

**NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC
AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES (NIJSES)**

Volume 4 Issue 1

<https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJSES/2023/10.5.1000>

Page | 36

**Redefining Academic Performance Metrics:
Evaluating the Excellence of Researchers,
Academics, and Scholars**

¹Ugwu Okechukwu Paul-Chima, ¹Ugwu Jovita Nnenna, ¹Alum Esther Ugo, ¹Obeagu Emmanuel. I., ¹Val Hyginus Udoka Eze, ²Asiati Mbabazi, ¹Ugwu Chinyere N., ¹Okon Micheal. B., ¹Ogenyi Fabian Chukwudi, ²Chidinma Esther Eze, ¹Obeagu Getrude Uzoma and ¹Aleke Jude U.

¹Department of Publication and Extension, Kampala International University Uganda

²Faculty of Education Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

The Redefining Academic Performance Metrics: Evaluating the Excellence of Researchers, Academics, and Scholars explores the evolving landscape of academia, focusing on the shift from traditional metrics like publication and citation counts to a more inclusive, open, and equitable approach. The study acknowledges the limitations of traditional metrics and celebrates pioneers in shaping the future of scholarly endeavors, highlighting the importance of inclusivity, openness, and equitable evaluations in assessing academic excellence.

Keywords: Academic Performance Metrics, Scholarly Achievement, Evaluation Criteria and Publication Metrics

INTRODUCTION

In the ever-evolving landscape of academia, the traditional yardsticks for measuring scholarly prowess have undergone a profound transformation [1-3]. Redefining Academic Performance Metrics: Evaluating the Excellence of Researchers, Academics, and Scholars delves into this paradigm shift, exploring the dynamic methods and criteria reshaping how people gauge and celebrate scholarly achievement [1-3]. From pioneering research methodologies to holistic approaches in evaluating intellectual contributions, this insightful exploration navigates the terrain where innovation, impact, and excellence converge in defining the new benchmarks for academic success [4-5]. In the

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

pulsating heartbeat of academia, where knowledge creation and dissemination thrive, the conventional means of evaluating scholarly prowess have encountered a stirring revolution [6-8]. Redefining Academic Performance Metrics: Evaluating the Excellence of Researchers, Academics, and Scholars is an illuminating expedition into this transformative landscape, unearthing the intricate web of factors reshaping the fundamental measures of academic accomplishment [9-10]. Amidst this dynamic evolution, traditional metrics like publication counts and citation indices, while still pivotal, have begun to yield space to a richer tapestry of evaluation. This paradigm shift illuminates the multidimensionality of scholarly contributions, embracing a spectrum of novel criteria encompassing societal impact, interdisciplinary collaboration, open science practices, and engagement with diverse communities [11-12]. By probing into this fascinating metamorphosis, this exploration navigates the interplay between innovation, significance, and the broader societal implications of scholarly pursuits [13]. It peels back the layers to reveal the nuanced ways in which researchers, academics, and scholars are redefining excellence, transcending the confines of quantitative assessments to embrace qualitative dimensions that encapsulate the true essence of academic brilliance. Through the lens of this exploration, we embark on a journey that celebrates the pioneers shaping the future of academia, while unraveling the intricate threads that interlace their contributions with the fabric of progress. It illuminates the emergent strategies and methodologies steering the course towards a more holistic, equitable, and inclusive evaluation of scholarly achievement, thereby reshaping the very foundations upon which academic excellence is measured [13]. This compelling investigation invites scholars, educators, and enthusiasts alike to traverse the evolving landscape of academic performance metrics, where innovation harmonizes with impact, and the legacy of scholarly brilliance is redefined in a tapestry woven from diverse threads of intellectual prowess.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE METRICS

Academic performance metrics are quantitative and qualitative measures used to assess the scholarly achievements, contributions, and impact of researchers, academics, and scholars. These metrics aim to evaluate various facets of academic work, including research output, teaching effectiveness, societal impact, and professional contributions. Common academic performance metrics include:

Publication Counts: The number of articles, books, or other scholarly works published by an individual within a specific field or discipline [4].

Citation Counts: The frequency with which a scholar's work is referenced by other researchers, indicating its influence and significance within the academic community [5].

h-index and Variants: Metrics like the h-index, g-index, or m-index provide a combined measure of productivity and impact, considering both the number of publications and their respective citation counts [6].

Journal Impact Factor: Reflects the average number of citations received by articles published in a particular journal, often used to gauge the prestige and reach of where a researcher publishes [7].

Altmetrics: Measures the broader impact of research beyond citations, encompassing social media mentions, downloads, media coverage, and other non-traditional indicators [8].

Teaching Evaluations: Feedback from students, peer evaluations, and teaching awards that assess a scholar's effectiveness in the classroom [9].

Grants and Funding: The ability of a researcher to secure grants, scholarships, and external funding for their projects often serves as an indicator of their research quality and potential [10].

Societal Impact: Assessments of how research contributes to solving real-world problems, policy influence, or advancements in various industries or communities [11].

Collaborations and Networks: Measures the extent and quality of collaborations with other researchers, institutions, or interdisciplinary partnerships [12].

Professional Contributions: Recognition within professional organizations, editorial roles, keynote presentations, and contributions to the academic community beyond research and teaching [12].

Citation per paper: The citation count per paper is calculated by dividing the total number of citations received by a researcher's publications by the total number of papers published [7].

Authorship Position: Being the first or last author on a paper often signifies significant contributions in specific fields, such as being the lead researcher or supervisor [13].

As academia evolves, there's a growing acknowledgment of the limitations of traditional metrics and a shift toward embracing a more holistic approach that considers diverse forms of impact, openness, diversity, and equity in evaluating academic performance.

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Publication Counts

Publication counts are a crucial metric in evaluating academic performance, providing a quantitative measure of a researcher's productivity and output within their field. They encompass various forms of scholarly contributions, such as journal articles, books, book chapters, conference papers, and patents. The significance of publication counts lies in their role in productivity, visibility, career advancement, and contributions to knowledge. Publication counts vary across different fields, with peer-reviewed journal articles being the gold standard [4]. However, there is a debate about the balance between quality and quantity, with some influential papers outweighing others. Co-authorship and collaboration may dilute the significance of an individual's contribution, and the emphasis on publication counts can lead to ethical concerns. The evolving role of publication counts in academia includes a shift towards quality metrics like citation counts, impact factors, and altmetrics, which aim to assess the influence and broader impact of scholarly work. The landscape of publication counts is diversifying with the rise of open access publishing and alternative dissemination methods. Interdisciplinary research often challenges the traditional notion of publication counts, as scholars contribute to diverse fields [4]. Academics is also redefining what constitutes impactful contributions, aiming for a more holistic evaluation that considers not just quantity or citations but also societal impact, open science practices, and collaboration. Publication counts are just one aspect of a researcher's profile, and the evolving landscape of academia demands a more nuanced approach to evaluating scholarly impact.

Citation Counts

Citation counts are a crucial metric in academia, indicating the impact and influence of scholarly work within a specific field or discipline. They indicate how often a researcher's work has been referenced, cited, or acknowledged by other researchers in their own publications. Citations serve as an indicator of influence, valuing research quality and building research networks. They also contribute to recognition and prestige, which can lead to career advancement, funding opportunities, and invitations to speak at conferences or events [5]. However, citation practices vary across different disciplines and subfields. Some fields have higher citation rates due to the nature of the research, while others may have lower frequencies. Excessive self-citation for the purpose of artificially boosting citation metrics raises ethical concerns. Citation lag may take time to accrue, especially in fields with longer publication cycles. A small percentage of papers receive a disproportionately high number of citations, while the majority may have fewer or no citations, leading to skewed distributions [6]. The balance between quantity and quality of citations is debated, with a few highly impactful citations carrying more weight than numerous low-impact citations. Alternative metrics, such as social media mentions, downloads, and media coverage, provide a more comprehensive view of influence. Open science and access aim to increase accessibility to research, potentially impacting citation rates. Interdisciplinary research may face challenges in citation counts, as it may take time for work across different fields to gain recognition and citations in multiple disciplines.

h-index and Variants

The h-index, a metric in academia, measures the productivity and impact of a researcher's work. Proposed by physicist Jorge Hirsch in 2005, it aims to balance both productivity and citation impact. Variants and adaptations include the g-index, introduced by Leo Egghe in 2006, which gives more weight to highly cited articles, the m-index, introduced by Egghe, which incorporates the average number of citations per article in a researcher's profile, and the i10-index, used by Google Scholar [5]. However, the h-index has its limitations, such as field normalization, career stage and duration, self-citations, and limitations in capturing the nuances of a researcher's impact. Fields with higher citation rates may lead to higher h-index scores, while early-career researchers might have lower h-index values. Self-citations can potentially inflate h-index scores, and the index might not capture the importance of highly influential papers or consider less-significant ones [5, 6]. The h-index is commonly used in academic evaluations, promotions, and funding decisions, but its role as a sole metric is increasingly questioned due to its limitations. Institutions and evaluators often consider the h-index alongside other quantitative and qualitative measures for a more comprehensive evaluation of academic impact. Critics are exploring alternative metrics and assessment frameworks that incorporate a broader spectrum of impact indicators, including societal engagement, open science practices, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Despite these limitations, the h-index and its variants remain influential tools for assessing a researcher's impact and productivity. As academia evolves, there is an ongoing pursuit of more nuanced and inclusive evaluation methods that go beyond mere citation counts to capture the multidimensional nature of academic impact and excellence.

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Journal Impact Factor (JIF)

The Journal Impact Factor (JIF) is a crucial metric in academic performance, affecting researchers, institutions, and the scholarly publishing landscape. Its significance is evident in its impact on research evaluation, funding, career progression, and scholarly publishing. Researchers often target high-impact journals to enhance their visibility and perceived impact, leading to tenure decisions, promotions, and funding opportunities. Institutions use JIF as a key metric for evaluating research productivity and impact, which affects resource allocation, funding decisions, and departmental rankings. Institutions with a higher number of publications in top-tier journals aim to improve their rankings and reputation, attracting better faculty and students [7, 8]. Funding agencies often consider JIF when allocating grants, leading to increased competition for researchers. Journal selection is also influenced by JIF, influencing the direction of scholarly discourse. The JIF can impact subscription fees, advertising revenues, and the financial viability of journals, contributing to the dominance of high-impact journals in the publishing market. However, a focus on high impact factors might lead to publication bias, where groundbreaking or niche research that doesn't fit into the 'high-impact' criteria may struggle to get published. Critics and limitations of the JIF include overemphasis on metrics, discipline disparities, and ethical concerns. Institutions and evaluators are exploring more comprehensive evaluation methods that include a range of impact indicators beyond just the JIF [8]. Alternative metrics, such as social media mentions, downloads, and online engagement, are also emerging. Open access and new publishing models challenge the dominance of traditional journals and encourage a more inclusive evaluation of research impact.

Altmetrics

Altmetrics, or alternative metrics, are non-traditional indicators used to measure the impact and reach of scholarly work beyond traditional citation counts. These metrics capture various forms of engagement, attention, and influence that academic outputs receive in digital environments. They have been shaping academic performance evaluation, scholarly communication, and the perception of impact in several ways [7-9]. Altmetrics offer a more holistic view of research impact by considering diverse forms of engagement, such as social media mentions, downloads, views, saves, discussions, and media coverage. They also acknowledge the broader societal impact of research by considering its visibility and engagement with non-academic audiences. Altmetrics can provide early signals of a work's impact, sometimes even before traditional citations accrue, allowing researchers to gauge the initial reception of their work. Influence on scholarly communication includes promoting open science, enhancing discoverability, and encouraging interaction and collaboration among researchers. They challenge the dominance of traditional citation-based metrics in evaluating academic performance, and are increasingly considered in hiring, tenure decisions, and funding allocations [7-9]. However, altmetrics face challenges such as method reliability, discipline-specific differences, and ethical considerations. Future directions include integrating altmetrics with traditional metrics, standardizing and enhancing transparency in calculation methodologies, and increasing education and awareness about the use and interpretation of altmetrics. In conclusion, altmetrics have emerged as valuable complements to traditional metrics, offering a more diverse and nuanced understanding of scholarly impact. As academia continues to evolve, altmetrics are likely to play an increasingly integral role in shaping how academic performance is evaluated and perceived.

Teaching evaluations

Teaching evaluations are crucial in academic institutions for assessing teaching quality and influencing scholarly evaluation. They can impact a scholar's tenure and promotion decisions, leading to teaching awards and recognition. Positive evaluations can also influence a scholar's overall reputation, student engagement, and career development. Some funding agencies consider teaching evaluations when awarding grants, especially those focused on educational research or pedagogical innovation. However, teaching evaluations face challenges such as biases and subjectivity, which can affect the fairness and accuracy of assessments [1-3]. Additionally, they may not fully capture the long-term impact of a scholar's teaching on student learning outcomes or broader educational goals. In recent years, institutions are moving towards a more holistic evaluation model, considering not only teaching evaluations but also research contributions, service to the institution, and broader societal impact. Emphasis on teaching evaluations encourages scholars to explore innovative teaching methods and incorporate new technologies, fostering a culture of continuous improvement [1-3]. Future directions include improving assessment methods, ensuring diversity and inclusion, and developing more comprehensive assessment tools. Institutions are striving for a balanced approach that considers a scholar's contributions across teaching, research, and service, acknowledging the multidimensional nature of academic performance.

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Grants and funding

Grants and funding are crucial in shaping a scholar's academic performance and career trajectory. They provide research opportunities, enable publication and dissemination of research findings, and provide access to specialized equipment, laboratories, datasets, and technical support. Grants also enhance a scholar's case for tenure and promotion, demonstrating their ability to attract external support and conduct impactful research. Successful grant acquisition can enhance a scholar's reputation, credibility, and visibility within their field, potentially leading to invitations for collaborations, conferences, and leadership roles. Institutions benefit from scholars securing external funding, fostering a culture of research excellence [10]. Successful research projects funded by grants contribute to advancing knowledge in a particular field, influencing its trajectory and shaping future research directions. Challenges include the competitive nature of grant acquisition, limited funding availability, and evolving perspectives on interdisciplinary collaboration and diversity and inclusion. Future directions include increasing accessibility to funding opportunities for researchers at various career stages, particularly supporting early-career scholars, and considering the societal impact of research. Grants and funding are integral to a scholar's career and impact within academia, but securing funding remains a competitive and multifaceted aspect of scholarly performance [11].

Societal Impact

Research's impact on real-world problems, policy, and industry advancements is a critical aspect of understanding its broader impact. It addresses pressing societal issues like healthcare, environmental sustainability, poverty, and technology, improving quality of life through new treatments, technologies, or policies. Collaboration with communities, stakeholders, or industry partners ensures relevance and benefits to the targeted population [1-3]. Research that informs policy decisions can significantly influence social, economic, or environmental issues. Legislative impact is demonstrated by studies leading to changes in laws, regulations, or governmental practices. Government and NGO partnerships facilitate the translation of research findings into policy action. Industry advancements are driven by innovations and technological breakthroughs, driving economic growth and competitiveness. Partnerships between researchers and industry players can translate academic research into commercial applications, contributing to economic development. Research that inspires entrepreneurship and startups contributes to job creation, economic innovation, and industry disruption. Evaluation and measurement of research's broader societal impact include metrics beyond academia, such as media coverage, policy mentions, patent applications, and citations in non-academic contexts. Qualitative assessments, including case studies and impact narratives, help illustrate how research has influenced real-world outcomes and contributed to positive changes [1-3]. Long-term sustainability involves tracking the relevance and effectiveness of research in addressing ongoing societal challenges. Future directions include promoting interdisciplinary research, enhancing knowledge transfer, and encouraging policy advocacy. Emphasizing the practical applications and societal relevance of research can maximize its potential for positive change beyond academic boundaries.

Collaborations and networks

Collaborations and networks significantly influence researchers' evaluation, impacting their academic performance, visibility, and impact within the scholarly community. They enhance research productivity, foster diverse expertise, and have higher citation rates. Collaborations also increase a researcher's visibility, contributing to a broader professional network and increasing their recognition. They also attract larger grants and funding opportunities due to the perceived strength of interdisciplinary or multi-institutional research initiatives [6-8]. Evaluation metrics and assessments acknowledge collaborative efforts, considering co-authored publications, interdisciplinary research, and the diversity of collaborators. Network analysis evaluates the quality, diversity, and impact of a researcher's collaborations, including the prominence of their co-authors or partners. Challenges include evaluating individual contributions and addressing unequal collaborative dynamics. Future directions include recognizing team science and developing sophisticated tools and metrics to assess the complexity, impact, and dynamics of research collaborations and networks. Shifting towards evaluation frameworks that value interdisciplinary collaborations and contributions is also essential [9]. Collaborations and networks profoundly influence researchers' evaluation, impacting their research productivity, visibility, career progression, and contributions to the academic community. Recognizing and appropriately assessing collaborative efforts becomes increasingly crucial in evaluating a researcher's impact and contributions.

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Professional Contributions

Professional contributions significantly influence a researcher's rating within their field. These contributions include research publications, grant acquisition, collaborations and networking, education and mentoring, innovation and intellectual property, public engagement and outreach, leadership and service, ethical and responsible conduct, and recognition and awards. Quality and quantity of research output, such as papers, articles, and books, indicate the depth and breadth of a researcher's work [10]. Citation metrics showcase the influence and relevance of a researcher's work within their field. Research funding, such as grants, reflects a researcher's ability to design compelling proposals and execute impactful projects. Collaborations and networking demonstrate the researcher's ability to work within a team and contribute to interdisciplinary advancements. Innovation and intellectual property development, such as patents or innovative technologies, can significantly contribute to a researcher's rating. Public engagement and outreach through media, public talks, or outreach programs can enhance a researcher's visibility and impact beyond academia. Leadership and service in academic associations, editorial boards, or review panels showcase a researcher's commitment to advancing the field and contributing to its governance [11]. Ethical and responsible conduct, including proper attribution, responsible conduct, and transparency, is essential for maintaining credibility and a positive reputation. Recognition and awards, such as fellowships or honors from esteemed institutions or professional societies, acknowledge a researcher's outstanding contributions and impact in their field. A comprehensive evaluation of a researcher's professional contributions across various domains serves as a comprehensive means to assess their impact, reputation, and standing within the academic and scientific community.

Citations per paper (CPP)

Citations per paper (CPP) is a crucial metric used to assess the impact and reputation of researchers within their respective fields [5-6]. It measures the average number of times a researcher's publications are cited by other scholarly works, serving as a benchmark for assessing the caliber of a researcher's work. A higher CPP signifies impact, as it generally indicates that a researcher's work is influential and widely recognized within their field. Higher CPP is often associated with high-quality research, as peers cite a paper, suggesting that the content is considered relevant, valuable, and reliable within the academic community. This enhances academic visibility and recognition, leading to greater recognition, awards, and invitations to speak or collaborate. Creative advancement can be significantly influenced by a high CPP, influencing decisions related to promotions, tenure, and securing research grants or funding. Researchers with a consistent high CPP are sought after for collaborations and can open doors for interdisciplinary collaborations [5-6]. Publication venue and journal choice can also influence a researcher's reputation. Researchers might prioritize publishing in journals with a higher impact factor to increase the likelihood of accruing more citations. Establishing expertise through a consistent record of high CPP across various publications can establish a researcher as an expert in a particular niche or subfield, contributing to their reputation as a thought leader or authority in that area. Long-term impact signifies the enduring relevance and impact of a researcher's work. However, challenges and considerations include field and discipline variations, overemphasis on metrics, and considering the broader context of a researcher's contributions to the field.

Authorship position

The authorship position on a scholarly publication is a crucial factor in evaluating a scholar's contributions and impact within their field. It signifies the level of involvement, contribution, and responsibility of a researcher in a particular study or publication. The sequence of authors often carries substantial weight in assessing a scholar's reputation and contributions [6-7]. First authorship is considered the primary contributor to the research, demonstrating leadership, expertise, and significant intellectual contribution. Last authorship typically belongs to the senior researcher or principal investigator, indicating oversight, guidance, and substantial contribution in terms of funding, supervision, or providing overall direction for the research. Middle authorship consists of various contributions, such as data collection, analysis, writing sections of the paper, or providing specific expertise or resources. Middle authors can signify collaboration and multidisciplinary input, showcasing the researcher's ability to work effectively within a team. The authorship position impacts a scholar's rating by recognizing their primary contribution, guidance and oversight, assessment of leadership and expertise, career advancement and recognition, and challenges and considerations [1-3]. Authorship practices can vary across disciplines, with some prioritizing first authorship while others prioritize senior authorship or view equal contribution among authors differently. Ethical considerations include ensuring fair and appropriate credit allocation among authors to maintain the integrity of authorship positions. In summary, authorship position serves as a crucial aspect in evaluating a scholar's

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

contributions, leadership, and expertise within their field. However, it is essential to consider authorship within the broader context of a researcher's overall contributions and impact within their field.

CONCLUSION

The study emphasizes the need for a reevaluation of scholarly excellence in academia, focusing on a balance between quantitative and qualitative metrics. Traditional metrics are essential but now part of a broader evaluation framework. The future of academic performance metrics should promote diverse contributions, societal relevance, interdisciplinary collaborations, and ethical practices. A holistic, inclusive, and reflective evaluation of academic brilliance is crucial for a future where innovation and societal impact converge to define scholarly eminence.

REFERENCES

1. Ugwu, C. N., Eze, V. H. U., Ugwu, J. N., Ogenyi, F. C., & Ugwu, O. P. (2023). Ethical Publication Issues in the Collection and Analysis of Research Data. *NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES*, 3(2), 132–140.
2. Eze, V. H. U., Eze, C. E., Mbabazi, A., Ugwu, C. N., Ugwu, P. O., Ogenyi, C. F., Ugwu, J. N., Alum, E. U., & Obeagu, E. I. (2023). Qualities and Characteristics of a Good Scientific Research Writing ; Step-by-Step Approaches. *IAA Journal of Applied Sciences*, 9(2), 71–76.
3. Ugwu, C. N., & Eze, V. H. U. (2023). Qualitative Research. *IDOSR of Computer and Applied Science*, 8(1), 20–35.
4. Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(46), 16569–16572.
5. Egghe, L. (2006). Theory and practice of the g-index. *Scientometrics*, 69(1), 131–152.
6. Priem, J. and Hemminger, B.M. (2010) Stoichiometrics: Towards New Metrics of Scholarly Impact on the Social Web. *First Monday*, 15.
<https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v15i7.2874>
7. Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2006). Concentration of the most-cited papers in the scientific literature: Analysis of journal ecosystems. *PLoS ONE*, 1(1), e5.
8. Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520(7548), 429–431.
9. Bornmann, L., & Mutz, R. (2015). Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric analysis based on the number of publications and cited references. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(11), 2215–2222.
10. Ross, J. S., Gross, C. P., Desai, M. M., Hong, Y., Grant, A. O., Daniels, S. R., & Hachinski, V. C. (2006). Effect of blinded peer review on abstract acceptance. *JAMA*, 295(14), 1675–1680.
11. Roemer, R. C., & Borchardt, R. (2015). From bibliometrics to altmetrics: A changing scholarly landscape. *College & Research Libraries News*, 76(2), 77–80.
12. Cronin, B. (2014). *The Scholar's Courtesy: A Survey of Goodwill Practices in Scholarly Communication*. ASIST Monograph Series.
13. Tenopir, C., King, D. W., & Bush, A. (2004). Medical faculty's use of print and electronic journals: Changes over time and in comparison with scientists. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 92(2), 233–241.

CITE AS: Ugwu Okechukwu Paul-Chima, Ugwu Jovita Nnenna, Alum Esther Ugo, Obeagu Emmanuel. I., Val Hyginus Udoka Eze, Asiati Mbabazi, Ugwu Chinyere N., Okon Micheal. B., Ogenyi Fabian Chukwudi, Chidinma Esther Eze, Obeagu Getrude Uzoma and Aleke Jude U. (2023). Redefining Academic Performance Metrics: Evaluating the Excellence of Researchers, Academics, and Scholars. *NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES (NIJSES)* 4(1)36-42. <https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJSES/2023/10.5.1000>

Ugwu *et al.*, 2023

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited