

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

The role of the reading committee is to review the candidate's scholarly work solely and in all its manifestations. The reading committee's report lays the groundwork for the departmental narrative on scholarship. The language in the current Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions, produced by the Office of the Vice President, 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 recommends that individuals appointed to reading committees for Library personnel actions and others engaged in the evaluative process consider the context of the work, the impact of the work, and any innovation demonstrated when assessing the materials received for review 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?
- Is the scholarly corpus focused, and does it present evidence of the candidate as a "go to" expert in that specialization?
- If a published (print or online) work, was it peer reviewed, and where does that journal/website fit in the pecking order of publications in that field? If not peer reviewed, what is the publication/website's audience?
- If it is published in an open access journal, what is the reputation of the OA journal in the field? Does it appear in the *Directory of Open Access Journals* (www.doaj.org)?
- Where does the candidate's work fall within current applications, theories, and trends in this area of study?
- Does the body of work demonstrate a continuum of scholarly effort and accomplishment in a given area?
- 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 specific part(s) did he/she contribute?

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 and how often?
- Has the scholarship been used, for example, in course syllabi beyond Rutgers University, linked to from external web sites, cited as a model for others, or used in support of grant applications?
- Has the work been translated into other languages?
- 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 scholarship 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, 2/27/2014
Accepted by RUL Faculty March 7, 2003