

Faculty Evaluation Rubrics

Rubrics are often used in teaching to assess and evaluate student learning as well as the quality of a student’s work. They can also be useful for evaluating faculty candidates and faculty performance. Rubrics not only help maintain consistency in the evaluation process and reduce bias, but they also help those under evaluation have a more clear understanding of performance expectations.

Rubrics provide a set of explicit evaluation criteria for assessing achievement on a wide variety of activities such as assignments, presentations, productivity, etc. Rubrics generally consist of three components: criteria, levels of performance, and descriptors.

Two common types of rubrics are **holistic rubrics and analytic rubrics**. Holistic rubrics assess a single level of performance, though multiple criteria are considered (see Table 1). Analytic rubrics assign a level of performance for each criterion (see Table 2).

<p>Excellent Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptor • Descriptor
<p>Good Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptor • Descriptor
<p>Poor Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptor • Descriptor

Table 1: Generic Holistic Rubric.

	Excellent	Good	Poor
Criteria 1	Descriptor	Descriptor	Descriptor
Criteria 2	Descriptor	Descriptor	Descriptor
Criteria 3	Descriptor	Descriptor	Descriptor

Table 2: Generic Analytic Rubric.

Below are links to several faculty evaluation rubrics. While these institutions are generally not peer institutions, nevertheless, the rubrics are instructive. They provide a variety of examples of how to define levels of performance, language for descriptors, and different rubric models.

- **Holistic Rubric** for each of the main areas of faculty responsibilities (Teaching, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Activity/Service): Ohio University College of Business Faculty Performance Evaluation: [http://aspnet.cob.ohio.edu/isms/upload/documents/32_634656961502193192_Appendix A 2012.docx](http://aspnet.cob.ohio.edu/isms/upload/documents/32_634656961502193192_Appendix_A_2012.docx) (See <http://aspnet.cob.ohio.edu/isms/cobContent.aspx?cid=1300> for general process information)
- **Analytic Rubric** for each of the main areas of faculty responsibilities (Teaching and Advising, Research and Scholarship Activity, and Service): University of North Dakota Department of Teaching and Learning: http://education.und.edu/teaching-and-learning/_files/docs/tenure-promotion-guidelines.pdf

Some additional rubrics available online which might be worth examining:

- University of Tennessee Knoxville Educational Leadership and Policy Studies: http://elps.utk.edu/Appendix%20A_ELPS%20Faculty%20Evaluation%20Guidelines.pdf
- Northwestern Oklahoma State University: www.nwosu.edu/facultyevaluation
- Southwest College: <http://www.swccd.edu/Docs/FacEvalRubricA2006.doc>

Example: Holistic Rubric for Research Performance from Ohio University College of Business Faculty

Level 1

No evidence of research activity

Level 2

The minimum expectation for research activity may be met with at least one of the following activities:

- Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal
- Submission of manuscript or instructional software to publisher
- Submission of paper to peer-reviewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting
- Documented progress on or completion of a manuscript/working paper
- Submission of an external grant proposal
- Funding of an internal grant request
- Attendance at a Research Development workshop, seminar, or conference. The faculty member should describe the impact of the development activity in the narrative.
- Invited published papers

A Group I faculty member who has no course reductions for research cannot be evaluated as being a "Level 2" in three successive years. If this happens, the faculty member will be rated as a "Level 1" until a rating of at least Level 3 has been achieved.

Level 3

Achievement of at least one of the following results:

- Submission of external research grant proposal judged as being significant by peers and departmental chairs/directors
- Presentation of peer-reviewed paper, workshop, symposia, poster-session, etc., at an acceptable academic, professional, or pedagogical conference or meeting
- Invited published papers judged by peers as requiring significant effort or having a significant impact based on quality or publication outlet.
- Publication of a case or paper in peer-reviewed meeting proceedings or book
- Publication of chapter in scholarly book, professional book or textbook
- Publication of book review in peer-reviewed journal
- Publication of editorials or research comments in professional or academic publication.

Level 3.5

Publication of one Acceptable Journal article

Level 4

Evaluation in Level 4 is earned by achievement of one of the following results:

- Publication of a High Quality Journal article
- Publication of two Acceptable Journal articles
- Publication of peer-reviewed research monograph
- Publication of a new edition of a scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director
- Publication of instructional software judged as significant by the faculty's peers and departmental chair/director
- Funding of external research grant (including OURC and Baker) judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

Level 4.5

Evaluation at Level 4.5 is earned by publication of 2 High Quality Journal Articles

Level 5

Evaluation in Level 5 is earned by

- Publication of an Elite Journal article earns a Level 5 rating for two consecutive years.
- Publication of one Top Journal article
- Publication of a new scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.

Example: Analytic Rubric for Research Performance from UND Department of Teaching and Learning:

Research & Scholarly Activity	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Scholarly Agenda	The candidate demonstrates an on-going sustained research program; research goals are clearly being met. Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations merits an excellent rating.	Evidence is provided that an on-going research program exists; achievement of goals may vary. Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations merits an adequate rating.	No or little evidence is provided that an on-going research program exists; program may consist of goals with minimal implementation or completion. Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations indicates insufficient progress.
Publications & Presentations	Publication accomplishments have allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria that results in associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty. Publications and presentations indicate products are judged to be of value to the candidate's field. Quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are evident. Three refereed or juried presentations are made at the national and international level. At minimum, six total publications are achieved: 4 major publications and at least 2 minor publications. Or, equivalent publication achievements clearly meet or exceed expectations for a record of excellence.	Publication accomplishments have allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria that results in associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty. Publications and presentations indicate products are judged to be of value to the candidate's field. Quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are evident. Three refereed or juried presentations are made at the regional, national and/or international level. At minimum, six total publications are achieved: 3 major publications and 3 minor publications. Or, equivalent publication achievements meet expectations for adequate.	Publication accomplishments have not allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria to attain associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty. Publications and presentations may have been accomplished, but quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are not evident; or the role of the candidate in the work was limited. Less than three refereed or juried presentations are made, or role was routinely minimal in the work. The candidate has not achieved the minimum of 3 major publications

