

**Guidelines for Annual Review of the Faculty**  
Graduate School of Library and Information Science  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Note: Criteria for salary increases and other benefits based on merit will be the same as the criteria for promotion and tenure as indicated in the GSLIS Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure document. In years where funds allow, a portion of salary increases will also be determined by equity considerations.

Faculty agreed to attach a copy of their vita to the annual report documentation submitted for the annual evaluation. The vitae will be made available to all faculty who wish to review them for purposes of comparing performance with colleagues as part of the self-evaluation process.

Faculty are expected to contribute to the GSLIS mission. The mission of the School is to provide:

- Education for leaders in research and practice in the fields of library and information science;
- Groundbreaking research to advance preservation of and access to information in both traditional and digital libraries and in the many settings outside of libraries where large amounts of critical information are collected;
- Useful service to librarians and other information services providers, as well as to the citizens of Illinois.

I. PURPOSES: The purposes of the GSLIS annual performance evaluation are both summative and formative:

- A. To provide a basis for ongoing performance evaluation
- B. To provide a basis for allocation of benefits based on merit
- C. To guide each faculty member in taking stock of past activities and in reflecting on plans for the future (self evaluation)

II. TIME PERIOD COVERED: The annual report covers a one year period, (May 1 to April 30). The evaluation is done in a larger context, which is provided by:

- A. The faculty member's up to date vita
- B. The faculty member's statement (no longer than 3 pages) on the year's activities and how they relate to ongoing research, teaching, and service. This is to include a short statement of future plans in so far as they can be projected.

III. DOCUMENTATION: Documentation provided is based on the University's promotion and tenure documents as outlined below:

- A. Resident Instruction
  - 1. Full and summary ICES and/or EON evaluations and syllabi for all courses taught.
  - 2. Contributions to teaching including development of new teaching methods and materials, course and curriculum development, supervision of teaching assistants, supervision of independent studies and practicums, and activities in the area of teaching beyond regular teaching.
- B. Research, Creative, and Other Scholarly Activities
  - 1. List publications, with senior author first (e.g., do not list multiple authorship as simply "with Professors x, y, and z"). Inclusive page numbers for publications in journals must be provided. Follow the outline given below for the organization of the list of publications.

Within each category, place items in chronological order. Include copies of materials whenever possible. Reviews and other evaluations may be included.

- a. Books Authored or Co-Authored (published or accepted)
  - (1) Original Editions
  - (2) Revisions
- b. Books Edited or Co-Edited (published or accepted)
  - (1) Original Editions
  - (2) Revisions
- c. Chapters in Books (published or accepted)
- d. Monographs (longer than an article, but shorter than a book) [published or accepted]
- e. Articles in Journals (published or accepted)
- f. Bulletins, Reports, or Papers in Conference Proceedings (published or accepted)
- g. Abstracts (published or accepted)
- h. Book Reviews (published or accepted)
- i. Publications in above categories which have been submitted for publication but not yet accepted
- j. Other (specify type) e.g., software developed, creative works, pieces of opinion

2. Grants received, proposals written whether funded or not

3. Recognitions and outstanding achievements (fellowships, prizes, etc.)

4. Supervision of student research. Include number of Masters theses, CAS projects and doctoral dissertations currently being supervised. Include MS, CAS, and doctoral committees of which a member.

5. Editor/editorial board of journals or other learned publications

6. Conference and other public presentations

\* Place a single asterisk before any publication which has undergone stringent editorial review by peers.

\*\* Place a double asterisk before any publication or presentation which was invited and carries with it prestige and recognition.

### C. Service (Public and University)

#### 1. Public Service

Indicate the public service performed in assisting agencies, schools, businesses, governmental agencies or other groups and individuals who benefit from the knowledge, information and services resident within the University community. To be recognized as public service, the activities should meet the following test:

- a. They contribute to the public welfare or the common good.
- b. They call upon your academic or professional expertise.
- c. They directly address or respond to real-world problems, issues, interests, or concerns.

2. Disciplinary and Professional Service

Indicate the professional service performed in assisting professional societies and associations, educational programs, and other private and public sector organizations, groups, and individuals. Activities should contribute to the aims of those served, as opposed to the public welfare or common good. Include, for example, offices held in professional societies; service on review panels; refereeing of journal articles, monographs, or proposals; conference planning; conducting workshops; consulting.

3. University/Campus Service

Indicate service on departmental, college, campus and university committees as well as administrative assignments.

Procedures:

The Dean, with the Executive Committee, reviews these reports usually by mid-June. Faculty members who have undergone third-year reviews or been evaluated for promotion and tenure in the past year need only submit an update to the dossier prepared for that purpose. The Dean sends a letter to each faculty member, and retains a copy of the faculty member's annual report together with the letter in the faculty member's personnel file. A faculty member may respond to the annual review by placing documentation in his or her official departmental personnel file.

Option for Broader Faculty Review:

As required by Provost Communication No. 21 Annual Faculty Review, the broader faculty review option is designed to provide GSLIS and individual faculty members with a mechanism for seeking additional information when either the Dean or the faculty member believes that there is need for a fuller and more complete assessment of the faculty member's record than has been provided by a series of annual reviews. The broader review is not an appeal of the annual review process, nor is its purpose to address a narrow, specific issue, such as the faculty member's salary determination, or other issues that are appropriately addressed through a grievance process. Concern with specific issues should be appealed following the established procedures in GSLIS. Rather, the broader review follows from and is based on previous annual reviews and takes the place, in the year it occurs, of the annual review process. The broader review concerns the faculty member's overall performance in teaching, research and public service or in a defined, significant subset of faculty roles and responsibilities. Invoking the broader review option, therefore, should be grounded in the results of at least the two immediately previous annual reviews, and more typically in a longer pattern that reveals a need for deeper scrutiny of the record in order to more fully understand the faculty member's performance or to ascertain whether the annual reviews have adequately assessed significant aspects of the record. Before invoking the broader review option, the faculty member and the Dean should make serious attempts to come to mutually satisfactory resolution through informal interactions and problem-solving efforts.

Procedure:

- 1) The broader faculty review should be requested, in writing, at the beginning of the annual faculty review process or at the beginning of the academic year.
- 2) A broader faculty review may be initiated by a faculty member or by the Dean. The person who initiates the review should submit the request to initiate the review to the other party (faculty member or Dean), with copies to the Executive Committee and to the Provost.

- 3) The document requesting to initiate a broader review should specify the grounds for the broader review, and explain why these grounds have not been and cannot be adequately addressed by the annual faculty review process.
- 4) The Dean and the faculty member should discuss the broader review process and the materials to be evaluated in the review. The Executive Committee should be informed of these discussions and their outcome. The Dean and the Executive Committee, in consultation, will make the final decision on the structure of the faculty review, and will inform the faculty member, in writing, as to the elements and structure of the review before the process begins.
- 5) If the Dean and the Executive Committee decide that the process will include solicitation of external letters, the elements of Communication No. 9 will be followed with respect to number of letters, objectivity and rank of evaluators, selection of peer institutions, and confidentiality of letters.
- 6) The information gathered in the broader review will be considered in concert with the annual faculty reviews conducted during that academic year in the unit.
- 7) The outcome of the broader review will be communicated, in writing, by the Dean to the faculty member, with a copy to the Provost.
- 8) The faculty member may appeal the outcome of the broader faculty review through the normal GSLIS appeal procedure. If the outcome of that appeal fails to produce satisfaction, the outcome may then be appealed, in writing, to the Provost. The Provost's decision on the matter shall be final.

#### Grievances:

A faculty member who believes he or she has been aggrieved by the application of the annual review procedure can petition the appropriate grievance committee for redress, just as he or she would do in any other grievance situation. As provided by the University's Statutes, a faculty member may always consult with the Faculty Advisory Committee.

Created May 1997  
Revised April 2004