# Sample research rubric (draft – should be tailored to hiring goals of each search and the hiring unit)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rubric Ranking** | | | |
|  | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (3)** | **Fair (2)** | **Poor (1)** |
| **Evidence of research productivity and scholarly impact** | (1) The applicant’s track record exceeds a level of productivity, as assessed by existence of peer reviewed research work and dissemination of research findings (papers, patents, presentations, seminars, blogs, podcasts, articles, website, etc.) that corresponds to the applicant’s career stage | The applicants track record meets an expected level of productivity, as assessed by existence of peer reviewed research work and dissemination of research findings (papers, patents, presentations, seminars, blogs, podcasts, articles, website, etc.) that corresponds to the applicant’s career stage  OR  The applicant’s track record meets an expected level of productivity corresponding to their career stage (e.g., *‘excellent description*’), but does not clearly exceed typical levels on multiple criteria. | The applicants track record is below an expected level of productivity, as assessed by existence of peer reviewed research work and dissemination of research findings (papers, patents, presentations, seminars, blogs, podcasts, articles, website, etc.) that corresponds to the applicant’s career stage  OR  The applicant’s track record is below an expected level of productivity corresponding to their career stage. There are notable gaps in at least one of the criteria described under ‘*excellent*’. | The applicants track record is lacking in one or more areas of productivity, including existence of peer reviewed research work, dissemination of research work, or work that is in the process of peer review.  OR  The applicant’s track record is substantially lacking in multiple dimensions of ‘research productivity’ as evidenced by comparatively low production of research products and failure to demonstrate sustained funding of their research program. |
| **Potential for scholarly impact** | The applicants research statement achieves all of the following aspects:  (1) clearly and cohesively describes creative and innovative research,  (2) identifies a clear plan outlined for a path forward upon starting as a faculty,  (3) demonstrates awareness of the impact of the proposed research (4) aligns proposed work with the departments’ strengths/initiatives | The applicants research statement achieves three of the four following aspects:  (1) clearly and cohesively describes creative and innovative research,  (2) identifies a clear plan outlined for a path forward upon starting as a faculty,  (3) demonstrates awareness of the impact of the proposed research  (4) aligns proposed work with the departments’ strengths/initiatives | The applicants research statement achieves two of the four following aspects:  (1) clearly and cohesively describes creative and innovative research,  (2) identifies a clear plan outlined for a path forward upon starting as a faculty,  (3) demonstrates awareness of the impact of the proposed research  (4) aligns proposed work with the departments’ strengths/initiatives | The applicants research statement is lacking in most or all of the following aspects:  (1) clearly and cohesively describes creative and innovative research,  (2) identifies a clear plan outlined for a path forward upon starting as a faculty,  (3) demonstrates awareness of the impact of the proposed research  (4) aligns proposed work with the departments’ strengths/initiatives |
| **Overall collaborative and institutional potential and alignment with the search’s research emphasis** | The applicant has clear potential to leverage the UW infrastructure, environment, and collaborations in areas of existing or emerging strengths within Dept and beyond  **AND**  Applicant’s stated research goals are in alignment with the search’s emphasis | The applicant has clear potential to leverage the UW infrastructure, environment, and collaborations in areas of existing or emerging strengths within Dept and beyond  **OR**  Applicant’s stated research goals are in alignment with the search’s emphasis | The applicant will be limited in leveraging the UW infrastructure, environment, and collaborations in areas of existing or emerging strengths within Dept and beyond  **AND**  Applicant’s stated research goals are marginally aligned with the search’s emphasis | The applicant will have little to no potential to leverage the UW infrastructure, environment, and collaborations in areas of existing or emerging strengths within UW Dept and beyond  **OR**  Applicant’s stated research goals are not aligned with the search’s emphasis |

# Sample teaching rubric (draft)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rubric Ranking** | | | |
|  | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (3)** | **Fair (2)** | **Poor (1)** |
| **Evidence of excellence in engineering teaching** | The applicant demonstrates a track record of excellence in engineering teaching exceeding a typical professor at their career stage as evidenced by items such as:  1) teaching awards or other recognitions  2) development innovative curricula or training programs  3) publication or presentation of teaching-related activities | The applicant demonstrates an expected level of teaching excellence corresponding to their career stage, but does not obviously exceed their peers in any noteworthy manner | The applicant’s track record in engineering teaching lacks depth, breath, or is noteworthy in absence of any accolades or recognitions for excellence in teaching | The applicant’s track record in engineering teaching lacks depth and breadth, contains no evidence of engagement in teaching beyond the classroom and contains no recognition of teaching excellence |
| **Evidence of teaching or interest and potential in contributing to the curriculum** | The applicant has indicated a strong interest and outlined a clear plan for teaching that is aligned with the departmental needs, including teaching interest in core classes at the graduate or undergraduate levels, electives, lab and/or design options. | The applicant has indicated an interest and outlined a clear plan for teaching, but the teaching plan does not necessarily align with the departmental needs in teaching core classes at the graduate or undergraduate levels, electives, lab and/or design options. | The applicant has indicated an interest in teaching but has not outlined a clear plan or the teaching plan does not align with the departmental needs, in teaching core classes at the graduate or undergraduate levels, electives, lab and/or design options. | The applicant has indicated no or little interest in teaching in engineering or does not provide a teaching plan. |

# Sample DEI rubric (draft – should be tailored to hiring goals of each search and the hiring unit)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rubric Ranking** | | | |
|  | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (3)** | **Fair (2)** | **Poor (1)** |
| **Demonstrated action or plan to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field** | Strong track record of multiple (different activities, addressing DEI in multiple spaces like research, teaching, mentoring, etc.) and consistent actions or demonstrated leadership to advance diversity, equity, and/or inclusion in the field, with impacts at either the individual or systems levels. Actions guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field.  OR  Detailed plan of action to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field, with impacts at either the individual or systems levels, and that is guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field. Plan includes multiple and diverse strategies across multiple areas of responsibility. | Track record of several actions (different activities, addressing DEI in multiple spaces like research, teaching, mentoring, etc.) to advance diversity, equity, and/or inclusion in the field, with impacts at either the individual or systems levels. Actions guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field.  OR  General plan of action to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field, with impacts at either the individual or systems levels, and that is guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field. Plan addresses multiple areas of responsibility. | Minimal record of action (e.g., one-off activity, passive action, confined to one area of responsibility, etc.) to advance diversity, equity, and/or inclusion in the field, with impacts at either the individual or systems levels.  OR  Generic plan of action (possibly not guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise) to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field, with impacts at either the individual or systems levels. Plan focuses on only one area of responsibility. | Little to no prior action to advance diversity, equity, and/or inclusion in the field.  OR  No plan of action to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field, |
| **Demonstrated or planned contribution to diversity, equity, and inclusion** | Excellent past participation and leadership in meaningful DEI activities and detailed plan (guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field) for continued contribution to DEI as a faculty member | Past participation and/or leadership in meaningful DEI activities and a plan (guided by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field) for continued contribution to DEI as a faculty member | Limited participation in meaningful DEI activities or minimal plan for contribution to DEI as faculty member. Past participation and future planned contribution minimally informed by the literature, data, or other relevant expertise on DEI in the field. | Little or no participation in meaningful DEI activities and little to no plan for contribution to DEI as faculty member. |