

## **CASA RSCA Metric – 2018**

The RSCA metric for the College of Applied Sciences and Arts measures the research, scholarship and creative activity of faculty members from the ten academic departments comprising the college: Health Sciences and Recreation, Hospitality Tourism and Event Management, Information, Journalism and Mass Communication, Justice Studies, Kinesiology, Nursing, Nutrition Food Science and Packaging, Occupational Therapy, and Social Work.

Measuring RSCA productivity in a meaningful way is complex and controversial. CASA's diverse array of departments makes the task even more challenging, as RSCA products vary significantly between disciplines and even sub-disciplines. Furthermore, often the significance of scholarly work -- especially highly original work -- is not fully appreciated for years or even decades. Therefore, it is certain that any metric will be imperfect at best. Nonetheless, it is important to develop a means to understand the amount and type of scholarship undertaken by faculty in the college.

In developing the CASA RSCA metric, 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. We made the following assumptions: 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; and 4) the metric should incorporate the value CASA places upon regional, applied, and collaborative scholarship.

We used an iterative, inclusive process to develop the metric. After creating an initial draft, the Associate Dean for Research consulted with the following groups for advice and feedback: each department separately; the college committee of chairs and directors; the college faculty RSCA advisory committee; and two college-wide meetings of faculty members, one on-line and one in person. The metric was revised after each meeting, and final points and questions were resolved in consultation with the college faculty RSCA advisory committee.

To implement the metric, scholarly accomplishments of the previous calendar year are collected through an on-line survey of faculty administered in the Spring semester. Reported accomplishments are weighted according to the metric; a three year rolling average is used to calculate faculty members' scores. Should the metric be used to identify faculty members eligible for RSCA assigned time, accomplishments claimed by identified faculty members will be verified. A subcommittee of the college RSCA advisory committee will advise the Dean in any situations of contested or disputed points.

The current version of CASA's RSCA metric provides an objective means for understanding the amount, type, and variety of CASA 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.

	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.25
Grant proposals	PI, external grant proposal awarded <sup>1</sup>	Co-PI, external grant proposal awarded <sup>1</sup>		PI, external grant proposal submitted <sup>2</sup> PI, internal grant proposal awarded <sup>3</sup>	Co-PI, external grant proposal submitted <sup>2</sup>
Journal articles	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> journal article <sup>6</sup>	Co-author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> journal article <sup>6</sup>	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> journal short report <sup>7</sup>	Co-author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> journal short report <sup>7</sup>	
Peer-reviewed conference papers, presentations and posters		First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding <sup>4</sup> author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> conference proceedings paper <sup>8</sup>	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> conference presentation <sup>9</sup> Co-author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> published conference proceedings paper <sup>8</sup>	Co-author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> conference presentation <sup>9</sup> Panelist, discussant, colloquium participant, or invited speaker, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> conference	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> conference poster presentation <sup>9</sup>
Books and book chapters	First <sup>4</sup> or solo author, scholarly book <sup>10</sup>	Co-author, scholarly book <sup>10</sup>	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, scholarly book chapter <sup>11</sup> Editor, scholarly book <sup>10</sup>	Co-author, scholarly book chapter <sup>11</sup> Co-editor, scholarly book <sup>10</sup>	
Media products	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author/creator, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> comprehensive media product or campaign <sup>12</sup>	Co-contributor, peer-reviewed <sup>5</sup> comprehensive media product or campaign <sup>12</sup>	First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, media piece <sup>13</sup>	Co-contributor, media piece <sup>13</sup>	
Other scholarly products (non-peer reviewed) <sup>16</sup>				First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, report <sup>14</sup> Book review <sup>15</sup> First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, non-peer-reviewed conference presentation <sup>9</sup>	Panelist, discussant, colloquium participant, or invited speaker, non-peer-reviewed conference Co-author, report <sup>14</sup> First <sup>4</sup> , solo or corresponding author, short report <sup>7</sup>

## 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. Co-PIs of CASA RSCA Infusion Interdisciplinary Collaboration grants 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.
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).
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).
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<sup>10</sup>; c) consist of substantial content (approximately 5 pages or more)
12. To receive points, a comprehensive media product or campaign must: a) be presented in a public forum; b) be discipline-relevant. This category is anticipated to be used only by JMC.
13. To receive points, a media piece must: be a) contribute to understanding or advance knowledge through original research and/or the synthesis of existing knowledge; b) be published at the discretion of at least one editor; c) be discipline-relevant; d) be published in a newspaper or magazines with a significant distribution. Interviews of or testimony by faculty members should not included. This category is anticipated to be used only by JMC.
14. 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).
15. To receive points, a book review must be: a) a review of a scholarly book<sup>8</sup>; and b) published in a peer-reviewed journal.
16. Total points for non-peer reviewed work will be capped at one point (1.0) per year.