

CSULB Faculty Center & Faculty Affairs

Ideas for Equity in Department RTP Policies

PRESENTATION/Q&A

CO-FACILITATORS

Dr. Emily Berquist

Interim Director
Faculty Center

Dr. Raven Pfister

Lecturer
Department of Communication Studies

Dr. Malcolm Finney

Interim Assistant Vice President for Faculty
Inclusive Excellence

Welcome and introductions

- Why us? Who are your facilitators and why are we here?
 - We care about equity! And we've been heavily involved in developing and advocating for more equitable policies and procedures for several years.
 - COVID Equity Task Force, 2021-2022
 - CLA Strategic Plan, 2021-2023 (Equity in Evaluations Team co-leads)
 - Thank you to our team members **Linna Li, Jacqueline Lyon, & Varisa Patraporn**—their research and insights were invaluable to us!
 - And thank you to **CLA Dean Thien** for supporting this work!
 - We want to help! We're happy to share our research and the ideas that formed the basis of the college-level RTP document we drafted for the CLA.
 - Of course, these are just ideas to help get your wheels turning. You're free to use or not use anything we share in whatever ways you see fit for your own departments.

FYIs & FAQs

- **Why are we offering this workshop now?**
 - The deadline for revisions to department RTP policies is looming...eek!
 - The 2023 changes to the University RTP Policy are significant
- **What's the plan?**
 - We'll discuss the model policies we drafted for the CLA RTP document and the body of research on which the policies were grounded (both CSULB-specific and broader academic research).
 - Three primary equity concerns in the RTP Policy emerged from our research:
 1. Student evaluations (SPOT)
 2. Scholarship of Engagement
 3. Cultural and Identity Taxation
- **What will you get out of it (aside from continental breakfast)?**
 - Everything! You'll have access to this PowerPoint, our academic references list, and the model policies we drafted for the CLA RTP document. What's ours is now yours.

Research on Student Evaluations

- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness are useful but flawed instruments that by their nature, do not accurately represent teaching effectiveness. Research indicates that students frequently base their determinations on factors that are outside of the instructor's control, reflecting biases such as:
 - Environmental bias (bias based on course conditions, including but not limited to course difficulty, course modality, course meeting time & place, student interest level, etc.).
 - Equity bias (bias towards the instructor because of aspect/s or perceived aspect/s of their identity, including but not limited to race, ethnicity, gender, ability, national origin, sexual orientation, and appearance).
- The compound effects of multiple biases working against an instructor most negatively impact marginalized and minoritized identity groups (e.g., women, BIPOC, non-native English speakers, etc.), which may result in significant efforts by the instructor to overcome said biases, potentially altering the nature of a course in ways that are not beneficial to students, but that will likely result in more positive student evaluations.

Suggestions for more equitable use of SPOT (Section 2.1)

- PROBLEM→overreliance on SPOT data in evaluating teaching 😞
 - The University RTP policy (2023) indicates that SPOT data must be included in a candidate's file, but it also says: “colleges and departments should employ multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and must not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms as evidence.” SPOT data, in part or in whole, does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness, and therefore, shall only be considered as one part of the candidate's portfolio, not the sole or primary source of evidence to evaluate teaching effectiveness.
 - Suggestion→supplemental evidence of teaching effectiveness: examples include but aren't limited to: reports of class observations conducted by colleagues, examples of completed student work, examples of adaptation to instruction, informal mid-semester evaluations administered directly by the faculty member, etc.

More SPOT ideas...

- PROBLEM→misuse and/or misinterpretation of SPOT data ☹
 - SPOT response rates have decreased dramatically since we switched to online evaluations; mean averages don't "mean" much when the response rate is tiny (skewed results from a non-representative sample)
 - Suggestions→consider other measures of central tendency that may present a more accurate picture and/or determine a cut-off point by which SPOT data would not factor into the overall evaluation (it would still need to be included in the file)
 - Comparisons of individual course SPOT means with department and college data may not consider contextual factors
 - Suggestion→more apples to apples: committees, chairs, and the dean shall evaluate SPOT data relative to context, including the contextual factors listed in the old RTP doc, PLUS:
 - Course type (e.g., required, elective, writing intensive, online/asynchronous, for majors only, GE, etc.)
 - Number of enrolled students (v. number of SPOT responses)
 - Course meeting time and place
 - Alignment of Standard Course Outline (SCO) with the candidate's area of expertise/training
 - Trends over time, keeping in mind that it's impossible to remove or account for all bias in student evals

Scholarship of Engagement: Suggestions for more equitable RSCA (Section 2.2)

- PROBLEM→the “traditional” model of scholarship [aka, scholarship of discovery] is narrowly defined, which discourages candidates from pursuing other forms of RSCA that are important to the University’s mission ☹️. AND...folks aren’t familiar with other forms of scholarship ☹️.
- The new University RTP Policy (2023) introduces and defines the continuum of scholarship, emphasizing that all forms of scholarship are equally valued. Contributions may be in one area or across multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship.
 - Scholarship now includes, but is not limited to:
 - Original research [discovery]
 - Making connections between disciplines [integration]
 - Reciprocal partnerships with broader communities [engagement] or bridging theory and practice [application]
 - Scholarship of Engagement/Community-based Scholarship: “Collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” (American Council on Education)
 - Communicating knowledge effectively to students and peers [teaching and learning]
- Suggestions→clear definitions and examples of the various forms of scholarship as well as evaluation criteria

More equitable RSCA stuff...

- Peer review requirement: these changes reflect the continuum of scholarship while reiterating that peer review isn't an "anything goes" criterion.
 - ...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.
- Peer review definition: we suggest expanding the definition to align with the continuum of scholarship
 1. a process by which qualified experts in the discipline evaluate the merit, importance, and originality of research, scholarly, and creative activities;
 2. 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.). It is the responsibility of the candidate to document the process of peer review.

Continuum of Scholarship Matrix (adapted from Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 2019-2020)

Scholarship Area & Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
DISCOVERY Creation of new disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) knowledge through creative/critical thought, research, and testing that is shared with others Example: empirical research	• Publications (articles, books, policy papers, etc.; may be based on theses, dissertations, etc.). • Presentations (conferences, round tables, webinars/virtual). • Inventions and patents. • Grant proposals. • Creative products (e.g., exhibits and performances). • Original creations in writing or multimedia, artistic works, or new technologies. • Publicly available electronic resources (e.g., software, websites, databases, etc.).	• Peer-review and acceptance of artifacts. • Journal impact factors (if appropriate). • Citation index (if appropriate). • Research productivity indices. • Successfully funded competitive grants. • Reviews of published work (e.g., books). • Awards and honors.	• Citations of work by others. • Designation as an expert: guest lecturer, invited speaker, keynote address, scholarship reviewer (grants, papers, books, conferences), tenure/promotion external reviewer, expert witness. • Featured performances at international, national, or regional venues. • Number of views, shares, likes for online dissemination of scholarship (e.g., podcasts, videos). • Editorship of high-quality disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals. • Leadership in professional organizations and duration of such leadership.

Scholarship Area & Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
INTEGRATION Critical evaluation, synthesis, analysis, integration, or interpretation of disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) research or creative work produced by others Example: literature review, meta-analysis	• Reflective essays and reviews. • Translations. • Popular publications. • Syntheses of the literature (e.g., literature reviews, meta-analyses, theory building papers). • Products/artifacts typical of discovery and application and practice.	• Reviews in newspapers for a creative work. • Book talks at universities and to public audiences. • Examples where colleagues from inside or outside CSULB have used the scholarship. • Evidence typical of discovery, application and practice, teaching and learning, and engagement.	• Evidence that others or the field have been influenced by the outcome (e.g., adoption, changes in perspectives in field; sharing materials). • Public venues to share scholarship with non-specialist/non-academic audiences. • Impact/leadership typical of discovery, application and practice, teaching and learning, and engagement.

Scholarship Area & Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
APPLICATION AND PRACTICE Use of a scholar's disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge to address important individual, institutional, and societal problems Example: development of a technology	•Translational research. •Commercialization. •Start-ups. •Technology transfer. •Technology development (e.g., assistive, learning). •Applied research supported by industry or government (e.g., policy adaptations, program recommendations, industry/government funding). •Products/artifacts typical of discovery and engagement.	•Products shared with stakeholders and open to review and critique by stakeholders and by peers. •Evidence typical of discovery, integration, teaching and learning, and engagement.	•Consulting related to work. •Approaches, methods, and tools, adopted and assessed by an end user(s) with positive results. •Impact/leadership typical of discovery, integration, teaching and learning, and engagement.

Scholarship Area & Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
ENGAGEMENT Collaborative partnerships with communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources and/or transformation of communities through shared projects and research Example: community-based programming (e.g., health assessments)	• Community-based programs that enhance curriculum, teaching and learning. • Educational or public outreach programs. • Partnerships with communities beyond campus to address critical societal issues, prepare educated citizens, or contribute to the public good. • Publication in public scholarship venues (e.g., videos, blogs, open access journals, digital humanities products, etc.). • Products/artifacts typical of discovery, integration, application and practice, teaching and learning.	• Works that benefit the external community, are visible and shared with stakeholders, and are open to review and critique by community stakeholders and by peers. • Sustained, mutually beneficial relationships with communities and organizations. • Evidence typical of discovery, integration, application and practice, and teaching and learning.	• Bringing to light and/or improving economic, social or environmental conditions of a community, region, agency, industry, or other sector. • Generation of major gifts to endow a program. • Citations or adoption of work by communities. • Impact/leadership typical of discovery, integration, application and practice, and teaching and learning.

Scholarship Area & Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
TEACHING AND LEARNING Development and improvement of pedagogical practices that are shared with others Example: development and assessment of teaching/learning practices	•Assessment and evaluation of teaching and student learning (e.g., teaching portfolio, professional development of other teachers). •Development and dissemination of instructional materials used by others to improve pedagogy and learning (e.g., syllabi, notes, manuals, books etc.). •Products/artifacts typical of discovery, integration, application and practice (e.g., learning technologies).	•Products shared with other teachers at other universities or educational institutions. •External reviews of pedagogical practices. •Public dissemination (e.g., podcast, summative blogpost, public science communication campaign, etc.). •Evidence typical of discovery, application and practice, and engagement.	•Wide adoption of materials and methods by others (e.g., downloads, likes, shares). •Popular (3rd party) articles. •Social media hits and followers. •Impact/leadership typical of discovery, application. and practice, and engagement.

Suggestions for more equitable service work (Section 2.3)

- PROBLEM→cultural and identity taxation ☹. What is it and how can we minimize the inequities it creates?
 - The new University RTP Policy (2023) stresses the importance of service work (it's just as important as instruction and RSCA) and explains how to document cultural and identity taxation related to service.
 - Cultural and identity taxation is the suggested or unstated expectation that employees from marginalized and/or minoritized backgrounds and/or identities should provide representation on committees and/or showcase their knowledge of and commitment to the groups and communities to which they belong or serve.
 - As the labor undertaken to support diversity initiatives is often provided by or extracted from marginalized and/or minoritized faculty, the quality and degree of their service may be impacted by the disproportionate expectations placed upon them for this work. Documenting this work is imperative to ensure it is acknowledged.
 - Evaluating committees should recognize that many faculty experience various forms of cultural and identity taxation, resulting in intense service work, student mentoring, and other activities on and off campus that are essential to the mission of the university. The university benefits from this work, and as such, it is incumbent upon evaluating committees to contextualize this service, and to recognize extraordinary service accomplishments that are tied to cultural and identity taxation.

Thank you for sharing your time with us today!

- We hope this information will be helpful to you as you draft your department policies!
- If you have any additional questions or suggestions, please feel free to contact us.
- Otherwise, we'll be in touch with all the materials we shared today.
- Thanks again! 😊

Scholarship of Engagement Evaluative Instrument

CRITERIA	INDICATORS
1.Goals for Academic and Community Change. Candidates should clearly define the aims, focus, and purpose of their work.	a. a concise articulation of the broad aims of the work; how it contributes to the candidate's discipline/field; and a clear description of how this RSCA resulted in the improvement of service delivery and/or policy change to benefit external/community partners b. a coherent statement detailing the program of RSCA and its objectives c. a statement of realistic, executable, impactful goals and objectives for the RSCA d. clear description of the RSCA's goals for teaching and student learning e. a statement outlining how this RSCA contributes to major intellectual questions in the field and how the work is of major concern and/or impact for community/external partners
2. Sufficient Grounding in Content Area and Community Groundwork. Candidates should clearly define their own preparation to undertake this work; indicate their knowledge of prior and ongoing developments in the area; and display knowledge of how this work affects their community partners.	a. description of how the candidate built, developed, and maintains essential relationships with the community (and when possible, provide relevant evidence) b. demonstration of having met the disciplinary standard for high-quality partnership and collaborative work c. description of the candidate's skills that were/are essential to the partnership d. detailing of any related skills or professional development trainings undertaken by the candidate that enhanced the Scholarship of Engagement e. explanation of how the RSCA is situated compared to existing products produced by or for community partners

3. Methodology Centered in Academic Research Methods and Community Partnership Goals/Needs.

Academic rigor can be demonstrated through research design, data collection, data analysis, and reports of results. Community-engaged approaches maintain, and can enhance, academic rigor.

- a. collaborative work with community partners that generates, refines, or validates a research question
- b. collaborative work with community partners that advances or alters the scholar's methodologies; the way they collect/refine/analyze/share data; and or the recruitment of community and/or study partners
- c. articulation of methodologies that are appropriate to the nature of the engaged RSCA being undertaken
- d. indication of any modifications to research questions, approaches, or methodologies in response to community feedback
- e. development of policy recommendations or documents, based on RSCA findings, in collaboration with community partners
- f. enhancing course curriculum by including real-time feedback and information gathered from community members, when appropriate
- g. deepening student engagement and learning outcomes by involving community experts in course conceptualization, design, and execution, when appropriate
- h. building on community partnerships/expertise and student feedback to revise curriculum, when appropriate
- i. building on and sharing study findings through community organizations, partnerships, and policy making venues

4. Demonstrating Impact on the Discipline/Field and the Community.

Academic research methods can be demonstrated through articulating the benefits the RSCA brought to the community in question. Academic research methods can also be demonstrated through assessment of the knowledge created, within the field/discipline, and in the community.

- a. meeting or exceeding intended goals and aims with the work; or changing the scope and approach of the project to better meet revised goals and aims
- b. contributing to disciplinary knowledge through publication in peer-reviewed academic journals, or in scholarly monographs
- c. benefitting the community partner through contributions they deem valuable
- d. demonstrating achieved progress towards greater equity and/or social justice, in order to benefit the public good
- e. applications for funding, as pertains to research, community partners, or general program implementation
- f. indicating how the collaborative work has resulted in change in how community partners design and implement programs, goals, and outcome measures
- g. contributing to the discipline by enhancing focus on issues that are central to the community partners
- h. identifying and elaborating new venues for further research, exploration, and/or community collaboration
- i. enhancing student capacity to engage in leadership roles in the community or on campus

5. Effectively Communicating to Community and Scholarly Audiences.

Scholars will communicate effectively to academic and/or community audiences. Scholars will also subject their ideas to peer review, whether by scholars or practitioners in the respective field, or by community members.

- a. disseminating study findings to appropriate academic and public audiences aligned with the university's mission
- b. publishing study findings or innovations in peer-reviewed academic journals, practitioner publications including magazines, or the journals of professional societies
- c. using appropriate means of distribution to reach community stakeholders in an accessible, understandable fashion, i.e., disseminating findings in media with which community partners are often engaged; or producing documents aimed for legislators, service providers, and/or policy makers who affect the community in question
- d. using collaborative community partnerships to communicate outcomes of this RSCA

6. Reflecting on How to Improve the Methodologies of Scholarship of Engagement.

Scholars will provide evidence of how they have engaged in reflective critique to improve the methodologies and outcomes of their collaborative work.

- a. critically evaluating the work using appropriate evidence
- b. seeking critical feedback from community members and implementing that feedback to change and improve research design
- c. altering research projects in response to feedback provided by community partners
- d. participating in dialogue related to the work at the local, state, national, or international level

7. Personal Contribution to Collaborative Leadership.

Scholars will provide evidence of how they and their work have earned a reputation for academic rigor, scholarly importance, and/or community benefit.

- a. describing how the work undertaken has been recognized, utilized, or built upon by community stakeholders, experts/practitioners/professionals, and/or other academics
- b. providing comments or reviews from academic and/or non-academic colleagues, community peers, or recognized experts. These comments/reviews can be solicited or unsolicited, formal or informal, anonymous or tied directly to the candidate
- c. including evidence of any awards, letters, or expressions of appreciation from the community involved
- d. receiving invitations to present the work to professional societies, community audiences, legislative or government bodies, or advisory/policymaking committees
- e. mentoring others, including students, early career faculty, and community partners

8. Socially and Ethically Responsible Conduct.

Scholars will demonstrate how their research and teaching is carried out with honesty and integrity. Such work fosters respectful relationships with community/external partners peers, other academics, and students.

- a. demonstrating socially responsible behavior during research, teaching and outreach, in writing, conversation, academic orientation, and in the nature of collaborative relationships with community members.
- b. when applicable, abiding by Human Subjects research policy as determined by IRB standards, within both the university and community environments
- c. articulating respectful engagement with community epistemologies and practices, incorporating them into research methodologies and outcomes as appropriate
- d. collaboration with community partners in writing, disseminating, and reviewing research projects, when appropriate
- e. acknowledging the participation of community members in the work