Guidelines for Peer Review Ratings


Peer reviewers are expected to review the ALFA document and become familiar with the librarian’s work. This includes but is not limited to the following:

- Review professional responsibilities, goals, and accomplishments as described on the ALFA.
- Review publications and presentations slides as available.
- Review descriptions of work accomplished with committees, organizations, etc.

Peer reviews are reviews of individual librarians and their responsibilities and goals. These are not comparative evaluations. The evaluation and ranking should be based on your professional opinion of their performance of their responsibilities.

The normal rating is “Good”. In this category, the librarian fulfills the expectations of their position as outlined in their ALFA and as described on the peer review form for each category.

Teaching/Professional Responsibilities

Excellent: Clearly exceeds expectations and goals. (ex: demonstrated initiative and problem-solving; assumed additional and challenging assignments). Performance is superior and consistently exceeds the requirements of the job. This rating is appropriate when the faculty member achieves significant accomplishments in their professional responsibilities.

Good: Meets expectations. Meets all performance expectations in areas of professional responsibility (ex: timely, accurate, and thorough execution of all duties with minimal supervision). This rating is appropriate when the faculty member adequately meets the expectations of performance and annual review goals with no significant deficiencies.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the performance expectations as established for the position and in the annual review process. This rating is appropriate when the faculty member needs substantial improvement in performance in areas of professional responsibility or lacks evidence to support accomplishment of professional responsibilities.

Research, Creative Activities, and Scholarship

Excellent: Exceeds expectations and goals. (ex: made exceptional contributions as evidenced by significant publications, presentations, or grants)
This rating is appropriate when the faculty member meets the expectations and makes significant achievements in research.

Good: Meets expectations. Meets all performance expectations by ongoing, appropriate scholarly output.  
This rating is appropriate when the faculty member adequately meets the expectations of performance and annual review goals with no significant deficiencies.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the performance expectations as established for the position and in the annual review process.  
This rating is appropriate when the faculty member needs substantial improvement in performance in areas of research, etc., or lacks evidence to support accomplishment of research, etc..

**Service**

Excellent: Exceeds expectations and goals. (ex: made exceptional contributions or assumed a leadership role as evidenced by holding elected office, appointment to committees, or awards)  
This rating is appropriate when the faculty member meets the expectations and makes significant achievements in service.

Good: Meets expectations. Meets all performance expectations in service. (ex: served as a member of appropriate university or professional committees)  
This rating is appropriate when the faculty member adequately meets the expectations of performance and annual review goals with no significant deficiencies.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the performance expectations as established for the position and in the annual review process.  
This rating is appropriate when the faculty member needs substantial improvement in performance in areas of service or lacks evidence to support accomplishment of service.