**University of Windsor Research Evaluation Rubric Working Document**

**This is a blank version of the sample research evaluation rubric for use by departments wishing to develop their own language or adapt some language from the sample rubric while drafting other sections independently. Criterion language, and quality descriptors and number scale can be changed or deleted as desired.**

*Criterion 1 Standard for (level): X out of y criteria at the x level? Mandatory indicators?*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1:** Expertise in research or creative area, relevant methodologies and effective and ethical project management | Poor (1-3) | Competent (4) | Good/Superior (5-6) | Excellent (7) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Criterion 2 Standard for (level): X out of y criteria at the x level? Mandatory indicators?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 2**: A record of high quality refereed publications, juried creative activity or other demonstrated scholarly outputs | N/A | Poor (1-3) | Competent (4) | Good/Superior (5-6) | Excellent (7) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Criterion 3 Standard for (level): X out of y criteria at the x level? Mandatory indicators?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 3:** Evidence of independent and original contributions to research or creative activity, which have an impact on the field of expertise. | N/A | Poor (1-3) | Competent (4) | Good/Superior (5-6) | Excellent (7) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Criterion 4 Standard for (level): X out of y criteria at the x level? Mandatory indicators?*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 4:** Effective research or commissioned income generation and infrastructure development strategies **[[1]](#footnote-1)** | Poor (1-3) | Competent (4) | Good/Superior (5-6) | Excellent (7) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Criterion 5 Standard for (level): X out of y criteria at the x level? Mandatory indicators?*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 5:** Demonstrated ability to attract and successfully mentor and train students in research [[2]](#footnote-2) | Poor (1-3) | Competent (4) | Good/Superior (5-6) | Excellent (7) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Criterion 6 Standard for (level): X out of y criteria at the x level? Mandatory indicators?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 6**:Influence on and contributions to the academic and broader national/international community. | N/A | Poor (1-3) | Competent (4) | Good/Superior (5-6) | Excellent (7) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Rubric use:**

Disciplinary variations may have significant impact on indicative standards that apply. In addition, researchers’ profiles, even within a given discipline, may require committees to consider varied combinations of the indicators, or to add other indicators specific to their disciplines prior to approval of their evaluation template. In some cases it may be most appropriate to identify that researchers should provide evidence for a given number of indicators, or for specific require indicators, while others are encouraged.

Committees may find that it is impossible to evaluate candidates on all indicators, and that is to be expected, given the diversity of approaches to research even within a specific discipline. Departments may wish to identify mandatory minimum standards for specific indicators, while others are preferred or encouraged or assessed cumulatively or on something like a “3 out of 5 meeting a certain standard” basis. Alternatively, departments can identify specific indicators as “not applicable” for specific roles. The general intention is that instructors should be able to provide evidence of effective practice across these criteria: they may not be able to provide evidence for all indicators for any given criterion, and they may also be able to provide alternative evidence that meets the criteria. The specific profile and research agenda of specific researchers may also be taken into account in determining the critical determining factors

That said, committees should exercise caution to ensure that mitigating factors incorporated in decision making are based as much as possible on evidence rather than anecdote.

Departments are encouraged to offer preliminary readings of submitted documents to suggest areas which might benefit from more complete documentation.

1. Disciplines vary in their reliance on external funding for research success, the typical size of grants, and the frequency with which funding is typically received. This may result in significant variations in how grant success is treated in tenure and promotion decisions across departments. Departments should provide quantifiers for this criterion that are consistent with their disciplinary standards. Indicative standards outlined in this rubric include factors that would tend to indicate that the candidate is engaged in building opportunity for the expansion of research capital, socially, intellectually and/or materially, in ways that can benefit the research, the researcher, the research team, the discipline, and the various communities the research might impact. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This criterion may be more suitable to some departments than to others, in particular with regard to the existence, size, and nature of graduate programs within departments. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)