College of Information, Data and Society (CIDS) Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) Metric
Proposed for 2025

The RSCA metric for the College of Information, Data and Society (CIDS) measures the research, scholarship, and creative activity of faculty members from the two academic schools and departments comprising the college: School of Information (iSchool) and Department of Applied Data Science (ADS).

The college-level RSCA Metric has the following objectives:
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, and only aggregated data are reported.
3. The metric measures outcomes, not processes, and the data are used to inform future RSCA funding.

The CIDS RSCA metric provides an objective means for understanding the quantity, types, and variety of College faculty members' RSCA productivity. The metric is a living document and will be revised regularly.

	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]	Collaborator, external grant proposal awarded	PI, external grant proposal submitted[2] PI, internal grant proposal awarded[3]	Co-PI, collaborator, 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 or solo author of editor-reviewed conference presentation[9]	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] First or solo author of an editor-reviewed OpEd in a widely circulated publication[7]	Panelist, discussant, colloquium participant, or invited speaker, non-peer-reviewed conference[9] First[4], solo or corresponding author, invited presentation to professional association, university, or other collaborating community partner[14] Co-author, report[12] First[4], solo or corresponding author, short report[7]

Notes

1. Points for <u>external grant proposals awarded</u> 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 <u>external grant proposals submitted</u> 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 earn the same points as a first/solo/corresponding author.

5. A <u>peer-review process</u> 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 <u>short report</u> or OpEd 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. Other examples could be a white paper, magazine article, etc.

8. *To receive points, a <u>conference proceedings paper</u> 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 <u>conference or poster presentation</u> 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 <u>scholarly book</u> 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 <u>scholarly book chapter</u> 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 <u>report</u> 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 <u>book review</u> must be: a) a review of a scholarly book; and b) published in a peer-reviewed journal.

14. To receive points, an <u>invited presentation</u> 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 support 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 original publications.

Historical Background and Rationale:
The development of the CIDS RSCA Metric started with a discussion among the faculty members at the iSchool in February 2020 at an iSchool Faculty Retreat; at that time, the iSchool was part of the College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE). iSchool faculty reviewed two existing RSCA Metrics to consider as the basis for a new college-level RSCA Metric: one from the College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS), and the other from the College of Engineering (CoE). At that meeting, iSchool faculty engaged in an in-depth discussion about the purpose of the RSCA Metric, and how to build the college-level RSCA Metric starting from the ones from CHHS and CoE.

As a result of the discussion and in consultation with the Department of Applied Data Science, the college decided to model the college-level RSCA Metric after the CHHS Metric, with certain elements added from the CoE Metric. The rationale was as follows: Library and Information Science (LIS), Informatics, Archives, and Instructional Design are already diverse fields with many sub-disciplines, and together with Applied Data Science, the college-level Metric must present a diverse picture that encompasses the RSCA activities in the college.

In 2024, CPGE was renamed the College of Information, Data and Society (CIDS); the RSCA metric was updated to reflect this new college name. In 2025, the College RSCA Metric was fully reviewed to ensure that it fully represents the RSCA products produced by faculty in the Department of Applied Data Science and the new degree areas developed in the iSchool.

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 our college faculty, a metric needs to be in place.

Proposed version for vote, Sept. 2025; Last updated/approved: 2 August 2024