

College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE) Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) Metric

The RSCA metric for the College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE) measures the research, scholarship and creative activity of faculty members from the two academic schools and departments comprising the college: School of Information, and Department of Data Analytics.

The development of the CPGE RSCA Metric started with a discussion among the faculty members at the School of Information (iSchool). iSchool faculty were asked to review two existing RSCA Metrics from the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), and the College of Engineering (CoE), on which we hope to base the CPGE RSCA Metric. Then, at the February iSchool faculty retreat, we had an in-depth discussion about the purpose of the RSCA Metric, about how to build the CPGE RSCA Metric based on the ones from CHHS and CoE.

As a result of the discussion, we decided to model the CPGE RSCA Metric after the CHHS Metric, with certain elements added from the CoE Metric. The rationale is as follows - Library and Information Science (LIS) is already a diverse field with many sub-disciplines, and together with Data Analytics, it presents a diverse picture that encompasses the RSCA activities in CPGE. Therefore, it is necessary to have a RSCA Metric that is inclusive enough to accommodate the diversity in CPGE's RSCA landscape. The CHHS Metric is more inclusive given the variety of programs in that college. As noted in their Metric statement, "as RSCA products vary significantly between disciplines and even sub-disciplines [in CHHS], ...our aim was to create an instrument that was nuanced enough to capture and quantify the scholarly accomplishments of faculty members from a range of disciplines, yet simple enough to be effectively implemented." On the other hand, the CoE Metric is quite engineering specific, and many of the elements do not apply in LIS. Therefore, we consider the CHHS Metric is a more appropriate one to follow. We then met with the Chair of Data Analytics for feedback to finalize the draft.

Still we recognize that measuring RSCA productivity in a meaningful way is complex and controversial, and it is unlikely for any metric to be perfect. Nonetheless, in order to understand the amount and type of scholarship produced by CPGE faculty, a metric needs to be in place.

Similar to CHHS, the following assumptions were considered in the CPGE RSCA Metric development process: 1) the metric is intended to measure RSCA only, not service or teaching; 2) the metric is not part of the RTP process or intended to be used to evaluate faculty; 3) the metric measures outcomes, not processes. The current version of the CPGE RSCA metric provides an objective means for understanding the amount, type, and variety of College faculty members' RSCA productivity. We consider the metric to be a living document, and expect that it will be revised regularly as we learn from our experience.

Last update: 2/19/2020

	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.25
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

Journal articles	First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed ⁵ journal article ⁶	Co-author, peer-reviewed ⁵ journal article ⁶	First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed ⁵ journal short report ⁷	Co-author, peer-reviewed ⁵ journal short report ⁷	
Grant proposals	PI, external grant proposal awarded ¹	Co-PI, external grant proposal awarded ¹		PI, external grant proposal submitted ² PI, internal grant proposal awarded ³	Co-PI, external grant proposal submitted ²
Books and book chapters	First ⁴ or solo author, scholarly book ¹⁰	Co-author, scholarly book ¹⁰ First ⁴ or solo editor, scholarly book ¹⁰	First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, scholarly book chapter ¹¹ Co-editor, scholarly book ¹⁰	Co-author, scholarly book chapter ¹¹	
Peer-reviewed conference papers, presentations and posters		First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed ⁵ conference proceedings paper ^{8,15}	First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed ⁵ conference presentation ⁹ Co-author, peer-reviewed ⁵ published conference proceedings paper ⁸	Co-author, peer-reviewed ⁵ conference presentation ⁹ Panelist, discussant, colloquium participant, or invited speaker, peer-reviewed ⁵ conference	First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed ⁵ conference poster presentation ⁹
Other scholarly products (non-peer reviewed)				First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, report ¹² Book review ¹³ First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, non-peer-reviewed conference presentation ⁹	Panelist, discussant, colloquium participant, or invited speaker, non-peer-reviewed conference ⁹ First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, invited presentation to professional association or collaborating community partner ¹⁴ Co-author, report ¹² First ⁴ , solo or corresponding author, short report ⁷

Notes

1. Points for external grant proposals awarded are granted for the year(s) the project receives funding. A PI or Co-PI of a 2-year grant award receives points in each of the years the project is funded.
2. Points for external grant proposals submitted are granted in the year the proposal is submitted. Letters of Intent do not count as external proposals.
3. In cases where grants are submitted with a formal multiple PI arrangement, both PIs are considered PIs.
4. If first authorship is incidental - that is, related to an alphabetical ordering of equally contributing authors rather than an ordering by contribution - use "co-author" category. If the journal article/conference paper/poster is co-authored by a faculty member's SJSU students, even if the faculty member isn't the first author, he or she will be awarded the same points as a first/solo/corresponding author.
5. A peer-review process means that submissions are reviewed prior to acceptance by an editorial committee or peer reviewers with expertise in the field, and acceptance is competitive (acceptance rate is not 100%).
6. To receive points, a journal article must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; b) be considered a full-length article for the discipline (approximately 4-5 pages or more). *Articles published in predatory journals do not earn any credit. Please contact the Faculty Director of Scholarly Communication Services at SJSU Library, Ann Agee (ann.agee@sjsu.edu), if you need help identifying the predatory journals in your field.*
7. To receive points, a short report must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; b) be a brief report /essay/commentary (approximately 3-4 pages). Blog entries should also not be included as a research product.
8. To receive points, a conference proceedings paper must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; b) be published in a conference proceedings report or journal; and c) undergo competitive peer review *subsequent to the acceptance of the abstract at the conference.*
9. To receive points, a conference or poster presentation must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; and b) be presented at an academic or professional conference.
10. To receive points, a scholarly book must be one of the following: a) a book that contributes to understanding or advances knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge, and is published by a university press or other academic or comparable publisher; b) a trade book on a topic relevant to the faculty member's discipline nationally distributed by an established publisher; or c) a text book that synthesizes elements of a faculty member's discipline, is updated regularly and is published by a higher education commercial publisher.
11. To receive points, a scholarly book chapter must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; b) be published in a scholarly book; c) consist of substantial content (approximately 5 pages or more)
12. To receive points, a report must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; b) be related to scholarly projects in the faculty member's discipline; and c) submitted to or distributed by a professional or academic organization; d) be a full length report (approximately 5 pages or more).
13. To receive points, a book review must be: a) a review of a scholarly book; and b) published in a peer-reviewed journal.
14. To receive points, an invited presentation must: a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; AND be either b) presented at a professional association meeting OR c) presented to professionals through an agency regarding results of scholarly work conducted in partnership with that agency.
15. If in a particular discipline, a conference proceedings paper carries as much weight as a journal publication, and the faculty member can provide evidence to provide that, the evidence will be reviewed by a committee. If deemed acceptable, the conference proceedings paper will receive the same points as a peer-reviewed journal article.

General note: If you publish or present in a language other than English, please provide a translation of the title (and abstract as appropriate) in documenting RSCA accomplishments. Furthermore, please clarify whether such publications are translations or an original publication.