



TO: UVM Deans

FROM: David V. Rosowsky, Provost 

DATE: October 14, 2015

SUBJECT: Scholarly Productivity and Impact Metrics, Common Elements Across Units

## BACKGROUND

As promised at the outset of the university-wide engagement exercise to define scholarly productivity and impact metrics at the department level, I indicated that I would review the final metrics (as submitted and subsequently approved at the levels of the dean and the provost) and look for possible commonalities.

This is a high-level summary only. Complete details may be found in the individual submissions by unit. These are available [online](#) and are maintained by the respective deans. A complete discussion of the goals of this university-wide engagement, the process used to develop the metrics, and clear statements about how the metrics could and should be used by the colleges and schools also can be found on the [webpage](#) created for this purpose.

In order to complete this high-level evaluation to identify commonly cited metrics, and in recognition of the disparate cultures within and across departments within the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), an “academic unit” is defined herein to be: (1) each academic college or school exclusive of CAS, (2) each academic department within CAS, and (3) Libraries and Extension. This results in a total of 31 distinct academic units that reported metrics. This is consistent with how the deans chose to submit their metrics (i.e., CAS reported metrics by department, while all other deans presented aggregate metrics that applied to all units within their college or school).

## COMMON METRICS ACROSS REPORTING UNITS

1. Papers published in peer-reviewed journals: 31 of 31 units (100%)
2. Books or book chapters (includes volumes): 31 of 31 units (100%)
3. Creative works, compositions, other scholarly or artistic works published, reviews: 13 of 31 units (42%)
4. Externally funded grants: 28 of 31 units (90%)

5. Awards, prizes, fellowships, national academy memberships: 26 of 31 units (84%)
6. Presentations at conferences/meetings/symposia: 26 of 31 units (84%)
7. Invited or juried exhibitions, performances, public commissions, work in major collections: 10 of 31 units (32%)

## CLOSING THOUGHTS

As promised at the outset of the university-wide engagement exercise to define scholarly productivity and impact metrics at the unit level, I indicated that I would review the final metrics and look for possible commonalities. I made clear from the beginning that my objective in making this offer was *to inform* the academic community – its leadership and its members – of any metrics that showed up in common across a majority of reporting units.

I posited at the outset, and continue to believe, that recognizing these common scholarship metrics can help *to contextualize shared goals* for scholarly productivity and impact, and *inform future discussions* about the importance of our scholarly endeavors – individually, by academic department, and collectively as a great university.

cc: Jim Vigoreaux, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs  
Brian Reed, Associate Provost for Teaching and Learning  
Richard Galbraith, Vice President for Research  
Lisa Aultman-Hall, Faculty Senate President  
Jan Carney, Faculty Senate Vice President  
Chris Burns, Faculty Senate RSCA Committee Chair