



COLLEGE OF NURSING AND HEALTH SCIENCES
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

TO: David Rosowsky, Provost and Senior Vice-President
FROM: Patty Prelock, Dean *Patty Prelock*
College of Nursing and Health Sciences
RE: CNHS Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics
DATE: 4-29-15; revised 5-25-15

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences presents the following scholarly productivity and impact metrics that will guide our decision making and approach to achieving our strategic objectives for the preparation of competent, highly qualified health professionals, implementation of educational innovations, and the facilitation of translational research. I fully endorse the selected metrics as they meet my priorities for the college and are the benchmarks I have been using over the last six years to determine my approach to program investment and support and to identify areas where changes need to be made.

CNHS Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics

- Peer reviewed publications
- Peer reviewed presentations
- All faculty publications
- External grant applications (research, teaching/training, outreach/service)
- Graduate pass rates at or above the national average for licensure or certification

The inclusion of the first four items was considered important, as these metrics are part of our annual review guidelines and our RPT process. Additionally, a review of Academic Analytics and the metrics by which we are compared to our peer institutions and competitors was considered and revealed these basic metrics were similar to those at other institutions. The fifth item was added as this is a critical part of our accreditation requirements across programs, must be reported annually and is an assessment of our ability to prepare students to meet the expected competencies in their respective fields. This is an important benchmark for us, and one that prospective students frequently use to determine program quality.

Process used to engage faculty in the discussion and decision making around the metrics.

The Provost's memo charging each unit to develop scholarly productivity and impact metrics was shared with the CNHS faculty prior to our December 10, 2014 faculty meeting. A brief discussion was held at that meeting and an Ad Hoc Committee on reviewing our RPT and Annual Review Guidelines reported they felt their work would help inform the discussion and we might want to wait until they had completed their task. I sent a couple of emails in January

and February asking for input on how faculty wanted to proceed. Since that communication did not yield specific suggestions, I met with my Leadership Team, including all department chairs and our Associate Dean, and we agreed on the following process, which was explained to faculty in an email on March 4, 2015. The process was as follows:

1. Chairs took the discussion to their departmental meetings to gather input faculty with a request from the Dean to be fully engaged in these discussions.
2. The Ad Hoc RPT committee was asked to weigh in based on their recent investigation of RPT and Annual Review criteria used to evaluate performance at peer and aspirant institutions.
3. The CNHS Research Committee was invited to provide input based on their experience with and knowledge of the expectations for scholarly productivity.

It was explained to faculty that we were looking for 5 to 6 key metrics that are easily measured and appropriate for evaluating the scholarly productivity and impact of CNHS. Once suggestions were received from each department, the AD Hoc Committee on RPTs and the Research Committee, the proposed metrics were collated and evaluated for redundancies. The unique set of metrics, totaling 18, was then presented to and voted on by the entire faculty via an email survey. Faculty were asked to vote yes or no for each metric. We selected the top 5 metrics where there was a majority agreement. These 5 metrics clearly separated themselves from the total 18 metrics that were considered.

As Dean, I provided the context for consideration of the metrics and what expectations I had for our faculty and our college. I actively participated with the faculty in rating those metrics I have found most meaningful in my role as Dean when comparing our performance to our comparator institutions. I fully endorse the metrics selected, as they are the key benchmarks I have been using to guide decision making around program investment and/or needed changes.

Explanation of how the metrics will be used to inform decision-making and achievement of the CNHS strategic objectives.

The first four metrics are already built into our annual review process for faculty through our RPT and annual review guidelines. These metrics also support our strategic priority for facilitating translational research, and specifically address the fourth goal of our strategic plan: ***Focus and strengthen research and scholarship while developing outstanding graduate programs that support the creation and sharing of knowledge*** (President's Action Plan II; Provost's Goals 4 & 6). The fifth metric, as I mentioned above, is built into our requirements for accreditation through required annual progress reports and self studies that accompany accreditation reviews every 5 to 10 years, depending on the individual program's cycle. This metric also supports our strategic priority for preparing competent, ethical scientists-practitioners, and specifically addresses the third goal of our strategic plan: ***Increase the quality and stature of academic programs and align undergraduate and graduate education with institutional priorities to focus and excel*** (President's Action Plan II & III; Provost's Goals 1, 2, & 8). We will use these metrics to ensure programs have the resources they need to achieve their required accreditation outcomes and to guide our thinking about where program investments should be made that are most likely to yield the impact we expect.