that it creates a launching point for others?
- ? Does the publication demonstrate the librarian's innovation in the application of new or existing technologies?

PPAAC 11/11/02; revised 11/12/02, 12/3/02, 2/20/03, 4/22/03

Accepted by RUL Faculty March 7, 2003