

## **Faculty Search Rubric Examples**

*September 2023*

Faculty search committees are required to develop a rubric before reviewing applicants. It is considered a best practice to make the process of evaluating faculty candidates as easy, consistent, and free from bias as possible.

This document includes several example rubrics to help generate ideas. They are not meant to be used directly. The search committee should create one(s) that makes sense for and is tailored to their search.

Note that while it takes more time to explicitly define what each level means for each criterion, once that is done, evaluators tend to be able to complete evaluations more quickly and consistently.

There are many additional resources on the web, such as:

- The Center for Teaching and Assessment of Learning (CTAL) provides more information about how to create a rubric, including a template (<https://ctal.udel.edu/resources-2/rubrics/>).
- <https://www.washington.edu/diversity/faculty-advancement/handbook/toolkit/>
- <https://www.northwestern.edu/provost/faculty-resources/faculty-searches/Resources/D-EvaluationRubrics.html>
- Best practices for designing effective rubrics (<https://teachonline.asu.edu/2019/02/best-practices-for-designing-effective-rubrics/>)
- <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/resources/improve/evaluate-course-level-learning/rubrics>

**Example 1a. For Screening Candidates**

If a candidate is below the minimum standard for a criterion, they earn 0 points. If they are between minimum and excellent, they earn 2 points for being better than the minimum but closer to that than excellent, and 3 points for being better than the minimum but closer to excellent than that.

Criterion	1 (minimum expectation)	2	3	4 (excellent)
Educational background	Ph.D degree in technical engineering field			Ph.D. degree in engineering education, with a B.S. or M.S. in technical engineering field, OR a Ph.D in a technical engineering field with significant (5+ years) experience in teaching engineering or in publishing in the scholarship of teaching and learning
Teaching experience	Has been instructor of record for at least one engineering course			Has five or more years experience teaching or coordinating in lower-level undergraduate courses in engineering
Familiarity with evidence-based teaching methods	Cites or mentions elements of active learning and/or the formal, rigorously documented approaches of Team Based Learning (TBL) or Problem Based Learning (PBL) as they relate to engineering pedagogy			Provides examples of familiarity of implementation and study of active learning, TBL, PBL, or other pedagogical innovation
Evidence of commitment to diversity and inclusion	Cites up-to-date publications in diversity and inclusion in STEM fields			Demonstrates experience in inclusive teaching in STEM and/or research in SoTL that include issues specific to diversity and inclusion

**Example 1b. For Final Review of Candidates**

Criterion	Weight	1 (minimum expectation)	2	3	4 (excellent)
Teaching experience	10%	Can discuss personal teaching philosophy and how it is borne out in teaching record			Can discuss personal teaching philosophy to include a variety of experiences in teaching lower-level undergraduate courses in engineering
Course development	20%	Can speak to an example of an improvement personally made to an undergraduate course			Can speak to significant course development (such as created a course from scratch or made serious revisions to an existing course) and how that experience can be applied to courses here
Coordination with faculty and teaching assistants	30%	Can discuss any experience in team teaching and/or directing teaching assistants			Can speak to a significant amount of course coordination either in terms of years of experience or number of faculty and assistants involved; can discuss how challenges in team teaching are addressed
Familiarity with evidence-based teaching methods	20%	Can speak contemporaneously to the implementation of active learning, PBL, TBL, or other pedagogical innovation in STEM			Can thoroughly discuss examples of implementation of active learning, TBL, PBL, or other pedagogical innovation in engineering
Evidence of commitment to diversity and inclusion	20%	Can speak contemporaneously to the issues of diversity and inclusion in undergraduate STEM education			Can thoroughly discuss personal implementation of inclusive teaching methods in STEM and/or research in [XX] that include issues specific to diversity and inclusion

## **Example 2. Evaluating Full Applicant Pool to Select Semi-finalist List**

1. Each committee member will review all applications. We will assign each committee member a start point from which they will proceed alphabetically so that we make sure there are a reasonable number of reviews for every candidate if some people did not complete all and so that there is a distribution of “fresh” and “tired” reviews for each candidate. Late applications will be added at the end of the alphabet and included in evaluation as appropriate.
2. Criteria for numerical evaluation of written applications
  - a. Past Productivity (35%)
    - i. 1 = no publications in quality journals
    - ii. 2 = <5 publications in quality journals or more in lower-tier journals
    - iii. 3 = 4 first author pubs in quality (~list some) journals + 2-4 co-author pubs OR EQUIVALENT
    - iv. 4 = 10-20 publications in quality journals
    - v. 5 = >20 publications OR >5 extremely high-quality publications
  - b. Creativity / Quality of proposed research (25%)
    - i. 1 = poorly motivated, uninteresting, or poorly explained
    - ii. 2 = clearly motivated, feasible, interesting
    - iii. 3 = Especially innovative or novel, breaks new ground
  - c. Strategic value to UD / Department (20%)
    - i. 1 = limited or no potential interactions
    - ii. 2 = Positive interactions with 1-2 other faculty but not in area of strategic area
    - iii. 3 = 4+ potential collaborators AND addresses strategic needs
  - d. Probability for high volume use of Center XX (20%)
    - i. 1=limited or no use of Center XX
    - ii. 2=medium use of Center XX
    - iii. 3=high volume use of Center XX
  - e. Teaching potential (Boolean multiplier)
    - i. 0 = unacceptably low teaching potential
    - ii. 1 = has reasonable teaching potential
  - f. Flag for special consideration
3. Reviewers will enter zeros for any noncompetitive candidate
4. When we meet to generate the semi-finalist, we will start with the top 30 as ranked by the rubric above, add all candidates any committee member believes should be given further consideration, then down-select back to 30.

### **Example 3. For Department Chair Search**

Each criterion will be rated 1 (high), 2 (medium), or 3 (low). The final scores will be weighted and summed for ranked evaluation.

1. **Visionary Internal Leadership** - strong, dynamic, and innovative (*30% weight*)
  - Research leadership and direction
    - Dedication to expanding collaborative and interdisciplinary environments
  - Effective internal leadership experience
    - Person skills.
  - Ability to communicate with and ‘persuade’ Dean/College administration.
  - Commitment to faculty mentoring
  - Values our values
    - Diversity, equity, and inclusion
    - Growth mindset – Faculty hires; staff hires; space expansion; teaching, lab, instruction, and research resource expansion
2. **Prominent External Leadership** - strong, dynamic, and innovative (*25%*)
  - Service to national/international professional community
  - Dedication to building department exposure nationally/internationally
  - Fellowships in professional societies and professional awards
  - Advocate for faculty and mentee awards nominations
3. **Vigorous Research Program** (*25%*)
  - Proven record of impactful research dissemination (papers, patents, presentations, citations)
  - Proven record of current and past externally funded research
  - Proven record of student/mentee training success
4. **Commitment to Undergraduate and Graduate Engineering Education** (*20%*)
  - Commitment to continuous evaluation and educational improvement
  - Supportive of innovative curriculum development/advancement
  - Supportive of interdisciplinary program development

**Example 4**

Criteria to the right are considered to include activities to the left, e.g., Strong leadership in column 4 includes significant budget experience from column 3

	Weight	1 Weak	2	3 OK	4 Strong
Visionary Leadership	High	No quantitative or qualitative research and funding leadership experience	Some research and funding leadership	A proven track record of research and funding leadership	Measurable research and funding leadership that improved rank, expanded collaborations, engaged with institution initiatives, and interdisciplinary environments; concrete plan or experience building department exposure nationally/internationally; significant experience growing (new facility expansion) and bottom line \$\$\$ and development
Administration	High	Little or no administrative experience	Led a non-academic unit, or a significant but finite project; significant college/university committee leadership	Served as Assoc Chair in a large dept; significant budget exp; other positions involving strategy, vertical communication;	Served as dept Chair, or head of Institute/School, or Asst Dean; Development success; heavy involvement outside dept; success building reputation/exposure; record of fostering interdisciplinary and collaborative work and mentoring
Research	Med	Individual success in funding and publications	Strong publication record, some interdisciplinary and collaborative success	Exceptionally strong publication record, Led interdisciplinary or multi-institutional teams; part of multiple collaborative efforts	Led research teams, built and fostered interdisciplinary collaborations; promoted and developed research in their unit; led and facilitated funding efforts/applications
Education	Med	Teaches, but no evidence of high quality; no history of program or curriculum development.	Some program/curricular development at grad or undergrad level.	Substantial course design, solid teaching record. Mentions teaching/education multiple times in interview (not just as direct answer). Program and curriculum development; awareness of research-based teaching methods	History of significant program or curriculum development; grad and undergrad level; uses/promotes research-based teaching methods; awards, or documented excellence in teaching record; interdisciplinary or community involvement in courses; develops teaching in graduate students;
General Fit for UD	Some	Dismissive of any of our core values; Interrupts people or does not listen well;			Shares our values of increasing rank, funding and research, exceptional people skills, diversity/equity/inclusion, and excellent teaching; values Dean's emphasis on visionary leadership in college, innovation, and national/international rank & funding increase; evidence of strong university/community participation
Recommendations	Some	Vague endorsements		Specific examples of high performance in multiple categories above;	Mentions visionary leadership, powers of persuasion and collaboration, advocacy, and impactful administration; quantitative funding and rank increase; qualitative increase on program/dept administration, faculty, students and staff, diversity/equity/inclusion

**Example 5**

	Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Adequate (3)	Inadequate (1)
Education and background	1A. PhD in relevant area of study	Academic background in [key area of interest]	Some [key area of interest] in academic background	Background in strongly allied field	Academic background weakly relevant
	1B. Post-PhD experience	1-3 years relevant post-PhD experience/not tenured	PhD in hand, but <1 yr. post-PhD experience	Clearly ABD (all but done)	not ABD or not in PhD program
	1C. Communication skills	Well-written cover letter and teaching/research/diversity statements with excellent English expression	Cover letter and teaching/research/diversity statements are well written with minimal grammatical errors	Cover letter and teaching/research/diversity statements are understandable, but contain significant grammatical errors	Cover letter and teaching/research/diversity statements are so poorly written as to be difficult to understand
Research potential	2A. Publication history	ABD/New PhD (3 or more published) plus for post-PhD (2+/yr. published)	ABD/New PhD (2 published) plus for post- PhD (1/year published)	ABD/New PhD (1 published) plus for post- PhD (1 submitted)	ABD/New PhD (none published) plus for post-PhD (nothing past PhD submitted)
	2B. Scholarly impact	At least one paper in TOP TIER JOURNAL (list examples of those journals)	At least one paper in high impact journal in field with wide readership)	At least one paper in high-impact, discipline-specific journal	All papers in low-impact journals or in non-peer reviewed literature
	2C. Funding history	ABD/New PhD (NSF fellowship or equivalent); Post-PhD (own external funding and evidence that they are looking for ways to obtain further funding)	ABD/New PhD (small grant from professional org); Post-PhD (small grant from professional organization or proposal submitted to external agency)	ABD/New PhD (internal university grant); Post-PhD (helped with gaining external funding)	ABD/New PhD (no funding); Post-PhD (no experience in gaining funds or writing proposals)
	2D. Potential to develop a well-funded program	Research statement contains concrete ideas for program focus and ideas for funding it	Research statement contains concrete ideas for program	Research statement discusses previous work, with some allusions toward potential program	No proposed program focus
Teaching potential	3A. Classroom teaching experience	Taught an undergraduate course	TA experience at the college level	Guest lectures or other ad hoc teaching at the college level	K-12 activities or equivalent experience
	3B. Classroom teaching potential	Teaching statement contains novel ideas for courses and content statement describes teaching philosophy and pedagogical approach; candidate indicates how teaching efforts would fit into current offerings	Teaching statement contains novel ideas for courses and content; statement describes teaching philosophy or pedagogical approach; proposed offerings clearly relevant to department focus	Teaching statement contains concrete ideas regarding course offerings and content; proposed offerings do not consider department focus	Teaching statement lists courses without reference to content or simply lists current course offerings
	3C. Research student supervision	ABD/New PhD (evidence of mentoring junior graduate students and/or undergraduates); post-PhD (has supervised a graduate student)	ABD/New PhD (teaching or research statement discusses approach to working w/graduate students); post-PhD (evidence of mentoring grads and/or undergrads)	Teaching or research statement mentions development of graduate program, but w/little specific detail regarding approach or vision	No reference to graduate program development or student supervision in teaching or research statements
Outreach	5A. Potential for outreach	Evidence in application materials that candidate has been instrumental in organizing outreach activities	Evidence in application materials that candidate has participated in outreach activities	Evidence in application materials that candidate has enthusiasm for outreach, but has not so far participated	No enthusiasm for outreach activities evident in application materials

**Example 6a: To Evaluate Applications**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Criterion Weight</b>	<b>4 Well-Qualified</b>	<b>3 Exceeding Criteria</b>	<b>2 Meeting Criteria</b>	<b>1 Not Meeting Criteria</b>
Degree	Yes/No	Has/Will have a PhD in civil + environmental engineering			Does not have a PhD in CEE
Research Experience (Publications + Funding)	30%	multiple first-author publications in high quality journals AND external competitive funding	multiple first-author publications in high quality journals OR external competitive funding	one first-author publication in a high quality journal AND promise of securing external competitive funding	no publications in quality journals
Proposed Research	30%	highly innovative, groundbreaking, high potential impact	novel, motivated, problem-focused, feasible	motivated, interesting	not motivated, inarticulate
Teaching Potential (G + UG teaching & mentoring)	30%	relevant teaching experience AND excellent teaching/diversity record and/or statement	relevant teaching experience OR excellent teaching/diversity statement	some teaching experience AND good teaching statement	little teaching experience OR average statement
Potential for Collaborations at UD	10%	Past: publications with other groups AND Future: high collaboration potential in strategic area	Past: publications with other groups OR Future: high collaboration potential in strategic area	Past: work with other groups OR Future: potential collaboration in strategic area	Limited record of collaboration AND collaboration @ UD unlikely

100%



**Example 6b: To Evaluate Zoom Interviewees**

Category	Question/Criterion	Criterion Weight	4 Excellent	3 Above Average	2 Below Average	1 Poor
Professionalism	<i>Professional rapport with interviewers</i>	Yes/No	Acceptable behavior and language. Attempts to be courteous to all involved in interview.			Unacceptable behavior and/or language.
Research (quality, vision)	First, can you start by telling us a little bit about your current and recent work in environmental engineering and your vision for your future research program.	20%	Well-organized self-introduction OR demonstrated ability to conduct high-quality research	Reasonably organized self-introduction AND potentially conducts high-quality research	Self-introduction is unclear or meandering OR research does not appear to be high quality	Self-introduction is unclear or meandering AND research does not appear to be high quality
Research (impact)	What do you see as the major challenges in your field of study over the next 5-7 years, and how do you envision your research contributing to these challenges?	20%	Clearly contextualized challenge AND contribution is especially innovative or novel, breaks new ground	Clearly contextualized challenge AND contribution is feasible, interesting	Challenge not clearly described OR contribution is unclear or uninteresting	Challenge not clearly described AND contribution is unclear or uninteresting
Research (group, equipment)	What is your vision for your research group at UD in terms of size, student type (undergrad / MS / PhD), the type of research projects they would take on, and the methods/equipment that they would use?	5%	Has a vision that is reasonable for UD	Has a vision that is reasonable for UD with minor modification	Vision raises concerns for how well it would work at UD	No vision OR poorly articulated vision

<b>Category</b>	<b>Question/Criterion</b>	<b>Criterion Weight</b>	<b>4 Excellent</b>	<b>3 Above Average</b>	<b>2 Below Average</b>	<b>1 Poor</b>
Research (funding)	How would you obtain funding and any other resources that would be needed to support this group and this type of research?	15%	Demonstrates knowledge of external funding landscape AND path to external funding seems promising	Demonstrates knowledge of external funding landscape OR path to external funding seems promising	Knowledge of external funding landscape is shaky OR path to external funding is questionable	Knowledge of external funding landscape is shaky AND path to external funding is questionable
Collaboration	What opportunities do you see for collaboration here at UD and/or what type of collaborations would you like to develop?	10%	Clearly articulated vision for collaborations AND strong potential to collaborate at UD	Clearly articulated vision for collaborations OR strong potential to collaborate at UD	Expresses interest in collaboration AND some potential to collaborate at UD	No interest in collaboration OR collaboration ideas poorly articulated OR collaboration at UD is unlikely
Teaching (courses)	What would be a) an introductory undergraduate-level course and b) an advanced, graduate level course you would be excited to teach and why? <i>(Follow up if needed: is there anything more general you would be interested in teaching?)</i>	10%	Expresses enthusiasm for instruction AND one or more courses are a good fit for the department	Expresses willingness to teach undergraduate courses AND one or more courses are a good fit for the department	Expresses willingness to teach undergraduate courses	Does not express a willingness to teach undergraduate courses

<b>Category</b>	<b>Question/Criterion</b>	<b>Criterion Weight</b>	<b>4 Excellent</b>	<b>3 Above Average</b>	<b>2 Below Average</b>	<b>1 Poor</b>
Teaching (experience/philosophy)	What has been a) your best and b) your worst experience as a teacher or mentor, and how would these experiences inform your teaching and/or mentorship at UD?	15%	Demonstrates thoughtful approach through past experiences AND appropriately identifies good practices	Demonstrates thoughtful approach through past experiences OR appropriately identifies good practices	No past experience OR does not demonstrate thoughtfulness or awareness of good practices	No past experience AND does not demonstrate thoughtfulness or awareness of good practices
DEI	The University and the Department are committed to building a diverse and inclusive environment. How can you contribute to this goal?	5%	Expresses support for building a diverse and inclusive environment AND offers exciting idea for personal implementation of inclusive teaching methods and/or research that includes issues specific to DEI	Expresses support for building a diverse and inclusive environment AND offers an appropriate idea for personal implementation of inclusive teaching methods and/or research that includes issues specific to DEI	Expresses support for building a diverse and inclusive environment, but idea is unclear, off-base, or poorly articulated	Does not express support for building a diverse and inclusive environment
Wrap up	Are there any questions you'd like to go back to? What questions do you have for us?					

100%

**Example 6c: To Evaluate In-person Interviewees**

<b>Question/Criterion</b>	<b>Criterion Weight</b>	<b>4 Excellent</b>	<b>3 Above Average</b>	<b>2 Below Average</b>	<b>1 Poor</b>
Professionalism	Yes/No	Acceptable behavior and language. Attempts to be courteous to all involved in interview.			Unacceptable behavior and/or language.
Ability to conduct high-quality research with real-world impact	40%	All of: - Demonstrated ability to conduct high-quality research with real-world impact - Exciting vision for innovative or novel future contributions. - Engaging seminar AND strong conversations during individual meetings.	All of: - Demonstrated ability to conduct high-quality research with real-world impact - Feasible vision for innovative or novel future contributions. - Engaging seminar OR strong conversations during individual meetings.	One of: - Research does not appear to be high quality or impactful - Unconvincing vision for future contributions - Confusing or poor communication in seminar or during individual meetings	Multiple of: - Research does not appear to be high quality or impactful - Unconvincing vision for future contributions - Confusing or poor communication in seminar or during individual meetings
Promise of or demonstrated success in securing funding	20%	Demonstrated success in funding or award recognition AND path to future external funding seems promising	Demonstrated success in funding or award recognition OR path to future external funding seems promising	Path to future external funding is questionable, but possible	Path to future external funding is unlikely
Likelihood of collaborations at UD	10%	Clearly articulated vision for collaborations AND strong potential to collaborate at UD	Clearly articulated vision for collaborations OR strong potential to collaborate at UD	Expresses interest in collaboration AND some potential to collaborate at UD	No interest in collaboration OR collaboration ideas poorly articulated OR collaboration at UD is unlikely

<b>Question/Criterion</b>	<b>Criterion Weight</b>	<b>4 Excellent</b>	<b>3 Above Average</b>	<b>2 Below Average</b>	<b>1 Poor</b>
Promise of or demonstrated excellence in teaching and mentoring	25%	Converses comfortably about teaching and mentoring with appropriate references to good practices AND enthusiastic about contributing to department teaching needs	Converses comfortably about teaching and mentoring with appropriate references to good practices AND willing/able to contribute to department teaching needs	Willing/able to contribute to department teaching needs	Not familiar with best practices, little thought in teaching/mentoring approach OR unlikely to contribute to department teaching needs
Commitment to DEI within the discipline, Department, and University	5%	Expresses support for building a diverse and inclusive environment AND offers exciting idea(s) for personal implementation of inclusive teaching methods and/or research that includes issues specific to DEI	Expresses support for building a diverse and inclusive environment AND offers appropriate idea(s) for personal implementation of inclusive teaching methods and/or research that includes issues specific to DEI	Expresses support for building a diverse and inclusive environment, but ideas are unclear, off-base, or poorly articulated	Does not express support for building a diverse and inclusive environment

100%