**CLA RTP Policy (proposed revisions for Scholarship of Engagement)**

*CLA Equity Task Force, Team 4: Raven Pfister & Emily Berquist Soule, co-leads*

*Equity Task Force Members: Linna Li, Jacqueline Lyon, & Varisa Patraporn*

**2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) requires research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) of all faculty members. *The* CLA recognizes *and appreciates* the diversity of *methods, epistemologies, and perspectives* represented within the college *and endorses an inclusive definition of scholarship aligned with the university's policy which recognizes scholarship as a continuum of diverse forms of knowledge and knowledge-making practices that can be pursued in a multitude of ways. This includes, but is not limited to: original research, making connections between disciplines, bridging theory and practice, communicating knowledge effectively to students and peers, or reciprocal partnerships with broader communities. The common characteristics for any scholarly form to be considered scholarship are: it must be public, amenable to critical appraisal, and in a form that permits exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community. Candidates may make contributions to the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application or engagement, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning (see University RTP Policy and Appendix for detailed descriptions and examples). Contributions may be in one area or across multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship. Scholarly contributions to any area(s) are valued equally by the CLA. The following* section outlines the criteria for the evaluation of RSCA in the college and candidates' responsibilities regarding RTP files and materials.

**2.2.1 RSCA File**

**2.2.1.1. Required Materials**

a. RSCA narrative written on the fillable form.

b. All published peer-reviewed research, scholarly, and creative activities for the review period only. RSCA claimed in prior action cannot be included. *Examples of* published peer-reviewed research include, but are not limited to: books, articles, films, and other media, *policy or program development, legislation, new statewide curriculum, patent applications, training videos, and digital creations or tools.* Such materials shall be *included in the file, linked in the narrative (digital products),* or, in the case of books and other materials that do not fit in the *file*, shall be submitted with the file. Furthermore, candidates have the option to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA as per the following guidelines:

1. Candidates *submitting materials for RTP have the option* to include accepted, in press, or forthcoming RSCA for the period of review. Alternately, if they deem it beneficial for future actions, they may withhold such materials for a subsequent RTP action. When candidates decide to withhold these materials, such items must be listed under Works in Progress on the Professional Data Sheet (PDS).

2. In cases of post-tenure promotion, candidates may only include publications and all in press, forthcoming or accepted RSCA that had not been previously claimed in a prior successful action.

c. For candidates who author externally-funded RSCA grants and choose to highlight those as an achievement in the narrative, the file must include: (1) summary or description of funded project; (2) length of grant period; (3) granting agency; (4) amount of award; (5) brief description of candidate's role in authorship and implementation.

d. Proof of publication status as per *2.2.4-5* (below) for all in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file.

e. Proof of peer review as per 2.2.3 *(below)*.

**2.2.1.2. Optional Materials**

*Candidates may contribute materials from multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship and those materials will be assessed using criteria, evidence, and standards that align with disciplinary norms (see 2.2.3 below and Appendix).* The inclusion of non peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book reviews) is optional. As such, the absence of such materials shall not be viewed as negative for any candidate.

**2.2.1.3 Excluded Materials**

Candidates cannot include other evidence of unpublished RSCA (e.g., works in progress, conference presentations, and invited lectures; *see Appendix for details and exceptions*). Listing such items on the PDS is sufficient.

**2.2.2 RSCA Narrative**

The RSCA narrative for the period of review must address:

a. Focus and sustained nature of the candidate's *RSCA*.

b. Significance and impact of the candidate's RSCA, *dependent on the norms in the field, type of scholarship, and the communities and constituencies with whom the candidate interacts.*

c. Candidate's role in authorship for co-and multi-authored RSCA.

d. Significance and impact of non peer-reviewed RSCA (e.g., book reviews) included in the candidate's RTP file.

**2.2.3 Peer Review Requirement and Definition**

In the CLA, *a candidate’s RSCA and how it impacts the world can take many forms. While* peer review is *a* primary requirement for the majority of a candidate’s *RSCA, not all scholarship can* *be measured in the same way. As such, the criteria, evidence, and standards used to assess peer review will vary based on the* context *of the scholarship—the form, intended audience, and intended impact. However, it is the candidate’s responsibility to clarify how their work meets the standards for peer review and to make the case for the external impact of their work, especially when the impact isn’t easily quantifiable (see Appendix for details).*

**2.2.3.1 Definition**

Peer review *has traditionally been* defined as a process by which qualified experts in the discipline impartially evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities. For the purposes of this policy, the term peer review

encompasses the terms ‘juried’ and ‘refereed,’ which may be used for all RSCA impartially evaluated by qualified experts in specific disciplines.

*Peer review has also been defined as a mutually constitutive process established in the reciprocal relationship between a researcher and the communities with which they are engaged (e.g., organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry, etc.). These forms of peer review may include, but are not limited to:*

a. The process of selection of work for dissemination within the publishing venues of non-academic sectors.

*b. Documentation of the quantity, strength, and impact of work on stakeholders (e.g., enactment of related legislation, adoption of innovations, and/or widespread changes in professional practice, etc.)*

c. The process of evaluation of extramural RSCA grant proposals by granting agencies or organizations.

d. A process leading to *creative* performances, *exhibitions of work, or academic* *presentations in public venues in which peers independently evaluated the work.*

*e. Testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adaptations from peers, professionals, community stakeholders, etc. that affirm the value of the work.*

*f. Awards, honors, or other public recognition of the work by peers, professionals, community stakeholders, etc.*

**2.2.3.2 Labeling Requirement**

For each RSCA item on the PDS, candidates are required to indicate whether the item was peer-reviewed by using consistent labels of “Peer Reviewed,” “Refereed,” “Juried,” etc. as appropriate to the field *and type of scholarship undertaken*.

**2.2.4 Definitions of Publication Status**

RSCA not yet in print or otherwise in the public domain must be labeled on the PDS according to the following definitions of publication status:

a. In press and forthcoming are interchangeable. Both refer to an accepted work that is in the copy-editing, page proof, or other pre-publication state.

b. Accepted refers to a manuscript that a publisher or other entity has agreed to publish without major changes.

c. Conditionally accepted refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating that changes are required before the manuscript will be published.

d. Revise and resubmit refers to a manuscript that has been reviewed and has received this evaluation from a publisher or other entity, indicating that the manuscript has to be evaluated again prior to a final decision.

e. Submitted means only that work has been submitted for consideration.

f. Under contract with complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract and a complete manuscript draft.

g. Under contract without complete manuscript draft refers to RSCA for which there is a contract granted without a complete manuscript draft.

*h. Ongoing refers to multi-stage projects and products that have resulted in some demonstrable RSCA, but are still underway and have not yet reached their final stage of dissemination, regardless of format.*

**2.2.5. Proof of Publication Status**

For in press, forthcoming, and accepted RSCA submitted with the RTP file, candidates must submit evidence of publication status (e.g., a letter from the publisher/editor or a copy of the contract). RSCA not submitted for evaluation (e.g., work in progress) does not require such documentation.

**2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

**2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such proof must be provided in English.

Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:

a. A printout of the venue's editorial policy.

b. Copies of reader reports.

c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.

*d. Letters, testimonials, evaluations, public recognition, etc. from community stakeholders or participatory agencies, communications between the community and researcher, and other potential evidence of peer review (see Appendix for additional information).*

**2.2.6.2 Ethical Concerns**

Any potential ethical concerns must be disclosed in the narrative.

Ethical concerns include, but are not limited to: conflicts of interest; monetary payment to secure publication; and duplicate publication:

a. Conflicts of interest: Conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to serving contemporaneously on the editorial, advisory, or executive board of the press or journal with which one has published.

b. Monetary contributions: Publications in venues to which an author is required to make a monetary contribution in order to secure publication (e.g., for-profit presses and vanity presses) shall be considered *a priori* an ethical concern, regardless of selection process. This does not include venues that require subsidies to offset publication costs after a work has been accepted for publication on its scholarly merits (e.g., charges for images).

c. Duplicate publication: Candidates must address duplicate RSCA in their narratives. Examples include, but are not limited to: the same article published in different venues or in different languages. Reprints must be labeled as such.

*Note to readers*

- our team began to work on Scholarship of Engagement (SoE) with the understanding that this has been a key area in which our faculty have experienced inequities in the CLA. Current CLA Policy mentions SoE, but provides zero guidance or parameters for evaluators to assess it as RSCA. So no matter how much an evaluating committee may *wish* to evaluate a candidate's SoE as RSCA, without a policy delineating a set of standards for doing so, they cannot fairly and adequately assess this work.

- We hoped to be able to revise the CLA RTP Policy itself to include a set of standards that both candidates and evaluators could use, but as many are unfamiliar with this type of scholarship, it was virtually impossible to include all the necessary information within the policy itself.

- Therefore, Team 4 decided to both revise the CLA RTP Policy as it pertains to SoE, and to create a separate appendix to define new/unfamiliar terminology and provide evaluation criteria and examples.

- our proposed policy revisions are based on the crowdsourcing work done by the CLASP team in the 21-22 a.y., extensive secondary research prepared by our team members, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the new proposed RTP policy for the university, and discussion with Dean Thien.

- as much as possible, new/changed language is marked in *green italics*