

Building a Rubric

Template for Equitable CRC Assessment Criteria

The goal of this proposed revised/expanded CRC rubric is to:

- Highlight additional opportunities for applicants to amplify the ways they have endeavoured to include EDI in their research teams/students in ways that are relevant to their context, and with their access to resources.
- Provide some guidance to adjudicate the criteria with an EDI lens.
- Provide departments and faculties with a rubric that more closely reflects principles of inclusive excellence, and can support development of better job advertisements and interview questions

CRC Criteria – Tier 1

Quality of Nominee and Proposed Research Program

outstanding and innovative world-class researcher whose accomplishments have made a major impact in their fields

EDI considerations

- capacity to enhance the Faculty's and institution's reputation, locally, nationally, internationally
- capacity to address society's greatest social, economic, political, and health problems/challenges
- capacity to acquire and renew funding (e.g., private or donor funds, external grants, government contracts, awards, etc.)

- How will you value non-traditional forms of knowledge production that can reflect outstanding contributions, such as community engagement or community-based contributions to knowledge?
- How is the work they are doing, and the perspectives and lived experience they bring to their work, relevant to the research and its theoretical and methodological underpinnings?
- When thinking about recognition, how can you ensure that scholars in certain fields or locations are not favoured?
- What aspects of achievement merit recognition and signal excellence but frequently get overlooked?
- How can the language of excellence itself be counter-productive to inviting applications from people producing robust and impressive scholarship in areas linked to decolonization and EDI, where there might be less of an emphasis on traditional notions of productivity and excellence and more of an emphasis on impact or relationality?

recognized internationally as leaders in their fields

EDI considerations

- research productivity focusing on national and international engagement (e.g., talks, abstracts, reports, etc.)
- Scholarly Impact (Citations, H Index, i10 Index) *
- knowledge translation (dissemination of knowledge beyond scholarly avenues: community reports, public talks, podcasts, etc.)

**In accordance with DORA recommendations (<https://sfedora.org/read/>), be cautious not to fixate on journal rankings as proxies for evidence of or potential for excellence.*

- How can you consider a range of metrics beyond traditional academic metrics (e.g., citations, H index, i10 index, etc.) and award research creativity in ways that value equitable practices?
- How will the barriers an applicant has faced or is facing be considered? How are we taking into consideration the tendency for opportunities for status and visibility to perpetuate themselves (i.e., someone who has a lot of invited talks is more like to get invited to more talks in the future)? How do we account for the way that biases can shape who gets more engagement?
- How do we situate the research productivity within the context of that researcher's opportunities? How will the applicant's work in promoting equity and inclusion be considered as an indicator of potential?
- How can different methods/methodologies/research approaches impact timeline/productivity and the questions that scholars can investigate?
- How can EDI be considered and valued in every aspect of a scholar's work, regardless of their identity, rather than thinking of EDI as an add-on or even a distraction from scholarly work?

superior records of attracting and supervising diverse graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (taking into account different practices in the relevant field or discipline) and, as chairholders, be expected to attract, develop and retain excellent trainees, students and future researchers from a wide range of backgrounds and communities

EDI considerations

- high-quality teaching and mentorship of a diversity of students at the graduate level
- active consideration and integration of EDI in the design of the research program
- robust plan to attract, develop and retain a diverse research team, including capacity to provide flexible work environment

- How is the nominee contributing to widening the pipeline by explicitly recruiting and supporting trainees from HPSM groups? If this is an explicit commitment, what consideration is given to how the needs of HPSM trainees might impact the nominee's timelines and output?
- How is superiority of the supervision record determined? i.e., is it by number of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows supervised or by the quality of their work? How is the excellency of a trainee determined?
- How is the social and cultural context of the applicant and the research team taken into account (e.g., 'diversity' may look different in Canada v. in some international contexts)?
- Is the applicant considering expanded notions of diversity, including invisible forms of diversity as well as aspects that may not be as commonly considered in Canada (e.g., socio-economic, religious, etc.?)

- How are accessibility and EDI considered in the research program, the recruitment of community participants (if relevant), and the dissemination of research findings?

proposing an original, innovative research program of the highest quality

EDI considerations

- Innovation in research approach and scope with equity in mind
- capacity to advance community-engaged research
- capacity to drive collaborative or interdisciplinary research initiatives within and external to the university
- capacity to develop and maintain reciprocal relationships within communities involved or impacted by the research
- capacity to leverage experiential knowledge to enhance quality and innovation of the research

- How is the work the candidate is doing, and the perspectives they bring, relevant to the work and the ways in which they approach it theoretically and methodologically?
- What kinds of scholarship are more likely to advance the field, or how are current trends impacting research in your field? How might that promote the advancement of HPSM groups (or not)?
- If relevant, how is the research approach proposing engaging communities of interest? How is reciprocity approached?
- What elements of the research demonstrate that it does so in meaningful and inclusive ways? For example, by:
 - Integrating feedback from the relevant communities
 - Providing clear benefits to the relevant communities
 - Being translated back to the relevant communities

Alignment of Nominee with Institutional Strategic Priorities/Plan

- alignment with Indigenous and/or Inclusive Excellence priorities (per StEAR framework)
- alignment with institutional priorities outlined in the Brighter World Strategy

Additional UBC Requirements

- service contributions/good citizenship/maintenance and regeneration of the university (e.g., Departmental, Faculty, or Institutional Committees, administrative leadership, mentorship, etc.)

CRC Criteria – Tier 2

Quality of Nominee and Proposed Research Program

excellent emerging world-class researchers who have demonstrated particular research creativity

EDI considerations

- capacity to enhance the Faculty's and institution's reputation, locally, nationally, internationally
- capacity to address societies greatest social, economic, political, and health problems/challenges
- capacity to acquire and renew funding (e.g., private or donor funds, external grants, government contracts, awards, etc.)

- How will you value non-traditional forms of knowledge production that can reflect outstanding contributions, such as community engagement or community-based contributions to knowledge?
- How is the work they are doing, and the perspectives and lived experience they bring to their work, relevant to the research and its theoretical and methodological underpinnings?
- When thinking about recognition, how can you ensure that scholars in certain fields or locations are not favoured?
- What aspects of achievement merit recognition and signal excellence but frequently get overlooked?
- How can the language of excellence itself be counter-productive to inviting applications from people producing robust and impressive scholarship in areas linked to decolonization and EDI, where there might be less of an emphasis on traditional notions of productivity and excellence and more of an emphasis on impact or relationality?

have demonstrated the potential to achieve international recognition in their fields in the next five to ten years

EDI considerations

- research productivity focusing on national and international engagement (Talks, abstracts, reports, etc.)
- Scholarly Impact (Citations, H Index, i10 Index) *
- knowledge translation (dissemination of knowledge beyond scholarly avenues: community reports, public talks, podcasts, etc.)

**In accordance with DORA recommendations (<https://sfedora.org/read/>), be cautious not to fixate on journal rankings as proxies for evidence of or potential for excellence.*

- How can you consider a range of metrics beyond traditional academic metrics (e.g., citations, H index, i10 index, etc.) and award research creativity in ways that value equitable practices?
- How will the barriers an applicant has faced or is facing be considered? How are we taking into consideration the tendency for opportunities for status and visibility to perpetuate themselves (i.e., someone who has a lot of invited talks is more like to get invited to more talks in the future)? How do we account for the way that biases can shape who gets more engagement?
- How do we situate the research productivity within the context of that researcher's opportunities?
- How will the applicant's work in promoting equity and inclusion be considered as an indicator of potential?

- How can EDI be considered and valued in every aspect of a scholar’s work, regardless of their identity, rather than thinking of EDI as an add-on or even a distraction from scholarly work?

as chairholders, have the potential to attract, develop and retain excellent diverse trainees, students and future researchers from a wide range of backgrounds and communities

EDI considerations

- high-quality teaching and mentorship of a diversity of students at the graduate level
- active consideration of EDI in the design or the research program
- robust plan to attract, develop and retain a diverse research team, including capacity to provide flexible work environment

- How is the nominee contributing to widening the pipeline by explicitly recruiting and supporting trainees from HPSM groups? If this is an explicit commitment, what consideration is given to how the needs of HPSM trainees might impact the nominee’s timelines and output?
- How is superiority of the supervision record determined? i.e., is it by number of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows supervised or by the quality of their work? How is the excellency of a trainee determined?
- How is the social and cultural context of the applicant and the research team taken into account (e.g., ‘diversity’ may look different in Canada v. in some international contexts)?
- Is the applicant considering expanded notions of diversity, including invisible forms of diversity as well as aspects that may not be as commonly considered in Canada? (e.g., socio-economic, religious, etc.?)
- How are accessibility and EDI considered in the research program, the recruitment of community participants (if relevant), and the dissemination of research findings?

proposing an original, innovative research program of high quality

EDI considerations

- Innovation in research approach and scope with equity in mind
- capacity to advance community engaged research
- capacity to drive collaborative or interdisciplinary research initiatives within and external to the university
- capacity to develop and maintain reciprocal relationships within communities involved or impacted by the research
- capacity to leverage experiential knowledge, including the research’s own lived experience, to enhance quality and innovation of the research

- How is the work the candidate is doing, and the perspectives they bring, relevant to the work and the ways in which they approach it theoretically and methodologically?
- What kinds of scholarship are more likely to advance the field, or how are current trends impacting research in your field? How might that promote the advancement of HPSM groups (or not)?
- If relevant, how is the research approach proposing engaging communities of interest? How is reciprocity approached?
- What elements of the research demonstrate that it does so in meaningful and inclusive ways? For example, by:
 - Integrating feedback from the relevant communities
 - Providing clear benefits to the relevant communities
 - Being translated back to the relevant communities

Alignment of Nominee with Institutional Strategic Priorities/Plan

- alignment with Indigenous and/or Inclusive Excellence priorities (per StEAR Framework)
- alignment with institutional priorities outlined in the Brighter World Strategy

Additional UBC Requirements

- service contributions/good citizenship (i.e. Departmental, Faculty, or Institutional Committees, mentorship)

Additional takeaways:

- Section “Publication Conventions in your Discipline” in the CRC application: Currently there are five fixed criteria to address in the one page, but could that be expanded to two pages, and a possibility to reflect on your environment and its practices so reviewers are comparing your relatively high productivity to your context at your small institution, rather than to the productivity of those at institutions that benefit from historical recognition and value assumptions.
- We need more examples of language in job ads, rubrics, interview questions, application forms that don’t require people first to see themselves as “exceptional” and “excellent” to even put their names forward.
- It is essential to provide training to adjudicators in terms of how to recognize non-traditional forms of knowledge, how to consider them, how to evaluate them was offered in advance of evaluating applications. Locally there was a good example of this within the [Interdisciplinary Graduate Studies Admissions Committee](#) at UBCO. There was a separate working group that developed the guidance document and created an open space for questions, before the review process started, which helped create new joint understanding.