

ACRL Impactful Scholarship and Metrics Framework

DRAFT – MARCH 2019

Introduction to the Framework

Task force background

The ACRL Impactful Scholarship and Metrics Task Force was formed primarily to create a framework for the measurement and evaluation of academic librarian scholarship. The framework is designed to address gaps between current scholarly evaluation practices and impactful scholarly activities within academic librarianship, including ways to evaluate and measure the impact of a wide range of research outputs.

The Task Force engaged in considerable research to uncover trends within: current evaluative expectations that academic librarians face, best practices for scholarly evaluation from other disciplinary societies, and thoughts and opinions regarding research and scholarly evaluation among academic librarians.

Information gathering results

The task force found a dearth of information regarding best practices for evaluating academic librarian scholarship. Current evaluation practices appear to vary greatly, with many of the guidelines examined by the task force too general to identify best practices. While many societies discuss scholarly impact in a disciplinary or academic context, none were found that employ a framework or similarly-detailed model to guide practice. Finally, survey data collected by the task force revealed that academic librarians have wide-ranging thoughts and opinions regarding scholarly evaluation, including some issues outside the scope of our work, most notably the role of open access in academic librarian scholarship.

As a result of these findings, this framework was largely constructed by the task force. Two documents informed the framework's creation: the [Becker Model](#), an online framework for tracking biomedical research impact with a format we predominantly followed; and Ernst Boyer's [Scholarship Reconsidered](#), a 1990 report published by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and cited by several institutional documents, which outlines four areas of impact that served as a guide for the development of the task force's own impact areas.

Main categories in the framework

This framework outlines two primary categories of impact. The first category, "Scholarly Impact," roughly mirrors traditional impact measurements, and is informed by citation-based metrics, as well as some other commonly-employed metrics, such as acceptance rate. The second category, "Practitioner Impact," describes measurements that reflect the practitioner community of academic librarians and other related professionals/users. These metrics are more qualitative, less traditional, and best deployed in complement with other evidence of impact in order to give a more complete story of librarian scholarship.

This framework attempts to describe a wide range of potential avenues for output - that is, ways in which librarians can share their research/scholarship with others. In cases where it was unclear whether an avenue could be considered scholarly in character, the framework aims for equity and inclusion.

Recommended use

This framework is intended to frame possibilities for scholarly evaluation rather than prescribe or recommend practices. The framework will be best employed as an entryway for discussion at individual institutions within the context of existing guidelines and expectations set forth for academic librarians by those respective institutions. Institutions prioritizing different metrics or areas of scholarly output can adopt areas of the framework that align with institutional values and priorities.

Along with institutional discussion, the Task Force supports the individual framing of metrics - that is, the ability for academic librarians to employ metrics that best tell their impact story. This echoes language found in several institutional guidelines, which leave the documentation and justification of impact up to the individual librarian.

Framework limitations

There is considerable debate about the role of non-citation-based metrics in describing research impact. The framework assigns metrics to categories but does not place judgment on their individual use or meaning beyond their value as complementary metrics and ways of measuring, describing, and contextualizing concrete and as well as potential practitioner impact.

Neither the research outputs nor suggested measurements are exhaustive and should not be used to discount other methods of scholarly distribution and measurement employed successfully by LIS professionals.

Future documentation

The final published framework, released no later than Summer 2020, will include supporting documentation including the full task force scope of work, comprehensive results, and task force recommendations.

Impactful Scholarship and Metrics Task Force Framework

| Scholarly/Research Output | Scholarly Impact metrics/measures | Practitioner Impact metrics/measures |
|---|--|---|
| Journal article | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Citation count - Journal acceptance rate - Journal prestige/reputation, including peer-review Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views/downloads - Shares/mentions/comments - Direct evidence of use (e.g., email follow-up) - Inclusion in practitioner materials, including syllabi, subject guide, or other materials |
| Conference/poster presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conference scope and/or size - Conference prestige/reputation, including refereed proposal process - Conference proposal acceptance rate - Invited to present Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attendance - Presentation evaluations - Views/downloads of video, webinar, or slides - Shares/mentions/comments - Direct evidence of use (e.g., email follow-up) - Inclusion in practitioner materials, including syllabi, subject guide, or other materials |
| Dataset, digital scholarship, or other online research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citations Published critical reviews Refereed awards or nominations Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Views/downloads -Shares/mentions/comments Adaptations or revisions of original work Attribution in other work Other reviews - Direct evidence of use (e.g., email follow-up) - Inclusion in practitioner materials, including syllabi, subject guide, or other materials |
| Book (including edited volumes, monographs, textbooks, reference works) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publisher's reputation - Published critical reviews - Citations Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct evidence of use (e.g., email follow-up) - Inclusion in practitioner materials, including syllabi, subject guide, or other materials - Views/downloads - Shares/mentions/comments - Other reviews - Library holdings/circulation |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | - Sales |
| Chapter in an edited volume (including conference proceedings) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publisher's reputation, including peer review/referee process - Citations to book chapter - Published critical reviews Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct evidence of use (e.g., email follow-up) - Inclusion in practitioner materials, including syllabi, subject guide, or other materials - Views/downloads - Shares/mentions/comments - Other reviews - Library holdings/circulation - Sales |
| Journal peer reviewer/advisory board member/editorship | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Journal acceptance rate - Journal prestige/reputation, including peer-review Role/responsibilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activities (e.g., number of manuscripts reviewed, specific board member duties) - Consultations or other evidence of direct support (e.g., correspondence prior to manuscript submission) |
| Information technology (development of systems, applications, implementations, etc.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews - Citations or inclusion of technology in subsequent research Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of technology use/adoption -Views/downloads -Shares/mentions/comments Evidence of derivative or dependent projects (e.g. forks) Invitations to conduct off-site workshops / trainings / consultations |
| Original professional practice (original cataloging, published metadata, etc.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews - Citations or inclusion of technology in subsequent research Refereed awards or nominations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of contributions - Evidence of use/adoption (e.g. transaction tracking/logfiles) - Views/downloads - Shares/mentions/comments - Contribution to cataloging services (e.g. NACO, PCC) - Contribution of authority headings to cataloging records |
| Published reviews | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citations Reputation/prestige of publication | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reach of publication Evidence of adoption or use Views/downloads Shares/mentions/comments |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Online contributions (blog editor/author, podcast creator, website maintenance, etc.)</p> | <p>Citations Published critical reviews Refereed awards or nominations</p> | <p>Views/downloads Shares/mentions/comments Other reviews Non-refereed awards or nominations Evidence of adoption or use</p> |
| <p>Professional association publications (e.g., authoring/editing ACRL guidelines, etc.)</p> | <p>Citations Scope/reputation of association</p> | <p>Views/downloads Shares/mentions/comments Evidence of adoption or use</p> |
| <p>Professional association service (committee or task force work, leadership, etc.)</p> | <p>Scope/reputation of association Role/responsibilities Refereed awards or nominations</p> | <p>Professional publications or other available materials Duties Other direct evidence of impact, e.g., adoption of any service work (including guidelines, best practices, etc.) by others</p> |
| <p>Creative works, including exhibitions</p> | <p>Published critical reviews Scope and prestige of venue / publisher Invited to present work Citations Refereed awards or nominations</p> | <p>Adaptations or revisions of original work Attribution in other work Other reviews Attendance Views/downloads Shares/mentions/comments</p> |