

## Universeity of Sample Research Evaluation Rubric

The rubric provides descriptors for the indicators associated with each criterion. Departments may wish to use a rubric like this for evaluation, or as a tool for collective discussion in the development of standards.

<b>Criterion 1:</b> Expertise in research or creative area, relevant methodologies and effective and ethical project management	N/A	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good/Superior (5-6)	Excellent (7)
a) An active or well-constructed research or creative activity plan, and a history of successful plans or programs <sup>1</sup>		Weak record of organized research activity. Research activities do not demonstrate a clearly focused research program, or the program may consist of goals with minimal evidence of implementation or completion. What evidence of progress there is does not suggest regular effort and progress towards established goals.	Evidence of organized research activity and an emerging research focus. The candidate provides evidence that research goals are being met, including articles and grant applications submitted for review, on a regular basis. Clear research statement.	The candidate demonstrates an ongoing, clearly focused, and highly active research program, with a continued pattern of quality articles under review. Strong evidence of an established research program with a promising trajectory and evidence of sustained evidence and success. Clearly focused research plan articulated in a research statement	Well-articulated and successful research agenda. Evidence that research goals are being met and exceeded, of ongoing re-evaluation and planning reflecting the development of new directions and expanding reach or depth. Evidence of leadership in meeting research agenda, and strong evidence of continuing productivity (e.g. pending publications, under review, grants submitted).
b) Conformity with all relevant institutional, disciplinary and funding agency ethical and research guidelines		There is evidence of lack of conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary, and funding agency ethical and research guidelines	There is no evidence of lack of conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary, and funding agency ethical research guidelines	The candidate demonstrates a high degree of attention to institutional, disciplinary and funding agency ethical research guidelines, and actively ensures that all	The candidate demonstrates a high degree of attention to institutional, disciplinary and funding agency ethical research guidelines, and leadership in actively developing and

<sup>1</sup> Departments may wish to request that proponents include in their research statements an explanation of why they selected the specific articles or exemplars chosen for review as part of the tenure and promotion package: this explanation can be used in conjunction with the summary of their research program and their CV to assess the progress and coherence of the program of research or creative activity.

				members of his or her team uphold those standards.	enhancing the ethical principles of research as the field evolves.
--	--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

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)
<p>a) Publishes in journals or with publishing houses with a strong academic reputation<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Creative activity occurs in significant venues, institutions based on peer review<sup>3</sup></p>		<p>Publications, if they occur, have not been peer-reviewed, or in journals, or with publishers limited academic reputations, or been self-published</p> <p>Performance, installation, and exhibition, if it occurs, is generally not based on peer review consistent with the standard of peer-review</p>	<p>Publications have been peer reviewed, and are generally published in well-respected journals or through publishing houses with high quality academic reputations.</p> <p>Performance, installation, and exhibition sometimes occurs in venues, institutions, and series that reach the degree of reputation and significance established</p>	<p>Publications are published in journals or with publishing houses with strong national or international reputations.</p> <p>Performance, installation, and exhibition occurs in venues, institutions, and series that reach the degree of reputation and significance established by the department, based on peer review consistent standard of</p>	<p>Many publications are published in journals or with publishing houses of elite national or international reputations.</p> <p>Performance, installation, and exhibition occurs in venues, institutions, and series that regularly exceed the degree of reputation and significance established by the department, based on peer review consistent standard of peer-review established by the department</p>

<sup>2</sup> Departments may wish to provide quantitative metrics such as journal impact factors as an element of their standards. Factors such as low acceptance rates, high levels of readership, importance to the field are also suggestive indicators in assessing quality and reputation. Some departments have used an illustrative model to articulate publications that are at acceptable levels. Departments may also wish to identify the range of publications or other products that should be taken into account.

<sup>3</sup> Factors such as location, the institution or series' influence and reputation, the jury's reputation, and reach and impact of events, and documentary evidence (inclusion in catalogues, exhibit books or professionally produced videos, for example) might be taken into account in establishing departmental standards for assessing the significance or reputation of sites of creative activity.

		established by the department, and occurs in venues, institutions, and series that do not reach the degree of reputation and significance established by the department.	by the department, based on peer review consistent with the standard of peer-review established by the department.	peer-review established by the department.	
b) Research dissemination or creative activity is at the national and/or international level		Research dissemination or creative activity is not at the national or international level	Research dissemination or creative activity is often at the national or international level.	Research dissemination or creative activity is consistently at the national or international level	Research dissemination or creative activity is consistently recognized widely and national and/or international levels.
c) Pace and quantity of publications or creative activity is consistent with disciplinary standards for strong scholarly performance <sup>4</sup>		Very limited or no publications	Has typically met the departmental productivity standard.	Has consistently met and in some areas exceeded the departmental productivity standard.	Consistently exceeds the productivity standard
d) Peer review <sup>5</sup> indicates that publications or creative activity is of high quality		Peer review indicates that publications or creative activity are of uneven quality.	Peer review indicates that publications are of satisfactory quality.	Peer review indicates that publications are of good quality.	Peer review indicates that publications are of excellent quality.

<sup>4</sup> As publication pace varies considerably among disciplines, departments are asked either to provide quantitative standards in the rubric, or in an appendix if a more detailed explanation of possible variations is required. Factors such as individual vs. collaborative work and degree of significance in collaborations should be taken into account.

<sup>5</sup> This may include both internal and external peer review of publications or documented creative activity. Departments considering creative activity should provide clarity regarding how creative activity should be documented for peer review.

<b>Criterion 3:</b> 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)
a) Original contributions to the field of study or creative practice that influenced thinking and/or practice in the field, including extent to which research or creative activity is considered, referred to, read; citation in documents; impact factors, citation counts, publication rates, confidential external reviews of impact		Weak evidence of original contributions to the field.	Evidence of original contributions to the field: some evidence that the research or creative activity has been read, considered, referred to by others in the field or as the basis for practical applications. <sup>6</sup>	Evidence of original contributions that are influencing the evolution of the field, practice, or thinking within the discipline or as practical applications	Evidence of major original contributions with significant impact within the discipline or through practical applications.
b) National recognition/ leadership within the area of research specialty		Little evidence of recognition as a contributor to the field nationally.	Some evidence of emerging recognition within the area of research specialty, including potentially invitations to give addresses, residencies, or research partnerships.	Strong evidence of national recognition within the area of research, including invitation to give keynote addresses, offer master classes, fellowships, major residencies or exchanges.	Strong evidence of national and emerging international recognition either in the area of research including keynotes, guest residencies, major and highly competitive research fellowship, residencies or exchanges.

<sup>6</sup> Departments may wish to provide more specific quantifiers based on factors including impact factors of journals, citation counts, and elements of the candidate’s research statement supported by evidence

DRAFT

<b>Criterion 4:</b> Effective research or commissioned income generation and infrastructure development strategies <sup>7</sup>	N/A	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good/Superior (5-6)	Excellent (7)
a) Ability to attract internal or external research or creative activity funding		Efforts to or success in acquiring research funding have not been consistent with the satisfactory standard established by the unit	Submission of external grant proposal and funding internal or external grant requests generally meet the standards set by the department.	Funding of external research grants judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.	History of regular, repeated and evolving success in major granting competitions, including those considered being the most highly competitive within the discipline, given the career stage of the candidate.
b) Ability to foster partnerships that directly contribute to research capacity or the development of research or creative activity infrastructure		No or weak evidence of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Some degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Strong degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Exceptional degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

c) Engagement in grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field		No or weak evidence of in grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	Some evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	Strong evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	Exceptional evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.
<b>Criterion 5:</b> Demonstrated ability to attract and successfully mentor and train students in research <sup>8</sup>	N/A	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good/Superior (5-6)	Excellent (7)
a) Successful graduate student recruitment, supervision and mentorship		There is little evidence of successful graduate student recruitment, supervision and mentorship	Some evidence of successful graduate student recruitment, supervision and mentorship.	Evidence that graduate students were recruited based on the candidate's reputation or actions, or that students supervised or mentored regularly met with solid success.	Clear evidence that the candidate attracts graduate students, and successfully supervises and mentors them to high achievement.
b) Graduate student access to external funds and HQP opportunities		There is little evidence that the candidate has provided opportunities to graduate students in terms of financial support or HQP opportunities.	The candidate has provided some degree of opportunity to graduate students, either in terms of financial or HQP opportunities.	There is a solid record of providing graduate students with financial and HQP opportunities.	The candidate has provided excellent financial and HQP opportunities for graduate students.

<sup>8</sup> 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.



c) Evidence of collaboration with graduate students on publication, research, or creative activity		No evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate students.	Some evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate students	Strong evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate students	Exceptional evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate students
--	--	---	--	--	---

DRAFT

<b>Criterion 6: Influence on and contributions to the academic and broader national/international community.</b>	N/A	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good/Superior (5-6)	Excellent (7)
a) Evidence of capacity to build productive research collaboration		No or weak evidence of research collaborations	Evidence of involvement in research collaborations	Evidence of leadership roles or strong demand for involvement in research collaborations	Leadership in developing and sustaining research collaborations on a national and international scale.
b) Publicly engaged academic work		No or weak evidence of public engagement in academic work (e.g. invited public or industry presentations or performances, media engagement with original or expert knowledge, consultation for industry or community or national communities, community-based knowledge dissemination).	Evidence of public or industry engagement in academic work.	Evidence of leadership and significantly impactful public or industry engagement in academic work.	Evidence of significant impact on social discourse, industry or community practice, on an industry-wide, national, or international basis.
c) Leadership contributions to national disciplinary academic associations or to the disciplinary community.		No contributions to national disciplinary or academic associations or to the disciplinary community, professional organizations, or academic community groups. .	Evidence of contributions such as peer review or other engagement with national disciplinary or academic associations and intermittent or	Evidence of significant contributions to committees of national I or international disciplinary academic associations, as well as the disciplinary community, particularly with evidence of specific initiatives undertaken.	Assumption of formal leadership roles on national or international disciplinary or academic associations, particularly with evidence of specific initiatives undertake and recurring instances of improvement-oriented leadership which expands the network of those communities.

			regional service to the disciplinary community.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

**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.