**Annual Review Methodology and Background**

**2019-2020**

Introduction

We want to ensure that our annual review meetings are useful and productive. Our goal is to identify aspects of your work that may require attention, if any, and to focus on ways that we can help you advance your career, while simultaneously meeting the needs of the Rubenstein School. Following guidelines in previous years, we will also evaluate performance in each area as follows:

* + good – generally meeting expectations, but improvement identified in one or more area
	+ very good – meeting or exceeding expectations in all areas
	+ highly meritorious – highest performers across the School in all areas

A *part* of our meeting will necessarily focus on quantitative performance metrics. We stress that only a part of our discussion will focus on these quantitative metrics; we will certainly include qualitative considerations too. We expect that there will likely be questions about the quantitative performance metrics that we are using. We want to minimize time taken to explain these metrics during our meeting together, so that we can maximize our discussion about how we can help you excel. Therefore, we thought it would be useful to describe these quantitative metrics here. We invite comments and questions about this document outside of our meeting, and will share with everyone important clarifications or modifications. Note that this document does not constitute RSENR policy per se; rather our interpretation of those policies.

Following the review template that we have asked you to submit, we will discuss your performance in five areas (teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and DEI involvement) using a mix of quantitative and qualitative metrics. In the following sections we describe the quantitative performance metrics we will use.

Teaching

Teaching contributions will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

* Student evaluation scores and feedback. Specifically, we will focus on the following questions from the standard RSENR evaluation survey:
	+ 17. I would recommend this course to other students.
	+ 21. I would rate the instructor highly compared to others.
	+ 22. I would rate the course highly compared to others.
* Total SCH taught vs SCH expected based on FTE workload based on current workload guidelines (2 year running average, with accommodations for sabbatical and other approved leave)
* Participation in “service” courses (e.g. RSENR core, required Graduate or Honors College courses)
* Use of high impact pedagogies for engaged learning
* Number of course preps and new courses developed (creative investment)

Advising

Advising is primarily evaluated based on advising load (number of undergraduates, Honors College theses, graduate students and Post Docs). However, recognizing the importance of the quality of advising, availability to students and mentoring in student success and retention we are looking for additional ways to assess advising practices across the school. Some metrics to be considered in an exploratory mode this year include:

* Feedback from advisee student surveys
* Activity metrics from EAB Navigate
* Documented calls to student services to fill gaps.

Scholarship

We will use 6 performance metrics 5 of which we will derive from Academic Analytics (AA) and one that we derive from UVM/SPA data. AA is a commercial enterprise that identifies information (e.g., publications, grants, citations, honors, etc.) about individual scholars across the nation and then aggregates that information at different levels (e.g., departments, colleges, institutions, disciplines). They then provide tools to explore this database in a variety of ways that can help us to identify strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities a levels from the individual to the entire institution. They operate as a subscription service and UVM has a subscription. In exploring this service, we think there are some things that are useful (which we will stress) and some things that are not. Our intention is to utilize the useful aspects of this service as a point of depart for discussion and not as the exclusive measure of your scholarly contributions.

With one exception, the metrics we will use are all percentiles and will be defined below. The data used to derive the AA metrics can be filtered and weighted in a variety of ways. The base data we will use generally covers the period from 2014 or 2015 to 2018, so there is a lag in the database. (The “Books” metric begins in 2009.) We have filtered this data so that it includes: land grant, public, R2, universities across the nation. So, we exclude, for example, private and R1 universities. Furthermore, the metrics are restricted to programs in environmental sciences and natural resources. This resulted in a database of 110 institutions, 118 departments, and 2215 faculty. The metrics we have chosen to use are consistent with the metrics identified by the RSENR faculty as the ones most relevant to us. Each metric is expressed as a percentile; i.e., your standing among the 2215 faculty in the filtered AA database (with exceptions noted below). The metrics we have chosen to use are:

* Articles – peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2015-2018
* Books - published between 2009-2018
* Citations - between 2014-2018
* Conference Proceedings - between 2015-2018
* Grants – based on FY13 to FY20 data from UVM/SPA and no AA data. This is the only metric where the percentile ranking is based only on RSENR faculty. There is a Grants metric based on the AA database that includes grants from 2015-2018, that figures in to the SRI Z-score described below.
* SRI Z-Score – “Scholarly Research Index”, based on AA database. The SRI is a weighted index of all of the metrics in the AA database. This is the only metric that is not expressed as a percentile. Rather, it is expressed as a Z-score which you can view as the standard deviation above or below the mean SRI for all faculty in the AA database. A negative Z-score indicates that you fall below the average of faculty in the database and positive Z-Score indicates that you fall above the average. The metrics that make up the SRI Z-score can be weighted as you choose. For the purposes of this analysis, we have chosen the following weights:
	+ 20% - Articles
	+ 10% - Honors
	+ 20% - Books
	+ 25% - Citations
	+ 5% - Conference Proceedings
	+ 20% - Grants (AA not SPA)

Service

The indicators we will use for this aspect of your service will be largely qualitative. We will be looking at the mix of service activities in which you are involved. Because of our small size and many internal committee obligations, we certainly want to see some involvement in our own RSENR committees. But service to UVM, state, regional, national, and international organizations is clearly important as well. Prior to the next, 2020-21 annual review this spring (2021), we propose to provide a quantitative component to this Service element. We will fully vet with the faculty any metric we propose before we use it.

DEI Involvement

For the moment, this element of the annual review will be entirely qualitative. We have asked the UVM IDEA committee to propose a rubric or framework that can guide us toward deeper and more meaningful involvement in activities that will move us in quantifiable ways toward a world that is just and equitable. Your input will be essential as we develop this rubric.