**Performance Evaluation by Unit Peer Review Committee**

**Tenure-Track and Tenured Library Faculty**

**January 1, 20\_\_\_ – December 31, 20\_\_\_**

Librarian\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Department\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions and Scale**

Using the documents outlined in III.B of the Libraries’ Personnel Document and personal knowledge of the faculty member’s performance and activities, the Unit Peer Review Committee should provide an assessment and score in each of the three areas of professional performance, scholarship, and service and justification for the rating in the comments. Scores are defined as follows:

**0–Does Not Meet Expectations**

**1–Minimally Meets Expectations**

**2–Fully Meets Expectations**

**3–Greatly Exceeds Expectations**

The committee may assign any value up to two decimal places between 0 and 3 in each of the three areas: professional performance, scholarship, and service. An overall score is computed from the relative weights in each area. An overall score below 1 is overall unsatisfactory. Failure by the librarian to provide evidence of contributions in any area will result in a score of 0 in the area(s) and failure to submit the required documents will result in an overall score of 0.

**I. Committee’s assessment of professional performance**

Activities and qualities to consider may include the following: application of professional knowledge; willingness to accept additional responsibility; collegial interaction with patrons and fellow employees; ability to identify, analyze, and solve problems; ability to make decisions; quality and quantity of work; contributions toward the goals and objectives of the department, Libraries, and University; effectiveness in carrying out personal goals; communication skills; effectiveness in the guidance, development, and supervision of other personnel; and effectiveness in the management of one’s unit or department. Not all categories apply to every librarian, and the committee may evaluate the librarian in other relevant categories not listed above but that are a part of the librarian’s specific position.

**Scale**

**0**–Mastery of required skills or competence is not evident in the performance of work; fails to contribute to organizational objectives.

**1–**Evidence of performance sufficient to fulfill basic job requirements; completes assignments; participates collegially in teamwork; contributes to organizational objectives.

**2–**Evidence of a high degree of competence in most areas of responsibility; has full command of knowledge and skills required; accepts additional responsibilities; contributes fully to organizational objectives.

**3–**Evidence of exemplary and meritorious performance; seeks out, accepts, and/or carries out additional responsibilities with a high degree of competence; expertise in the position is recognized by others; contributes substantially to organizational objectives.

Committee’s comments:

Performance rating: \_\_\_\_\_ (70% of composite rating)

**II. Committee’s assessment of scholarship**

Examples of scholarly activities are found in II.C of the Libraries’ Personnel Document. Not all categories apply to every librarian. In assigning a score, the committee should consider the qualitative and quantitative measures of the rigor of a faculty member’s work and not rely solely on the number of scholarly works.

**Scale**

**0–**Evidence includes, but is not limited to, documented breaches of professional ethics, such as plagiarism or falsification; no research or grants in progress.

**1–**Evidence includes, but is not limited to, progress on a major scholarly project (e.g., literature review, data collection or analysis, preparation of a manuscript for submission to a journal or publisher, preparation of a funding proposal); presentation of a paper at a regional or national conference, publication of a non-peer-reviewed journal article, book review or encyclopedia entry; participation in research workshops and/or professional training.

**2–**Evidence includes, but is not limited to, a record of peer-reviewed work, such as publication of an article in a journal or of a scholarly book; research awards; award of peer-reviewed external funding; peer-reviewed presentations or invited presentations at state or regional conferences. Multiple examples of scholarship that in isolation would minimally meet expectations (score of 1) may warrant a score of fully meets expectations (score of 2).

**3–**Evidence includes, but is not limited to, an exemplary record of substantial peer-reviewed work, such as publication of an article in a highly regarded journal or of a book from a major academic or university press; national research awards; award of significant or multi-year peer-reviewed external funding; peer-reviewed presentations or invited presentations at national or international conferences.

Committee’s comments:

Scholarship rating: \_\_\_\_\_ (15% of composite rating)

**III. Committee’s assessment of service**

Examples of service activities are found in II.C of the Libraries’ Personnel Document. Not all categories apply to every librarian. In assigning a score, the committee should consider the depth and impact of a faculty member’s work, as well as the scope of the participation (e.g., national versus regional), and not rely solely on the quantity or categorization of activities.

**Scale**

**0–**No evidence beyond what is immediately required as an integral part of the faculty member’s professional performance exists.

**1–**Evidence includes, but is not limited to, active membership of a standing or ad-hoc committee and participation in departmental affairs and governance.

**2–**Evidence includes, but is not limited to, active membership on two or more standing or ad-hoc committees; substantial contributions to departmental affairs and governance; participation in university-wide service and/or extramural contributions to professional organizations; reviewing manuscripts for peer-reviewed publications and presentations; editorial work for scholarly publications; organizing conferences and moderating panels, contributing professional expertise to funding agencies and community activities aligned with the mission of a land-grant institution. Multiple examples of service, including participation in departmental affairs and governance, that in isolation would minimally meet expectations (score of 1) may warrant a score of fully meets expectations (score of 2).

**3–**Evidence resembles expectations above for a score of 2, and may include a combination of the following: appointed or elected leadership (e.g., chairs, offices, editorships) at any level (departmental through international), demonstrated appointed or elected service at the national or international level, service on review panels or editorial boards, awards, evaluation by peers for service activities, or other signs of recognition for contributions to the discipline, university, or community relevant to the university’s mission as a land-grant institution. External commendation for superlative service strengthens a case for this score.

Committee’s comments:

Service rating: \_\_\_\_\_ (15% of composite rating)

Committee's overall comments:\*

\*Required if composite rating is below 1.

Professional Performance rating: \_\_\_\_\_ x .70 = \_\_\_\_\_

Scholarship rating: \_\_\_\_\_ x .15 = \_\_\_\_\_

Service rating: \_\_\_\_\_ x .15 = \_\_\_\_\_

**Total—Composite rating by Committee: \_\_\_\_\_**

Employee’s comments: Provide comments, if desired, on separate page(s).
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