

**Metrics for Scholarly Productivity and Impact**  
**Department of Anthropology**  
**2015**

Anthropology is a diverse discipline, which includes subfields and approaches that variously could fit within the social sciences, humanities, and/or sciences. The department recognizes that scholarship takes many forms and that peer-reviewed forms should generally be given greater weight than others when evaluating productivity and impact. In addition to journal articles, books and edited volumes, and book chapters are also highly valued in our discipline and frequently cited; in particular those subjected to extensive peer review before they are accepted for publication.

The American Anthropological Association does not provide standards for the evaluation of productivity or for measuring impact in the field. However, we can glean information on the range of scholarly output to be considered and criteria by which publications might be judged from advice given for evaluation of scholarship in the emergent area of practicing, applied, and public interest anthropology and from the American Anthropological Association Statement on Electronic Publishing (<http://www.aaanet.org/profdev/Academic-Tenure-and-Promotion.cfm>).

The AAA list “acceptance rates, the robustness of peer review, and the strength of a publication’s editorial board [as] relevant indicators of impact.” The association notes that citation indices and journal impact factors are inappropriate for much of anthropological research, which is often published in non-tracked journals, in monographs and in foreign-language publications. Additionally, for those publications with tracked citations, “the ‘journal cited half-life’ for anthropology publications across the subfields is, by Thompson Reuters’ own reckoning, more than ten years,” so impact must be measured over at least a 10 year time frame.

The following list encompasses common, although not all, forms of scholarly output for our field and may be used to develop an imperfect metric. These works may appear in print or electronic format. The metrics below reflect our collective emphasis on student involvement in faculty research and scholarship.

**Publications and Presentations**

- Peer-reviewed book-length publications, including books, textbooks, research or technical reports, and edited volumes
- Peer-reviewed articles or chapters, such as those published in journals and edited volumes
- Research or technical reports submitted to universities and/or governmental/community organizations (these are especially relevant in the field of archaeology)
- Solicited scholarly works, including books, textbooks, articles, and chapters
- Editorship of scholarly journals, books, or conference proceedings
- Presentations accepted at professional conferences and meetings
- Short publications (e.g., under 3000 words), such as reviews and encyclopedia entries.
- Other outlets, such as museum exhibitions or catalogs, documentary videos, websites, datasets, or scholarly conferences or sessions/panels organized
- Scholarly publications and presentations authored by students
- Students completing theses, including Honors College, College Honors, and IDM theses.

### **Awards/Grants/Recognition**

- Competitive extramural contracts, grant and fellowships (extramural: overall and successful applications; internal: grants received)
- Awards, honors and other recognition of contributions in the area of scholarship
- Invited or keynote presentations
- Invitations to referee scholarly manuscripts, grant proposals, programs and promotions
- Graduates going on to graduate or professional study
- Students selected for competitive national and international scholarships/fellowships
- Students awarded university- and college-wide grants and awards
- Students supported by faculty grants
- Judgments of departmental colleagues and colleagues and experts in the field outside the department and university.

**Art and Art History**  
**Metrics for Scholarly Productivity**  
[Approved by Departmental faculty April 21, 2015]

Art and Art History consists of three program areas: Studio Art, Art History, and Art Education. Faculty members in Studio Art and Art History are expected to be involved in scholarly activities as appropriate to the discipline and area of expertise. Faculty members in Art Education are lecturers who are not expected to be involved in scholarly activities.

**Studio Art**

The factors listed below may be used in the evaluation of scholarly research in the area of studio art. However, some artists may legitimately produce work that is not suited to measurement by conventional indicators. In such instances, it is possible for the work in question to be substantial without achieving major external recognition. In these cases the evaluation must be based on the perceptible qualities of the art itself as they relate to the goals and intentions of the art maker. While the notion of peer review is at times applicable to measuring achievement in studio art in the form of juried exhibitions, residencies, screenings, or conference presentations, the meaning of peer review, as the term is used in other disciplines, does not translate well to the discipline of studio art. In many cases, opportunities that are the result of an invitation from a curator, gallery director, publisher, or fellow artist are important indicators of reputation and impact.

Our plan to track scholarly activities in the area of studio art is to collect on an annual basis the following indicators, as listed by the faculty member on the annual activity form, with the full understanding that qualitative judgments of impact are often more relevant than a strictly quantitative accounting.

- Evaluation by internal and/or external peers and/or other informed and acknowledged authorities
- Professional work in museums
- Professional work in distinguished venues
- Professional work in university galleries/museums
- National/international grants, awards, or fellowships
- National/international invitational or competitive exhibitions/festivals
- Lecture or participation in a panel discussion at national or international conferences
- Artist residencies, offered as a result of artistic merit, at other universities or colleges
- Prestigious competitive national or international residency fellowships awarded
- National/international jury participation or consultation
- Inclusion of work in a scholarly publication in print or online form
- National broadcast or cablecast of artist's work
- Public commissions
- Prizes at national/international exhibitions or festivals

- Reviews of work in national/international publications in print and online form
- Publication of written work in national/international journals or books in print and online form with higher recognition given to peer-reviewed outlets.
- Presence of work in major collections
- Regional invitational or solo exhibitions

While usually not considered to indicate as high a level of recognition as those factors listed above, the following factors are accepted within the field as evidence of achievement in studio art.

- University grants
- Regional jury participation
- Activities related to the exploration of new processes
- Critical reviews in regional publications in print or online form
- Prizes at regional exhibitions or festivals
- Radio, TV, or online interviews or reviews
- Showings at regional festivals
- Publication of writings in regional journals, or books in print, or online
- Presence of work in non-major public collections
- Regional curatorial activities

## **Art History**

### Overview

The Art History program is staffed by professional art historians who publish original, high-quality, contemporary research on significant monuments of the world's artistic heritage to contribute to the ongoing discussion about the roles of the visual arts in human history. The art historians are happy to contribute to the goal of providing a means by which non-specialists at UVM in senior administrative positions who must make qualitative judgments at the College and University levels can properly gauge the significance of our individual and collective contributions to our discipline and to the sub-disciplines in which we work.

Any system of metrics used for measuring quantity and quality of scholarly production in art history must recognize that it is a sub-discipline of the humanities. In this aspect, art historians operate in a manner similar to that of historians, classicists, and philosophers. Research on art historical topics requires travel, much of it outside the United States. It demands work in languages other than English. It can only be produced in final form with good illustrations that can often be obtained only with considerable difficulty. Because of these constraints, production time is often slow. We most commonly work alone; our major vehicle of dissemination is the monograph, which can take the form of a book or

museum catalogue associated with a large exhibition. Such publications have gestation periods lasting several years. We publish through peer-reviewed university and private academic trade presses and internationally established museums, which means that the finished product has gone through several iterations before being accepted and published.

There is no single journal that is recognized as the flagship for the discipline; instead, there are many different journals that address the variety of chronological, regional, media, and intellectual research avenues pursued by those in the field. In addition to producing journal articles for such specialized venues, art historians publish work in the forms of book chapters, encyclopedia articles, dictionary articles, exhibition reviews, and book reviews. They also regularly present papers at international and national meetings and symposia.

Like other disciplines in the humanities, art history is subdivided into several smaller categories in which individuals pursue their research and publication agendas. This means that the importance of new studies will usually not be widely appreciated for many years. It will often take decades for the full impact of new interpretations to move out of the specialists' realm and into the wider discipline.

Our national professional organization, the College Art Association, has not endorsed any single set of standards that can be used to establish metrics in the discipline as a whole. The faculty of the program in Art History are not opposed to an annual evaluation of our scholarly production, but we are concerned with the use of a metric system devised for disciplines profoundly unrelated and dissimilar to our own.

#### Available Scholarly Indexes

To date, there is no one tool that tracks citations in the humanities. This is an issue, in part, because art historians publish in a variety of publications, books, articles, catalogues, book chapters, etc., that make tracking more difficult, in that they do not provide a full picture of scholarly contributions to the field. The tools listed below were developed by scientists and have focused on the sciences and social sciences exclusively, which are primarily article-based fields. In sum, the available tools are not sufficiently comprehensive; they do not include many journals in which art historians publish; they do not include many of the types of publications that are critical to our field; they are not sufficiently nuanced to capture the area-specificity of our field, and they are further exclusionary in tracking only English-language publications. The citation metric tools currently available are inaccurate and unhelpful for tracking the impact of scholarly productions in art history.

### **Academia.edu**

Academia.edu is a social network for academics. It allows users to upload papers, “follow” other scholars, and track people who search for, or download, their work. It can provide interesting information regarding the reach of a given scholar’s research, but users must actively contribute to the site in order to be evaluated, and their level of participation will necessarily affect their scores. In this respect, the site is not an independent evaluator of research.

### **SCImago Journal Rank Indicator**

The SCImago Journal Rank Indicator ([www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com)) provides journal rankings for a variety of fields. But, since it does not include ratings for book chapters, encyclopedia articles, or exhibition catalogues, it fails to cover the range of publications produced by our faculty. Furthermore, SCImago’s journal rankings fluctuate widely over time and are not always accurate. *October*, a journal published by MIT Press with a distinguished editorial board of public intellectuals (Rosalind Krauss, Hal Foster, Denis Hollier), received for its “Visual Arts and Performing Arts ranking Q4s in 2005 and 2006, Q1s in 2007-2009, a Q4 in 2010, a Q2 in 2011, a Q1 in 2012, and a Q4 in 2014. This wide range of fluctuating scores does not reflect the journal’s strong and sustained reputation, and it suggests that the index’s criteria and algorithms are not well suited to work in this field. Journals in our field tend to be area specific and indices like SCImago do not account for the higher merit, in some case, in publishing in those journals as opposed to publishing in journals that are broader in scope, but may have a higher impact metrics rating. These area-based journals are peer-reviewed and regarded as significant, and have a sustained and widespread utility and impact in our respective fields of study. Many of our faculty have, in fact, published in these types of journals, such as the *Journal of Indian Ocean Archaeology*, *New England Classical Journal*, *Journal of the David Collection*, and *The Bible and Interpretation*, none of which are listed in the SCImago index. This index, as with others, also does not include publications in other languages.

### **Academic Analytics**

Another available index is provided by Academic Analytics ([www.academicanalytics.com](http://www.academicanalytics.com)). Unfortunately, it is difficult to gauge their effectiveness, since their data is available only with a subscription. But research conducted by other departments suggests that humanities coverage in the Academic Analytics database is both inaccurate and incomplete. The Classics Department found that Academic Analytics failed to include 5 books and 11 articles that had been recently published by its faculty.

For this reason, we would request access to the database in order to test its accuracy for gauging scholarship in our field.

### **Thomson Reuter's Journal Citation Reports**

Like SCImago, many of the journals in our field are not accurately accounted for in the Reuter's metrics, since there is a top tier journal for each area of study in the discipline, foreign-language articles are not included, and it is limited to journal citations, which excludes the variety of publications expected for scholarly production in our fields. Furthermore, JCR draws its data from Web of Science, which does not track publications in art history.

### **Publish or Perish**

Publish or Perish pulls from Google Scholar citation information. This obviously relies on the accuracy and completeness of Google Scholar entries. There are no Google Scholar metrics rankings per discipline in art history (only Humanities, with no Art History subfield. The Visual Arts subfield includes Studio Art, Arts Education, Criticism, Design, and Art History). This is far too generalized to be of value in assessing our publication impact.

### Internal means of evaluation

We have established a ranking system for publications and other means of scholarly dissemination in the field, which are described in our RPT guidelines.

Types of Publications and Presentations, which are counted in scholarly production for Art History:

- Peer-reviewed book-length publications, including books, textbooks, and edited volumes.
- Solicited scholarly exhibition catalogues at internationally recognized museum venues.
- Peer-reviewed articles or chapters, such as those published in journals and edited volumes.
- Solicited scholarly works, including books, textbooks, articles, and chapters.
- Editorship of scholarly journals, books, or conference proceedings.
- Presentations accepted at professional conferences and meetings.
- Short publications (e.g., under 3000 words), such as reviews and encyclopedia entries.

- Other outlets, such as museum exhibitions without catalogues, documentary videos, websites, datasets, or organized scholarly conferences or sessions/panels.

Other types of evidence:

- Successful competitive extramural contracts, grant and fellowships.
- Awards, honors and other recognition of contributions in the area of scholarship
- Invited or keynote presentations.
- Invitations to referee scholarly manuscripts, grant proposals, programs and promotions.
- Judgments of colleagues and experts in the field outside the department.

N.B. This document shall not be used to supersede or dictate language in future iterations of Departmental FEGs or RPT guidelines. Rather, this document outlines current understandings of practices established by the CBA as they pertain to Departmental faculty.



## **Departmental Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics**

Department of Asian Languages and Literatures (March 12, 2015)

The Department of Asian Languages and Literatures has both tenured and non-tenured faculty members. As the non-tenured faculty members are not expected to be engaged in academic research and scholarly studies other than teaching, the Departmental Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics are set for tenured or tenure-track faculty members only.

The Department has already had the RPT Guidelines and the Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, so the Metrics are set in accordance with these two Guidelines as well.

### **1) Scholarly Productivity.**

The Department operates based on the understanding that there are many forms of scholarly activity, and that judgments of their value must consider the quality of scholarly production as well as quantity. It affirms the value of professional publication, particularly publication of work that has been peer reviewed. A faculty can be considered as scholarly productive if he/she accomplishes at least two of the following every year or at least one item (except book reviews) from A every three years.

- A. Published works, including books, textbooks, journal articles, book chapters, and book reviews.
- B. Editorial work on scholarly journals, anthologies, and conference proceedings.
- C. Presentations of papers, and acting as discussant of the work of others, at professional meetings and conferences.

In addition to the above, because peer-reviewed funding for scholarly activities enhances the productivity and stature of the individual scholar, faculty members are encouraged to seek extramural funding in support of their research from federal institutes and agencies, foundations and other non-profit organizations where available. Efforts to do so are recognized as evidence of scholarly activity and success in acquiring extramural funding via juried competitions will be treated as evidence that a scholar's work and methods have been positively evaluated by scholarly peers. At the same time, failure to secure such funding will not be considered as being less scholarly productive.

### **2) Scholarly Impact.**

The Department recognizes that scholarly impact sometimes can be difficult to measure as it can change as time goes on. Some scholarly works may have a small impact in the related field in the beginning but may be very influential later on. However, to make it feasible to measure the impact of a scholarly work, the Department has developed the following list in the order of scholarly impact with the strongest at the top of the list.

- A. Books, textbooks, journal articles, and book chapters published

- a. By an internationally prestigious academic publisher, including first-tier national research university presses, internationally prestigious academic publishing houses in the relevant specialized field of study.
  - b. By an academic publisher that is well-known but is clearly not the kind of publishers described above in a.
- B. Editorial work on scholarly journals, anthologies, and conference proceedings
  - a. For an internationally prestigious publisher or an international professional organization.
  - b. For a nationally well-known publisher or a national professional organization.
- C. Reviews of books or textbooks published
  - a. By an internationally prestigious academic journal
  - b. By an nationally known academic journal
- D. Keynote speech
  - a. At international academic meetings and conferences.
  - b. At national academic meetings and conferences.
- E. Presentations of papers, and acting as discussant of the work of others
  - a. At international academic meetings and conferences.
  - b. At national academic meetings and conferences.

Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics  
Department of Biology  
APPROVED 3/11/2015

**Funding**

Extramural support for research, shared instrumentation, infrastructure, student mentoring or support, outreach, pedagogy, historical collections.

Intramural support for research, student mentoring or support, outreach, pedagogy.

Collaborative endeavors.

**Publications and Presentations**

Original research published in peer-reviewed journals.

Invited reviews, books, book chapters.

Edited work (books, special volumes).

Additional products such as shared software, databases, patents, etc.

Conference and professional meeting presentations (talks, posters, panels).

**Professional Service**

Journal Editor, Associate Editor, Reviewer.

Funding agency panelist.

External reviewer for funding agencies, academic programs, academic promotions.

Mentor for pre-college, undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate research.

Meeting/conference organizer, session chair.

Scholarly outreach.

**Awards and Recognitions**

Institutional, regional, national and international awards.

Recognition to current or former students or mentees.

Invited or elected membership in national/international academies, society fellowships.

Conference and professional invitations.

**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY**  
**Faculty Research & Scholarship Metrics – Approved 03/17/15**

The Department of Chemistry prides itself on a tradition of internationally-recognized scientific scholarship and achievement. At the same time, the Department trains graduate and undergraduate researchers through for-credit and paid research and thesis projects. As a small department compared to competitor institutions, we attract faculty who are interested in supporting and fostering student research while promoting our own scholarship and careers.

Faculty have traditionally been organized into divisions of analytical, inorganic, organic, and physical chemistry based primarily on the courses they teach, but also on the types of research they perform and therefore the interests of the students they attract. In recent years, the field of chemistry has become more diverse and interdisciplinary, with activity and growth with the areas of biology, biochemistry, materials science, environmental science, and engineering. New faculty hired by the Department have reflected these changes, and Chemistry faculty also participate in interdisciplinary graduate degree programs in Cellular, Molecular, and Biomolecular Science, Materials Science, and Bioengineering, and Chemistry faculty sponsor graduate research projects through all of these interdisciplinary programs. Chemistry faculty have participated in NIH-funded training grants, which provide graduate student, postdoctoral, and technician stipends, through the College of Medicine in Immunology & Infection Disease and Environmental Pathology. Thus the collective picture of research and scholarship within the Department starts with a strong core of work in the traditional Chemistry subdisciplines and proceeds along a spectrum of increasingly interdisciplinary research.

Peer review of published research is a fundamental way to establish a record of scientific achievement. It provides a mechanism by which Chemistry faculty can validate the quality and importance of their scholarship, and it also lays the groundwork for financial support of this scholarship. Consequently, the Department places particular importance on the number of publications, and the quality of the journals in which they are published, as a marker of scholarly progress. Within reason given the strong teaching mission of the Department, statistics such as h-factor, number of citations, and journal impact factors are ways to capture this information. However, they can only be understood by comparison, and the most appropriate comparison is with UVM's competitor institutions.

Simply put, chemical research is expensive. For promotion and tenure to the senior level, Chemistry faculty must show evidence of the development of an independent, sustainable career by acquiring external intramural funding to support this research. Because research proposals for funding are peer-reviewed, and peer-reviewed publications are usually a key part of a successful proposal, research funding is one of the primary metrics of faculty achievement. The overall research enterprise of the University is strengthened through Chemistry's financial support of undergraduate and graduate stipends; graduate tuition and benefits; salaries and benefits of faculty, postdocs, and technicians; and general University operations through indirect cost return.

To assess the research and scholarship of Chemistry faculty, we propose to capture several metrics in four broad areas: (1) research-related enrollments; (2) publications; (3) research funding; (4) other metrics. Detailed lists are provided below.

### **1. Research-related enrollment:**

- Total graduate enrollment
  - Total number of M.S. & Ph.D. students
  - Ratio of Ph.D. to M.S.
  - Graduate students per faculty member and per-faculty FTE relative to competitor institutions
- Total undergraduate enrollment in research courses
  - Percentage of undergraduates performing research
  - Number and percentage of undergraduates performing funded summer research
- Placement of undergraduate and graduate alumni
- Total number of interdisciplinary students sponsored

### **2. Publications:**

- Number of publications per year
  - Department total
  - Per-faculty average relative to competitor institutions
- H-factor or journal impact factor per year
  - Departmental maximum and average relative to competitor institutions
- Number of books or reviews
- Add-on publications, news releases, local press, or popular press
- Patents submitted or awarded

### **3. Research Funding:**

- Submitted proposals
  - Total number
    - Multi-year
    - Chemistry PI
    - Special RFP including CAREER, etc.
  - Amount of funding requested
  - Per-faculty average relative to competitor institutions
- Successful proposals
  - Total number
    - Multi-year
    - Chemistry PI
    - Special RFP
  - Amount of funding awarded
  - Per-faculty average relative to competitor institutions
  - Success rate (fraction of submitted proposals that are awarded)
- Amount of funding per graduate student
- Number of graduate research assistantships per year
- Training/center grant participation
- Corporate funding

### **4. Other research & scholarship metrics:**

- Faculty on editorial boards of journals
- Service on grant review panels
- National honors and awards
- Organization of national or international symposia
- Technology transfer

**Department of Classics**  
**Scholarly Metrics**

**Publications**

Peer-Reviewed

Journal Articles

Reviews

Books/Monographs

Textbooks

Book Chapters

Edited Work

Books

Special Volumes

Quality of Publications

Stature of Publication Venue

"Reach"/ Impact for Faculty, Dept., CAS, UVM, Broader Knowledge

Other Contributions

Creative Writing (Poems/Fiction/Screenplays)

Websites

Exhibitions/Catalogues

Short Publications, e.g. Reviews, Encyclopedia Entries

Non-Peer Reviewed (e.g., popular press)

Non-Peer Reviewed but Solicited Books, Chapters, Articles

Manuscripts that are In-progress/Under Review

**Exhibitions/Performances**

Invited

**Presentations**

Contributed - Talks/Posters/Panels

International Conferences

National Conferences

Academic Institutions

Research Institutions

Refereed

Invited Talks

International Conferences

National Conferences

Academic Institutions

Research Institutions

Keynote Presentations

Local Presentations

**Funding**

External Grant Applications

External Grants Awarded

Amount Awarded  
Competitiveness of Funding Source  
Other  
Internal Grants Received  
teaching, outreach and service

### **Professional**

Honors, Awards and Prizes for Research  
Institutional  
Regional  
National  
International  
Honors, Awards and Prizes for Teaching  
Institutional  
Discipline  
Regional/National  
Honors, Awards and Prizes for Service  
Institutional  
Discipline  
Regional/National  
Editor, Assoc Editor, Editorial Board  
Reviewer  
Journals  
Book Manuscripts  
Funding agencies  
Academic Programs  
Academic Promotions  
National or International Meetings and Conferences  
Program Organizer  
Session Chair  
Discussant  
Other  
Academy/Fellowship and Professional Board Memberships  
Judgment of Dpt. Colleagues and Outside Experts  
Leadership in Professional Organizations

### **Student Mentorship**

Pre-College Student Mentorship  
Undergraduate Students  
Undergraduate Research  
Funded Summer Research  
Honors Theses successfully defended  
Conference presentations at National/International Meetings  
Publications  
Competitive National/International Scholarships/Fellowships  
UVM Grants and Awards

Placement of students after graduation

Graduate Students

Quality of entering students

Conference presentations at National/International Meetings



Economics Department

Metrics for department productivity (February 2015)

Original research published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes

Other work published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes

Books or book chapters published

Articles published, volumes edited, other scholarly works published

Published critical reviews

Journal editorships

Invited lectures and seminars

**Metrics for Scholarly Productivity and Impact**  
**English Department**  
**March 2015**

**CONTEXT:**

If the UVM English Department is to be compared to departments at peer institutions, we must use the same metric as the other institutions; however, I have been unable to discover a dominant or best-practices metric in our field. English language and literature journals, journals related to film and television studies, and creative writing publications are not indexed in *Journal Citation Reports* or ranked by impact factor or “tier.”

The nearest thing to a relevant model is the SCImago Journal Rank Indicator (<http://www.scimagojr.com/index.php>); however, this database has two major shortcomings for scholarship in English. First, it excludes some of the preeminent journals in English studies, literary theory, cultural studies, and film and television studies, including *Arizona Quarterly*, *Jump Cut*, *Substance*, and *Black American Literature Forum*. It is also merely a ranking of journals, whereas at least half of our faculty’s publications are books and book chapters.

The Association of Departments of English (<http://www.ade.org>) has nothing to say on the subject, and a query to other chairs on the ADE listserv has yielded no answers. The Modern Language Association, our largest professional organization, responded to a query as follows:

*It's been a long standing policy that the MLA Bibliography does not have or use a ranking system for journals or publishers.*

*Sincerely,*

*Barbara Chen*

*Director of Bibliographic Information Services and Editor, MLA International Bibliography*

In view of this, we have modified one of the sample metrics provided by the Dean to simply count, without further differentiating, the various forms of peer-reviewed scholarship and creative work we produce, as well as other projects and accomplishments.

We wish to note that this list does not include all of the forms of scholarly productivity that we recognize in our RPT and evaluation guidelines; it merely enumerates those that appear most frequently and thus will be most useful for comparison. We also feel it is important to acknowledge the creative and scholarly productivity of our talented lecturers.

**PLAN:**

The Department Chair will submit an updated spreadsheet each year (see below).

From the Provost’s memo, we find the following examples of productivity relevant to

our department:

- ☐ Original research published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes
- ☐ Other work published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes
- ☐ Books or book chapters published
- ☐ Articles published, volumes edited, other scholarly works published
- ☐ Published critical reviews
- ☐ Journal editorships and editorial board memberships
- ☐ Major awards and prizes won by faculty

The following are relevant, but very rarely accomplished within English departments:

- ☐ Extramural support for research, scholarship, creativity
- ☐ Extramural support for teaching, outreach, service

“Other work,” for our department, should include the following:

- Poems, fiction, screenplays, and creative non-fiction published in reputable venues [note that there is no peer-review system for creative writing commensurate with the system for research]
- Films and television programs & juried exhibitions of them
- Book-length non-fiction studies such as biographies, whether published by a peer-reviewed or non-academic press
- Guest-editorship of a special issue of a peer-reviewed journal
- Editorship of scholarly editions of primary texts
- Textbooks
- Major reports for professional organizations

Student success is important, but we have no way of tracking how many of our students receive national awards or go on to graduate study. English departments without Ph.D. programs, like ours, are not included in the *U.S. News* or other national rankings of programs.

Faculty Productivity		2015	2016
Tenured & Tenure Track			
	Peer-reviewed scholarly journal & chapter publications		
	Journal & chapter publications/TT faculty		
	Scholarly book-length publications*		
	Book-length publications/TT faculty		
	Creative short publications*		
	Creative book-length publications**		
	Leadership roles in national organizations		
	Major reports for professional societies		
	Extramural support, e.g. grants		
	National & international recognitions and awards		
	Published critical reviews		
	Editorship of a book, journal special issue, or scholarly edition		
	Textbooks		
	Films and videos: juried exhibitions		
Non-Tenure Track Faculty			

	Short scholarly or creative publications (poems, peer-reviewed essays and book chapters, stories)		
	Book-length scholarly or creative publications		
	Other accomplishments (e.g. awards, editorships)		

\* Scholarly books will be peer-reviewed, but this category also includes books such as biographies published by trade presses for general audiences.

\*\* It is not practical to record the ratio of creative publications to TT faculty because the proportion of creative writers varies among English departments; our department has very few, unlike departments with large MFA programs.

**Metrics for Scholarly Productivity**  
 Department of Geography, University of Vermont  
 March 24, 2015

The Department of Geography has a long history of assessing scholarly productivity and impact. Given the transdisciplinary nature of both the field of geography and of the research, teaching, and service commitments of our faculty we recognize the need for flexibility in the evaluation of our scholarly output. In particular, the existence of multiple sub-fields that span the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities—including small but influential or emerging subfields—necessitates the recognition that quantitative data must be accompanied and augmented by robust qualitative context and justifications. Therefore the Department of Geography will track, report, and act on the following scholarly metrics with such a need for a flexible interpretation firmly in mind.

The following represent activities and achievements at the individual level that are commonly included in evaluations of geographers, at UVM and in the discipline more broadly:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Factors to be considered and addressed</b>
<b>Publications</b>	Journal articles	Peer-review, impact factors, citations, reach, single/co-author, role in publication
	Book - authored	Peer-review, reputation of publisher, citations, single/co-author, role in publication
	Book - edited	Peer-review, reputation of publisher, citations, single/co-editor, role in publication
	Book chapter	Peer-review, reputation of publisher, citations, single/co-author, role in publication
	Scholarly commentary	Reputation of journal, reach, citations
	Review article	Reputation of journal, reach, citations
	Book review	Reputation of journal, reach, citations
	Special issue journal editor	Peer-review, impact factors, citations, reach, single/co-editor, role in publication
	Journal editorship	Rank of journal, impact factors, candidate's length of service, editorial position
	Technical reports, White papers, Policy papers	Authorship, publication and review process, reach, impact. This is a broad category; candidates should provide appropriate context and a fair assessment of how such reports were initiated, generated, reviewed, and their influence on the field.
	Public/social media	Readership, circulation, social media uptake, reach. Candidates should provide context and assessment of how these activities contribute to 'public scholarship', the transfer of knowledge to broader audiences, and professional name recognition of the candidate, department/program, and/or institution.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Factors to be considered and addressed</b>
<b>Publications, cont.</b>	Creative work, including tutorials, maps, and data visualizations	Impact, competitiveness, reach, media and avenues of dissemination. Similar to popular/social media factors, candidate should identify the contribution of these efforts to public scholarship or pedagogy.
	Other publications - to be described by individual candidates	Review process, venue/publisher, audience, reach and impact.
	Ad-hoc reviewer	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national), number of articles/books, range of journals/publishers or fields/sub-disciplines represented.
<b>Grants &amp; Fellowships</b>	External	PI/Co-PI/etc.; Funded, pending, un-funded, review process, competitiveness (national/regional, level of specialization of funder, success rates, etc.)
	Internal	PI/Co-PI/etc.; Funded, pending, un-funded, review process, competitiveness (success rates, etc.)
	Service on review panel	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national), number of proposals, frequency of panels and length of service.
	Ad-hoc reviewer	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national), number of proposals, range of funders or fields/sub-disciplines represented.
<b>Awards</b>	Teaching award	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national); competitiveness
	Research award	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national); competitiveness
	Service awards	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national); competitiveness
	Other awards	Scale, competitiveness; covering awards that do not fit into one of the above categories (e.g. blending more than one category, or representing different professional realms)
<b>Recognition</b>	Invitation for Keynote	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national); funded; reach; audience
	Invitation to deliver talk	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national); funded; reach; audience
	Academy & Board Memberships	Scale (internal, discipline, regional/national); competitiveness; relevance to professional discipline
	Distinctions	Other indicators of acknowledgement, impact, influence, etc. for excellence in teaching, research/creativity, and/or service

## Demonstrating Scholarly Productivity and Impact

The **broader goals** of scholarship and creative production may include (but are not limited to)\*:

- the production and transmission of knowledge through multiple channels
- critical analysis and review of a topic, sub-field, technique, or body of work
- developing and sharing new techniques and methods of research and teaching
- contributing to innovation in pedagogy, public service, and scholarship
- employing professional expertise to the benefit of society

*\*These goals are articulated for the convenience of faculty charged with identifying how their work is meaningful and are not intended as a checklist.*

### *Evaluating and Contextualizing Publications:*

Each faculty member will be responsible for crafting a narrative using available databases (such as Web of Science) to identify the top journals and presses in her/his fields by rankings, impact factors, reach, citation methods, and prestige. The narrative and list will be kept in faculty members' files and may be reviewed and amended annually by the individual in conjunction with the annual review process. This allows the Department to accommodate the wide range of sub-disciplines in Geography and allows for change over time in what constitutes 'top' journals/presses.

For each publication (or other form of production), faculty members will provide explanatory notes addressing the relevant factors from the above table, as well as how it contributes to the individual faculty member's interpretation of the broader goals of scholarship (above). Special attention should be given to multi-authored publications; for these, faculty members should identify and explain their individual proportion of effort in each stage of the publication process and identify the roles of co-authors (e.g. student, peer, former advisor, etc.) for context.

Other forms of documentation of a faculty member's impact on her/his field(s) may be included and represented at her/his discretion, such as comments by external reviewers, letters of commendation, and other forms of recognition.

### *Evaluating and Contextualizing Applications for Funding:*

Faculty members will provide contextual information regarding the scale and competitiveness of specific funding programs and competitions to which they apply, as well as the objectives, standards, and rigor of the funding agency more



broadly. For example, it is recommended that faculty not only list a national funder (e.g. National Science Foundation), but also the competitiveness and prestige of specific programs and funding streams within the organization. As with publications, additional information about co-investigators and each person's role and contribution should be made clear. Faculty members should identify how each funded project will contribute to the above goals of scholarship and creative production. Due to the time-consuming nature of generating grant/fellowship proposals, *unfunded* projects should also be described and their outcomes contextualized (e.g. what were the ratings from reviewers, did feedback from reviewers lead to resubmission, was project successful in a different competition, etc.).

*Evaluating and Contextualizing Other Forms of Distinction and Recognition:*

Faculty members should provide, as much as possible, evidence of how competitive, prestigious, etc. the distinction is, as well as a sense of its potential future impact for the faculty member, for public knowledge, and for the good reputation of the Geography Department, CAS, and UVM.

**Scholarly Metrics - Department of Geology**  
**March 24, 2015**

Consistent with nationally accepted standards in STEM sciences, the Department of Geology will track, report and act on the following *Department-wide*\* scholarly metrics:

- Number of publications in peer reviewed outlets
- Journal stature as determined by the Departmental faculty (top tier, mid tier, low tier)
- Journal impact factors (recognizing that journals with smaller audiences may have lower impact factors even though they may be the top journals in the field)
- Number of citations (recognizing that there is a significant time lag in citations and that publications in smaller fields may not be as well cited)
- Number of extramural grant awards
- Number of extramural grant submissions
- Invited talks and presentations at national and international conferences
- Number of major professional or society fellows, major awards and prizes won by faculty
- Number of journal editorial positions (editor, associate editor, editorial board)
- Membership on grant review panels
- Quality of entering graduate students
- Number of MS students graduated
- Number of graduate and undergraduate student publications and presentations at national meetings
- Number of students selected for competitive national and international scholarships/fellowships
- Number of Bachelor's graduates going on to graduate or professional study
- Number of successful honors these defended
- Number of students engaged in mentored research

*\*Recognizing that all numbers must take into consideration the small size of the Department and are best viewed as a measure of dept. productivity/faculty size.*

## Department of German and Russian

### Scholarly Production and Impact Metrics

#### I. Scholarly Production Metrics

In assessing scholarly production, the Department of German and Russian first acknowledges that there are many different forms of scholarly activity and second, that both quality and quantity need to be considered. The following list reflects the high esteem in which we hold scholarly publications, especially those that are peer-reviewed. These metrics coincide with those outlined in our RPT and Annual Faculty Evaluation guidelines. They are arranged in order of importance.

##### **1. Peer-reviewed book-length publications**

monograph or sole-authored book  
co-authored book  
textbook  
book-length translation  
edited book  
co-edited book

##### **2. Peer-reviewed publications other than books:**

articles, chapters, contributions to proceedings, translations

##### **3. Solicited peer-reviewed publications other than books:**

articles, chapters, contributions to proceedings, translations

##### **4. Non-peer-reviewed publications other than books:**

articles, chapters, contributions to proceedings, introductions, translations

##### **5. Short publications** (e.g. under 3000 words):

articles, encyclopedia entries, reviews

##### **6. Presentations**

keynote address (national or international)  
presentation accepted by peer review, given at national convention  
presentation accepted by peer review, given at regional convention  
invited presentation (other institution)  
local presentation (e.g. campus organizations, other classes)

##### **7. Awards/Grants**

national/international award, honorary membership, etc.  
national/international major grant  
small grant: external source  
small grant: internal source

## II. Scholarly Impact Metrics

In our discipline, scholarly impact is difficult to measure. We do not use the same metrics as the sciences. Moreover, impact is sometime short-lived as interest in certain topics and areas changes. In order to follow the Provost's directive, we have developed the following list of indicators, again starting with the most significant.

Publication by renowned university or academic press

Publication in foremost journal in the profession. This is, of course, subject to debate. We have settled on the following publications:

German: *German Quarterly*, *Monatshefte*, *Seminar*, *German Studies Review*, *Journal for Austrian Studies*

Russian: *Slavic Review*, *Slavic and East European Journal*, *Russian Review*, *Russian Language Journal*

Editorship of a major journal

Invitation to deliver key note address

Invitation to deliver lecture at peer universities

Member of board of directors of renowned journal in the profession

National/international award

Major grant award

<b>Faculty Productivity</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Single-Authored Books</b>		
<b>Edited Books</b>		
<b>Textbooks</b>		
<b>Peer-Reviewed Articles</b>		
<b>Peer-Reviewed Book Chapters</b>		
<b>Major Review Essays</b>		
<b>Other Published Essays (including in magazines, newspapers, etc.)</b>		
<b>Museum Exhibitions/Documentary Film Work</b>		
<b>Preservation Reports/Professional Reports/Training Manuals</b>		
<b>Databases/Online Archives</b>		
<b>Grants/ Awards for Research</b>		
<b>Book/Article Prizes</b>		
<b>Conference Presentations/Invited Lectures</b>		
<b>Editorial Positions on Journals</b>		
<b>Scholarly Association Offices</b>		
<b>Book Reviews</b>		

**Metrics for Scholarly Productivity and Impact**  
**Department of History and Historic Preservations**  
**March 2015**

**Explaining Scholarship in History and Historic Preservation:**

Scholarship in the humanities, and in history in particular, is disseminated in an entirely different manner than in the sciences. Like in research and teaching oriented departments in the United States and Canada, research in history involves the production of lengthy (frequently 25-30 page) articles and monographic book studies (published with university presses and academic trade presses that conduct extensive peer-review). Books in history involve long periods of travel to archives and libraries, sustained reading and the dissection of primary sources (contemporaneous documents). They also entail the careful examination of other scholarship and the formulation of analyses and written narratives about events, topics, and key developments. The production of most historical monographs (which are generally two to three hundred pages in length with extensive citations and voluminous bibliographies) requires sustained work over many years (anywhere from 5-10, depending on the scope and depth of the project). The impact of books in history is occasionally felt immediately in those studies that are widely reviewed in popular newspapers and magazines (which happens fairly frequently) but, in most cases, a book's impact builds momentum over a period of 2-5 years as reviews get published in scholarly journals (frequently 1-3 years after publication) and as other historians begin to incorporate this material into their own article and book manuscripts. In history, as in many of other humanities disciplines, is it not uncommon for citations of major books to continue not for a period of 1 or 2 years (until the findings are superseded) but often for a period of 10-20 years, and frequently longer.

Historians also disseminate their ideas through conference presentations, essays in popular periodicals and magazines, museum exhibitions, documentary films, book chapters in annotated collections, and review essays. Since our department houses both history and historic preservation, it is also important to note that while all of the above are measurements of scholarly impact and productivity in the latter field, Historic Preservation scholars also produce professional reports, training manuals, and extensive nomination forms for the National Register of Historic Places. Chapters in books are important to call out separately here as a measurement of scholarly productivity, given that these publications frequently do not appear in citation indexes or in databases such as those offered by Academic Analytics (though the latter has taken some steps over the past year to rectify this problem).

In providing this brief summary of historical scholarship, the hope is to illustrate not only the peculiarities of the field but also the inadvisability of imposing productivity metrics (such as Journal Impact Factors) that were developed for medicine and the sciences onto the humanities or interpretive social sciences. While the Department of History and Historic Preservation is not opposed to measuring our output on an annual basis, any attempt to create a single productivity or impact metric would be shortsighted and would

not adequately reflect the diverse and highly impactful work that historians (and other scholars in the humanities) engage in on a regular basis.

### **Scholarly Metrics and Citation Indexes:**

Discussions of impact factors and Thomson Reuter's *Journal Citation Reports (JCR)* are largely irrelevant in the disciplines of history and historic preservation. Many history journals are not indexed in *Journal Citation Reports* and rankings and tiers in a discipline as diverse as history (where every area of the field has its own top journal—British History—*Journal of British Studies*, African History—*Journal of African History*, Canadian History—*The Canadian Historical Review*, History of Sexuality—*Journal of the History of Sexuality*, etc., etc.) are nearly impossible, hence the relative lack of ranking lists. The closest thing to a model for ranking journals in history is the SCImago Journal Rank Indicator. There are, however, several problems with this ranking indicator: 1) it is not inclusive of all the journals in which many historians and historic preservation specialists might choose to publish their work; 2) it does not provide citation information or ranking for scholarly essays that appear in edited collections (which are also peer-reviewed); and 3) the citation reports frequently do not capture publications in foreign languages (something history faculty engage in quite routinely).

Furthermore, it is important to note that *JCR* is incomplete for the humanities for a variety of different reasons. It draws its data principally from a limited number of Web of Science databases (the only one of which that is really relevant to historians being the *Social Sciences Citation Index*). Most significantly, *JCR* does not include data from the *Arts and Humanities Citation Index*, where citations to historical scholarship are most likely to be found. And, again, since the focus here is on articles in journals a whole branch of scholarly productivity in history (publication in peer-reviewed edited collections) is excluded from consideration.

Finally, historians tend to rely not on productivity metrics in assessing contributions to scholarship but on the disciplinary knowledge and expertise of other historians, who are best equipped to comment on the importance and quality of individual journals and presses. In all decisions about promotion, we ask external reviewers to comment on the quality of publications and the importance of the presses and journals in which history and historic preservation faculty publish. In providing guidance to the external evaluators, the department relies on our well-developed RPT guidelines. The main components of these guidelines, reproduced below, will form the basis for our proposed measurement of scholarly productivity and impact.

### **Relevant Sections of History and Historic Preservation RPT Guidelines:**

The following details are drawn from our RPT Guidelines documents. We have two separate documents in the department, one for history and one for historic preservation.

#### *History Guidelines:*

**General criteria:** Judgments in this area should be based on the quality of research, and not solely on quantity. Although the department recognizes that historians express scholarship in a number of useful and valuable ways, it affirms the importance of

professional publication based on peer review. Research that does not yield a significant body of peer-reviewed scholarship is not sufficient.

**Indicators of performance include:**

1. Published works, including books, textbooks, articles in journals, chapters in edited collections and book reviews (in either paper or electronic formats);
2. Other scholarly electronic publications (including, but not limited to, digitized sources and websites), videos/films, museum exhibits and public history programs;
3. Editorial work on scholarly journals, anthologies and conference proceedings;
4. Presentations at professional meetings and conferences;
5. Research grants: Although research grants are not essential to scholarly productivity in history, an individual's application for and success in obtaining grants, thereby increasing the probability of scholarly achievement, may be a consideration;
6. Awards, honors and other recognition of contributions in the area of scholarship;
7. Refereeing scholarly articles and books;
8. Judgments of departmental colleagues;
9. Judgments of colleagues and experts in the field outside the department and university.

*Historic Preservation Guidelines:*

**Scholarship/Professional Service:** As a field of intellectual endeavor, historic preservation is fundamentally interdisciplinary. It draws on a wide range of disciplines across the curriculum that relate to the conservation of the historic built environment. There are three basic components to the field: a) history of the built environment, b) architectural conservation, and c) preservation policy, advocacy and law; and within these broad rubrics, numerous ancillary disciplines. Like their colleagues in other academic fields, preservationists have their particular fields of specialized research. But they are also generalists in that they must be familiar with all the categories listed above and be able to relate them to their own work. Because the professional training of preservation educators is not only fundamentally interdisciplinary, but also incorporates applied knowledge, it is quite different from that of the typical historian. Preservationists' research and scholarship is integrated with and inseparable from their professional service. Their research will ordinarily place greater emphasis on community-based projects than on the more autonomous, independent research and writing in which historians typically engage.

**Scholarship:**

1. professional reports on recent projects in the field;



2. published works, including books, scholarly articles professional articles, textbooks, training manuals and book reviews (all in either paper or electronic formats);
3. Electronic publications (including digitized sources and websites), videos/films, museum exhibits and public history programs;
4. training manuals (published and/or unpublished) designed for professionals in the field;
5. presentations at professional meetings and conferences;
6. preparation of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places;
7. letters of reference and/or evaluation from peers among preservation educators;
8. letters of reference and/or evaluation from professionals in historic preservation, governmental agencies and museum research organizations that use the services of preservationist educators;
9. prizes for books or other contributions to the field;
10. reviews of the books, articles or other presentations of the candidate's work;
11. citation of the candidate's work in the scholarly or professional literature.

### **History and Historic Preservation Plan:**

The Department of History and Historic Preservation will be using one of the modified sample metrics provided by the Dean to count the various forms of peer-reviewed scholarship and reports that we produce on an annual basis (without providing systems for ranking journals, presses, etc., which as indicated above is extremely difficult in a field as diverse and interdisciplinary as history).

By using the table attached, the Department Chair will provide data about numbers of publications, etc. on an annual basis, using information provided by faculty on their annual activity reports.

In his memo to deans, the Provost indicated a number of potential metrics that might be included in assessing individual departments. The items included in that original document that might be most relevant include the following:

- Original research published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes
- Other work published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes
- Books or book chapters published
- Articles published, volumes edited, other scholarly works published
- Published critical reviews
- Invited exhibitions/performances, juried exhibitions/performances
- Journal editorships
- Extramural support for research, scholarship, creativity
- Major awards and prizes won by faculty
- Number of professional or society faculty fellowships

In considering “other” published work, the department would want to include the following:

- Relevant reports (especially related to Historic Preservation)
- Museum Exhibitions
- Textbooks
- Documentary Film Advising
- Professional Organization Reports
- Databases and/or Digital Archives

## **Department of Music and Dance Metrics for Scholarly Productivity**

The Department of Music and Dance consists of three program areas (Music, Music Education, and Dance), with three degree programs (a Bachelor of Arts with concentrations in music history and literature, music theory and composition, classical performance, jazz studies, and music technology and business; a Bachelor of Music in Performance; and a Bachelor of Science in Music Education, offered through the College of Education and Social Services), and minors in both dance and music. Because of these diverse offerings, it is important to note that faculty may be involved in traditional scholarly research, creative work, or **both**.

Two of the leading professional organizations in music (the College Music Society, and the National Association of Music Executives at State Universities) are investigating and discussing ways to address the push for quantitative analysis of research and creative work in the music, but neither has made concrete recommendations at this time. The National Association of Schools of Music, another leading professional organization, published a policy brief entitled *Assessment on Our Own Terms* in 2007, but it falls short on specific recommendations, and is more oriented to how programs are assessed within a university than specifically how faculty research or creative work is assessed within the academy. The most substantive comment about faculty assessment is:

The arts are centered in a culture of achievement in an evaluation of whole works rather than a culture of evidence with regard to easily assessable parts. Successful works are those that achieve goals they have set for themselves at the beginning, rather than following a set of universal principles or rules.<sup>1</sup>

### **Traditional Scholarly Research**

Because of the diversity of our offerings, traditional research in our department is subdivided into categories (dance, ethnomusicology, music education, music history, and music theory) in which individuals pursue their research and publication agendas. This means that there is no single journal that is the research goal of all of our scholars; instead, there are many different journals that each represent the variety of sub-disciplines pursued by our faculty. Further, the norm in some sub-disciplines, such as music education, is for parallel research agendas in both publication and conference presentation.

The leading academic research index, Academic Analytics, is widely regarded by the arts community as not being able to adequately present faculty research in the creative arts. For example, their own CEO is quoted as saying that Academic Analytics "unequivocally ... just 'don't do' performing arts."<sup>2</sup> At least one university preparing to work with Academic Analytics is also aware of this problem with the creative arts, including music and dance as disciplines that don't work well with the Academic Analytics portal because faculty research is not "captured by articles, citations, conference proceedings, books, federal grants, and honors."<sup>3</sup> The Arts & Humanities Citation Index contains some of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark Wait and Samuel Hope, *Assessment on Our Own Terms* (National Association of Schools of Music, 2007), 5.

<sup>2</sup> E-mail from John Miller, Director, Challey School of Music, North Dakota State University to the listserve of the National Association of Music Executives at State Universities (April 2, 2015).

<sup>3</sup> Lou McClelland, Academic Analytics at CU-Boulder (<http://www.colorado.edu/pba/peer/CU-BoulderAndAcademicAnalytics.pdf>), accessed June 25, 2015.

publications in which our faculty publish (*American Music*, *Ethnomusicology*, *Latin American Music Review*, *Musical Quarterly*, etc.), but has an unusual list of journals that contain no scholarly journals dedicated to jazz (*Down Beat*, for example, is found on the shelves of most bookstores and is not commonly perceived as a scholarly journal, while peer-reviewed journals such as *Jazz Perspectives*, in which three of our faculty have published articles, is not on the list), and only one music education journal from the United States (but not *Music Educators Journal*, which is the refereed journal with the widest reach). While the SCImago Journal Rank Indicator is more inclusive than the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (it includes *Jazz Perspectives* and other journals not found in the Arts & Humanities index), we agree with anecdotal evidence we have from other UVM colleagues that the rankings of the journals does not correlate to publications stature in the field (one of the most prestigious music journals, *Musical Quarterly*, is ranked 98<sup>th</sup> out of 114 journals).

When assessing research in music and dance, we look primarily for contributions to the field of expertise as evidenced by items such as:

- the writing and publication of books
- editorships of published books
- contributions of a chapter or chapters to published books
- journal articles published in juried reviews and journals
- journal articles chosen for publication by editors
- research articles published in symposium proceedings
- editorships of recognized journals
- published reviews for recognized journals
- citations of one's work by others in published books and journals
- invited or accepted papers and presentations for international/national/regional organizations
- invited or accepted papers and presentations for state/local organizations
- invited or accepted papers and presentations at on-campus symposia
- receipt of grants for research
- receipt of honors or awards in the above

Secondarily, we look for:

- journal articles published in non-juried reviews and journals
- self-published or unpublished, focused, on-going, pertinent, and credible research or composition that shows the promise of making a valuable mark on the profession
- reviewing books or articles for publication
- articles or concert reviews published in the campus or local presses
- other articles or reviews published in the popular presses
- invitation to speak to or participate on a panel discussion at national, regional, or state level
- appearance as a guest lecturer or seminar leader in other departments or programs on campus
- interviews on television, radio, and other media

### **Creative Work**

Again, because of the diversity of our offerings, creative work in our department is subdivided into discrete categories (solo performance, ensemble performance, conducting, composition/choreography, masterclasses/clinics, and musical arrangement) that may also differ depending on whether the creative work is in classical music or jazz. This makes the quantified interpretation of creative work difficult at best. The NASM policy brief referenced earlier states:

[A]t the higher levels of achievement, our assessments get further and further away from sets of discrete bits of knowledge or discrete technical skills and move to questions of blending of aesthetic choice, of timing, and so forth. The thing that makes all of this extremely difficult for those on the outside to understand is that there is almost never a pure correlation between discrete knowledge and technical skills on one hand and artistry on the other. The proof of this is that there are far more musicians with high levels of technical proficiency than musicians whose interpretive abilities are acknowledged to be supreme by most musicians and by audiences in the thousands.<sup>4</sup>

The closest we can make to a qualitative assessment of creative work is, but not limited to, the venue and/or organization that performs the work. While we value creative work done with established arts organizations such as the Vermont Symphony Orchestra, the Albany (NY) Symphony, the Burlington Discover Jazz Festival, the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts, etc., we acknowledge that important creative work may also be occurring in smaller venues and/or may be initiated by the artists themselves.

When assessing creative work in music, we look primarily for contributions to the field of expertise as evidenced by items such as:

- solo or ensemble appearances as a professional performer in off-campus venues such as concert halls, music festivals, music clubs, and churches
- music directorships or regular appointments in professional or semi-professional ensembles
- engagement as a professional adjudicator or clinician for recognized organizations
- guest artist residencies or master classes on other campuses
- formal on-campus faculty recitals
- appearances in formal on-campus faculty ensemble recitals
- national, regional, state, or local broadcast or performances of recordings or compositions
- recordings on commercially available labels, as a solo or ensemble performer
- receipt of grants for creative work
- the writing and publication of compositions
- editorships of published compositions
- national, regional, state, or local performances of compositions
- national, regional, state, or local commissions for new compositions
- recordings of compositions on commercially available labels
- receipt of honors or awards in the above

Secondarily, we look for:

- informal on- or off-campus performances
- music directorships of community ensembles
- non-commercially available recordings, as a solo or ensemble player
- non-recurring professional appearances at churches, restaurants and clubs, or private functions
- local broadcast of performances or recordings
- self-published or unpublished, focused, on-going, pertinent, and credible composition that shows the promise of making a valuable mark on the profession
- guest artist residencies or master classes in other departments or programs on-campus

When assessing creative work in dance, we look primarily for contributions to the field of expertise as evidenced by items such as:

- choreographing or directing professional or semi-professional performing arts presentations
- performing in professional or semi-professional productions

---

<sup>4</sup> Mark Wait and Samuel Hope, *Assessment on Our Own Terms* (National Association of Schools of Music, 2007), 9.

- designing for performing arts presentations (i.e. costumes, scenic elements, light, and sound/music)
- collaborating with artists from other fields for professional or semi-professional presentations such as opera, musical theater, gallery installation, film, and video
- serving as artistic director for professional or semi-professional performing arts organizations
- formal on-campus performances
- engagement as a professional adjudicator or consultant for recognized organizations
- guest artist residencies or master classes on other campuses
- national, regional, state, or local commissions for new choreography
- recordings of choreography on commercially available labels
- restaging choreography or reconstructing historically relevant choreography (such as from a notated score or from personal knowledge of previously created repertory)
- receipt of grants for creative work
- receipt of honors or awards in the above

Secondarily, we look for:

- choreographing or directing community performing arts presentations
- performing as dancer and/or actor in community productions
- collaborating with artists from other fields for community presentations such as opera, musical theater, gallery installation, film, and video
- serving as artistic director for community performing arts organizations
- informal on- or off-campus performances
- guest artist residencies or master classes in other departments or programs on-campus

[NOTE: This document does not supersede or replace the departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs) or the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Guidelines that have been approved by the department faculty, the Dean's Office of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost's Office.]

## Metrics for Assessing Scholarly Productivity and Impact for the Department of Philosophy

This document summarizes metrics to track scholarly productivity and impact for the Philosophy Department. It was edited and submitted by the Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from a document submitted by the Philosophy Department.

Philosophy faculty publish peer-reviewed pieces of the following types: journal articles, book chapters, book reviews, critical book reviews, translations, encyclopedia articles, and books. Venues for each type of research product will be sorted into tiers based on their prestige and visibility, and that, for each tier and type of research product, the faculty will compile a an FTE-weighted average of the number of such research products faculty in the department have placed at that tier or above. So, for instance, assuming that the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy is a top-tier venue for encyclopedia articles, an article in that venue is added both to the count of encyclopedia articles at any tier and to the count of encyclopedia articles at only the top tier. Because the average is FTE-weighted, a publication by a faculty member with a half-time appointment counts half as much as a publication by a faculty member with a 100% appointment. These counts are not equally significant indicators of scholarly productivity and impact. In particular, placing a piece in a top-tier venue is much more important indicator of scholarly productivity and impact than placing a piece at a lower tier.

The specification of tiers for venues for each type of publication will be developed by faculty in Philosophy by the end of the Fall 2015 semester, and be subject to review by the faculty every five years, in conjunction with the faculty review of RPT and Annual Performance Review Guidelines required by article 14.4 of the CBA. Only publications that are subject to peer review and that appear in reputable scholarly journals, presses, or other venues will be counted; no distinction will be made between publications that have already appeared and those that have merely been accepted for publication in reputable scholarly venues; and the moving window for the metrics will be five years.

[NOTE: This document does not supersede or replace the departmental Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines (AEGs) or the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Guidelines that have been approved by the department faculty, the Dean's Office of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost's Office.]

## **Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics, Department of Physics**

(submitted March 20, 2015)

These metrics are needed to assess the productivity of individual faculty members and thus determine the national and international visibility of the research carried out in the Physics department. We propose the use of the following metrics widely used, with variations, by the physics community all over the world. The list is not necessarily in order of importance (specific weights can be assigned in more detailed departmental implementation guidelines).

1. Number of publications in refereed physics journals.
2. Quality of the journal, as determined by the Journal Impact Factor. A detailed explanation of impact factor calculations (involving average number of citations of articles in a given journal within a fixed timeframe) can be found on the Thompson Reuters Web of Science (WoS) website <http://wokinfo.com/essays/impact-factor/>.
3. A list of journal impact factors is available through WoS <http://apps.webofknowledge.com/> (Journal Citation Reports link). We envisage differentiation between (a.) very low impact factor journals (less than 1), (b.) typical good impact range (where most publications occur), in between 2 and 10 or so, which includes most journals of the Physical Review family, and (c.) high impact, above 30, the highest being Rev. Mod. Phys. (42), Nature (42), and Science (31).
4. Number of citations (total), citations per year, and citations within a recent 5 year period. These are available (for example) through Google Scholar <http://scholar.google.com>, by creating a scholar profile (time burden to create one – only 10 min!)
5. Number of publication-quality preprints; only those available in the form of submitted journal articles on <http://arxiv.org> This preprint archive is widely used in the physics community (it contains over 1 million papers!), and typically contains articles to be published within a year or so in refereed journals. The Google Scholar citation profile automatically includes the preprints (with their updated journal references) in the citation calculations.
6. Books published.
7. National and International level prizes awarded for outstanding research (e.g. by the American Physical Society, Nobel Committee, etc.)
8. Service related to physics journal refereeing and editing: papers reviewed, membership in editorial boards, editing special journal issues, etc.
9. Number of external grants reviewed.
10. Number of submitted external grants.
11. Number of awarded external grants.
12. Number of invited talks at conferences and universities/research institutions.
13. Number of contributed talks/posters at conferences and universities/research institutions.
14. Number of graduate students applying for and entering the Physics and Materials Science Programs & number of graduate students receiving their degrees under the Physics department umbrella.
15. Number of publications involving graduate and undergraduate students and number of conference presentations involving those.



## **Political Science Department Faculty Research Productivity Metrics**

Peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles

(Department: Per TT faculty member)

Peer-reviewed scholarly books and peer-reviewed book-length publications

(Department: Per TT faculty member)

Peer-reviewed chapters in edited scholarly books, proceedings, or working paper series

(Department: Per TT faculty member)

Total citations (Google Scholar; ResearchGate)

Books, journals, symposia, special issues, proceedings edited

Major articles in law journals

Major articles in other scholarly non-peer reviewed journals

Book reviews published in scholarly journals

Other non-peer-reviewed publications (textbooks, articles in magazines or newspapers, opinion pieces, editorial introductions, encyclopedia articles, etc.)

Papers presented at peer-selective scholarly conferences

Invited scholarly lectures

Recognitions, awards, and prizes

Funded fellowship awards (Fulbright, etc.)

Grants received, internal

Manuscripts reviewed for research journals

Manuscripts reviewed for scholarly book publishers

### ***Unusual and not commonly expected, but highly valued:***

Editor of journal

Sponsored award proposals submitted

External grants received

Fellowships in academic and professional societies

Election to office in professional organization

Scholarly Metrics  
Department of Psychological Science  
February 5, 2015

The Department of Psychological Science has long history of assessing department-wide scholarly productivity and impact. Consistent with nationally accepted standards in STEM sciences, the Department of Psychological Science will track, report and act on the following Department-wide scholarly metrics.

- Number of publications in peer reviewed outlets
- Journal stature as determined by the Departmental faculty (top tier, mid tier, low tier; see attached)
- Journal impact factors (recognizing that journals with smaller audiences may have lower impact factors even though they may be the top journals in the field)
- Number of citations (recognizing that there is a significant time lag in citations and that publications in smaller fields may not be as well cited)
- Number of extramural grant awards
- Number of extramural grant submissions
- Invited talks and presentations at national and international conferences
- Number of major professional or society fellows, major awards and prizes won by faculty
- Number of journal editorial positions (editor, associate editor, editorial board)
- Membership on grant review panels
- Number and quality of graduate applicants
- Quality of entering graduate students
- Degrees completion rate
- Number of graduate and undergraduate student publications and presentations at national meetings
- The success of graduate students in obtaining post-doctoral employment
- Number of successful honors these defended
- Number of student engaged in mentored research

## Scholarly Productivity Metrics for the Religion Department

April 2015

The members of the Religion Department faculty are committed to the scholar-teacher model of the academic profession, and we consider our research and publication efforts as being of equal importance to our teaching and mentoring activities. We are scholars and teachers of undergraduates within a multi-disciplinary department that is embedded in the Humanities. Our department is currently comprised of scholars with training in anthropology, history, philosophy and religious studies, and we bring these diverse theoretical orientations and methods to our study of religion in both its historical and contemporary forms. While we regard our location in the Humanities and our constitution as a multi-disciplinary department as sources of analytical rigor and vitality, the diversity of our approaches to the study of religion precludes the identification of a single metric that we can use to fairly and meaningfully evaluate our many forms of scholarly production.

One significant challenge has to do with a given metric's time horizon. This can manifest in multiple ways. First, the time between completion of a scholarly work and its publication can be significant in our field. Because there is commonly a backlog in the publication process for many highly regarded peer-reviewed journals, it can take as much as three or four years from the time an article is submitted until its publication in a prestigious journal in one of our various sub-disciplines. A focus on measuring annual productivity effectively discourages scholars from submitting their work to the most highly regarded publication venues in our various sub-disciplines, particularly for those who have not yet gained tenure. Second, and more importantly, the impact of papers and books in the Humanities takes much longer to develop than it does in the natural sciences. For example, Kevin Trainor's book, *Relics, Ritual and Representation in Buddhism*, which was first published by Cambridge University Press in 1997, was reissued by Cambridge in 2007. In other words, the impact of work in the Humanities generally emerges more slowly than it does in the natural sciences, and published work may continue to remain influential for much longer periods of time. As a result, annual metrics do not effectively track the impact of our research and publication activity. There is, moreover, relatively little overlap in the prestigious publication venues among our various sub-disciplines, and there is no widely respected system for ranking their impact. In addition, chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes constitute one of the most important publication outlets in our field, and these chapters are not consistently indexed in benchmarking databases such as Academic Analytics.

The Religion Department will begin to keep an annual scholarly activity log, which the department chair will compile from the annual activity reports submitted by faculty members in the department. The following forms of scholarly activity will be logged:

- Single-authored monograph
- Co-authored monograph
- Chapter in a peer-reviewed edited volume
- Peer-reviewed journal article
- Edited or co-edited volume or special journal issue
- External fellowship or grant
- Invited journal article or book chapter (not peer-reviewed)
- Single-authored or co-authored textbook
- Review essay
- Encyclopedia article
- Book review
- Internal grant
- Article in popular press (newspapers, magazines)
- Academic blog post
- Peer-reviewed conference presentation
- Invited conference presentation/talk

**Metrics for Scholarly Productivity and Impact**  
**Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics**  
**February, 2015**

**CONTEXT:**

Language and linguistics journals, journals related to film studies, and creative writing publications are not indexed in *Journal Citation Reports* or ranked by impact factor, citations, or “tier.” SCImago Journal Rank Indicator (<http://www.scimagojr.com/index.php>) is potentially a useful quantitative tool. However, it excludes some of the preeminent U.S. journals in French, Italian and in Latino and Chicano studies, including *L’Esprit Créateur*, *H-France Reviews*, and *Revue d’Histoire Littéraire de la France*; *Annali d’Italianistica*, *Italica*, and *Quaderni d’Italianistica*; and *Latino Studies Journal*, *MALCS Journal*, *Ollantay*, and *Aztlan* respectively.

If the UVM Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics is to be compared to peer institutions, some measure of comparison is gained through the use of the same metric used by other institutions; however, we see any given metric as but one quantitative tool and subject to professional or field-centric biases. Furthermore, a dominant or best-practices metric appears to be lacking in our fields. The Modern Language Association, our largest professional organization, responded to a query as follows:

*It's been a long standing policy that the MLA Bibliography does not have or use a ranking system for journals or publishers.*

*Sincerely,*

*Barbara Chen*

*Director of Bibliographic Information Services and Editor, MLA International Bibliography*

In view of this, we have prepared a metric tool that simply counts, without further differentiating, the forms of peer-reviewed scholarship and creative production we produce.<sup>1</sup>

**PLAN:**

Using the attached document, the Department Chair will submit an updated spreadsheet each year.

From the Provost’s memo, we find the following examples of productivity relevant to our department:

- Original research published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes
- Other work published in peer-reviewed journals or other volumes
- Books or book chapters published
- Articles published, volumes edited, other scholarly works published
- Published critical reviews and encyclopedia entries
- Invited exhibitions/performances, juried exhibitions/performances
- Journal editorships and editorial board memberships
- Major awards and prizes won by faculty

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that creative writing publications are not peer-reviewed in the same way as research articles; however, reputable journals and magazines compare to peer-reviewed journals in prestige.

The following are relevant, but very rarely accomplished within Romance languages or linguistics departments:

- Extramural support for research, scholarship, creativity
- Extramural support for teaching, outreach, service

“Other work,” for our department, should include the following:

- Poems, fiction, screenplays, and creative non-fiction published in reputable venues  
[note that there is no peer-review system for creative writing commensurate with the system for research]
- Films and television programs
- Plays, exhibits, performance arts
- Book-length non-fiction studies such as biographies, whether published by a peer-reviewed or non-academic press
- Guest-editorship of a special issue of a peer-reviewed journal
- Editorship of scholarly editions of primary texts
- Critically annotated translation of a primary text
- Textbooks published by reputable presses
- Other work: pedagogical or research materials published online (e.g. creation of a database for the use of teachers and/or scholars)

Student success is a priority for faculty in the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics, but we have no systematic way of tracking how many of our students receive national awards or go on to graduate study. Departments without active Master’s, let alone Ph.D., programs, like ours, are not included in the *U.S. News* or other national rankings of programs.

### **QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:**

- Given that a major monograph or a lengthy novel can take a decade to complete, how can yearly scoring be accurate and equitable?
- Given that many of our faculty publish original research in national and international journals that are not tracked by the Journal Citation Reports, or like-minded databases, how can yearly scoring be accurate and equitable?

## **Scholarly Metrics in Sociology**

Sociology is an intellectually diverse discipline. Even among "classic" mid-20<sup>th</sup> century sociologists, it was long acknowledged that there exist different "cultures" in the discipline: differences in methodological and theoretical orientation, for example, and differences between those who publish more in book format and those who publish in scholarly journals. Since the 1960s, furthermore, the diversity of the discipline has grown as it has become more international, and branched out into new areas and new subfields. Differences within the field extend to different expectations of quantity and character of publication, given the different pacing of different approaches and problem areas. The discipline is characterized, not so much by a single consensus paradigm as by many different schools of thought, and within different schools there are different expectations in terms of quantity and character of publications, grants, and most other quantifiable measures.

Given that reality, and the fact the diversity of the field is reflected in UVM's sociology faculty, the primary metric of scholarly productivity in the Department is peer review, i.e., the careful disciplined judgment, typically expressed in blind or double blind review, of scholars with relevant expertise, inside and outside UVM. Direct forms of peer review include primarily letters written by scholars outside the university in the case of promotion reviews for associate or full professor. Publications in peer reviewed outlets and grants and fellowships are also an important indicator of the considered respect of peers, although given the differences in expectations of quantity in different areas, sheer numbers of peer reviewed publications or grants are not enough by themselves to make quality judgments.

For all these reasons, UVM Sociology regularly uses the following principles and measures in its evaluations of scholarly productivity:

### **General Criteria**

The Department of Sociology recognizes three general criteria for evaluating the research activity of its faculty. These criteria are: (1) quality, (2) quantity and (3) continuity.

Quantity of research is important but the Department emphasizes the quality of research rather than sheer quantity, as measured by peer review. The Department will wish to consider the quality, visibility and professional recognition of the publishing outlet. In addition, the candidate's research should be both programmatic and sustained.

### **Indicators**

- 1) Publications, including
  - a) articles in peer-reviewed and professionally reviewed scholarly journals

- b) books, articles or chapters in books,
- c) editorship of collections of articles, contributions published in conference proceedings or collections of articles ☐
- d) critical reviews
- 2) Presentations at Professional Meetings (refereed and invited lectures and papers, section organizing, discussant). ☐
- 3) Grants (internal and external). ☐
- 4) Editorships of professional journals; refereeing for professional journals, granting agencies and ☐conference submissions. ☐
- 5) Applied research, including
  - a) technical reports;
  - b) policy analyses;
  - c) evaluation research;
  - d) expert witnessing; ☐
  - e) articles in the popular press, e.g. New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post. ☐
- 6) Awards, honors and other recognition of contributions resulting from the candidate's research ☐or scholarship. ☐
- 7) Work under review or in progress (manuscripts, working papers). ☐

### **Methods of Evaluation**

1. Professional judgment of colleagues and experts in the field outside of the Department and ☐University (reviews of books and articles, letters of reference, when appropriate). ☐
2. Professional judgment of Department and University colleagues. ☐
3. Indirect evaluation by outside experts (invited papers and presentations, honors, awards, ☐quality of publication outlets, citations). ☐



## **Department of Theatre Metrics for Evaluating Scholarly/Creative Research**

The Department of Theatre is a Fine Arts department whose primary goal is the education of students in both the theory and practice of theatre arts using our productions as the laboratory for the culmination of the learning process. Our role in the University is that of a core teaching/creative unit, with service responsibilities that are consistent with our primary functions. Our instructional responsibility is similar to other Fine Arts departments in the college, i.e., Music and Art and in addition to that we produce an ambitious season of plays each academic year, while maintaining active professional lives outside our university responsibilities.

The Department maintains a strong belief that our teaching and creative work are inseparable, both conceptually and practically. Whereas an examination of teaching, advising, research, creative work, and service lends a degree of neatness to the process of evaluation, it is an imperfect process of evaluation nonetheless because the life it reflects is not splintered. In the theatre we teach and advise when we direct, design, act, and pursue the myriad of tasks involved in production. Each of those activities is derived from research.

Similar to our colleagues in the life sciences, who are expected to support their own research through extra mural research grants, the faculty in the Department of Theatre supports its own laboratory by maintaining a production schedule that must financially support itself. Each production must pay for its own expenses, and therefore as faculty we help fund the research and creative work of our students in our laboratory: i.e., our academic production work.

Unlike our colleagues in most areas, our external creative work is mostly done during the summer season, or during leave time. Given the production and teaching responsibilities throughout the academic year, most faculty are unable to accept external engagements that would take them away from campus for extended periods of time without doing serious damage to their curriculum.

Theatre is by its very nature a collaborative art form. Each faculty member plays a vital role in the process of building a production. We are not a department where we have the luxury of more than one faculty member concentrating in any specific area. Every faculty member's presence is vital to the success of both production and curriculum, and while each primary area of appointment varies greatly, all are integral to the whole.

The Department of Theatre faculty is composed of both teacher/scholars and teacher/artists.

Teacher/scholars are evaluated by but not limited to the following measures:

- Continued research in primary or secondary area of interest
- Publication of scholarly book
- Receipt of major award or major grant
- Acceptance by a publisher of a contracted manuscript
- Publication of juried articles
- Delivery of scholarly presentations
- Service as editor or as co-editor of a book or associate editor of a journal;

- Publication of a juried paper or delivery of a scholarly presentation or service as co-editor of a book or associate editor of a journal
- Submission of a paper or presentation or publication of several book reviews
- Publication of a book review or evidence of a paper or presentation in the writing stage
- Supporting departmental productions/artists with dramaturgical research

The teacher/artists are evaluated by but not limited to the following measures:

- Working in one's primary or secondary area of emphasis in a contracted nationally or internationally recognized professional venue
- Working in one's primary or secondary area of emphasis in a significant external professional venue (external defined as not only out of UVM but also out of Burlington and immediate area).
- Working in one's primary or secondary area of emphasis in significant external productions or an internal production evaluated and attested to by an external evaluator
- Presenting professional workshops or seminars in conjunction with national professional organizations
- Supporting departmental productions and other artist in area of professional interest.

In addition to theatre scholar/artists, the Department of Theatre houses the program of Speech and Debate. Specific criteria for evaluation of the Debate Coach, in conjunction with the endowed professorship in Speech and Debate is as follows but it should be noted that the evaluation of coaching skills must be done in the format of a blind evaluation by other coaches in the same division as the UVM team.

Evaluations of Coaching Abilities will be based on three areas:

1. Quantity:
  1. Number of tournaments attended.
  2. Number of students participating from UVM (a minimum of an average of ten debaters is expected).
  3. Number of events UVM Debate Team stages (an average of 2-5 is expected).
2. Quality:
  1. The performance (Win/Loss) record.
  2. The performance in the Community.
3. Stewardship:  
Should indicate use of financial resources a timely and prudent manner.

**NOTE:** The above should be evaluated for consistency and quality over a 4-5 year period.