# Progress Evaluation Rubric

# Progress Evaluation Rubric

This rubric provides standardized criteria for evaluating research progress and performance across different roles in the IDEEAS Lab.

## Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

### Research Progress and Quality (40%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Consistently meets or exceeds research milestones - Produces high-quality, rigorous research outputs - Demonstrates deep understanding of research area - Shows innovation and original thinking - Effectively integrates feedback and improves work

**Proficient (3)**: - Generally meets research milestones on time - Produces solid, methodologically sound research - Shows good understanding of research area - Incorporates some original ideas or approaches - Responds well to feedback and makes improvements

**Developing (2)**: - Sometimes meets milestones but may need extensions - Research quality is acceptable but needs improvement - Basic understanding of research area with some gaps - Limited original contribution or innovation - Inconsistent in incorporating feedback

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Frequently misses milestones or requires significant support - Research quality below acceptable standards - Significant gaps in understanding of research area - Little evidence of original thinking - Difficulty incorporating feedback effectively

### Professional Skills Development (25%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Exceptional communication skills (written and oral) - Strong project management and time management - Demonstrates leadership in lab activities - Actively builds professional network - Excellent collaboration and teamwork skills

**Proficient (3)**: - Good communication skills with room for growth - Generally manages time and projects well - Contributes positively to lab community - Some networking and professional development - Works well with others on team projects

**Developing (2)**: - Communication skills need development - Struggles with time or project management - Limited contribution to lab community - Minimal professional development activities - Some challenges in collaborative work

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Poor communication skills affecting work quality - Significant time management or organization issues - Little engagement with lab community - No evidence of professional development - Difficulty working effectively with others

### Mentoring and Teaching (20%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Outstanding mentor to undergraduate researchers - Excellent teaching or TA performance - Actively supports peer learning and development - Demonstrates strong pedagogical understanding - Receives consistently positive feedback from mentees

**Proficient (3)**: - Good mentoring skills with positive outcomes - Solid teaching or TA performance - Supports peers when asked - Shows understanding of effective teaching practices - Generally positive feedback from mentees

**Developing (2)**: - Basic mentoring skills but needs development - Adequate teaching performance with room for improvement - Limited peer support or teaching involvement - Some understanding of pedagogical principles - Mixed feedback from mentees or students

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Poor mentoring skills or negative outcomes - Below-standard teaching performance - No involvement in peer support or teaching - Little understanding of effective teaching - Negative feedback from mentees or students

### Lab Citizenship and Ethics (15%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Exemplary lab citizenship and community building - Strong commitment to ethical research practices - Actively contributes to lab culture and operations - Demonstrates responsibility and accountability - Serves as positive role model for others

**Proficient (3)**: - Good lab citizenship with positive contributions - Consistent adherence to ethical standards - Regular participation in lab activities - Generally responsible and accountable - Positive influence on lab culture

**Developing (2)**: - Basic lab participation but could contribute more - Generally follows ethical guidelines - Inconsistent engagement with lab community - Sometimes needs reminders about responsibilities - Neutral impact on lab culture

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Poor lab citizenship or negative impact - Ethical concerns or violations - Minimal engagement with lab activities - Frequently irresponsible or unaccountable - Negative impact on lab culture or morale

## Undergraduate Researcher Evaluation Rubric

### Task Completion and Quality (35%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Consistently completes tasks on time and exceeds expectations - Work quality is exceptional for undergraduate level - Shows attention to detail and thoroughness - Demonstrates understanding of task importance - Requires minimal supervision

**Proficient (3)**: - Generally completes tasks on time with good quality - Work meets expectations for undergraduate level - Shows good attention to detail - Understands most aspects of assigned work - Requires moderate supervision and guidance

**Developing (2)**: - Sometimes completes tasks but may need extensions - Work quality is acceptable but inconsistent - Some attention to detail but misses important aspects - Basic understanding of work requirements - Requires significant supervision and support

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Frequently fails to complete tasks or meet deadlines - Work quality below acceptable standards - Poor attention to detail and accuracy - Limited understanding of work requirements - Requires constant supervision and direction

### Learning and Skill Development (30%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Rapidly acquires new skills and knowledge - Demonstrates mastery of technical tools and methods - Shows strong problem-solving abilities - Actively seeks learning opportunities - Applies learning effectively to new situations

**Proficient (3)**: - Steadily develops new skills and knowledge - Competent use of required tools and methods - Good problem-solving with some guidance - Participates in available learning opportunities - Generally applies learning to work tasks

**Developing (2)**: - Slow but steady skill and knowledge development - Basic competency in required tools and methods - Problem-solving requires significant guidance - Limited engagement with learning opportunities - Difficulty applying learning to new situations

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Little evidence of skill or knowledge development - Struggles with basic tools and methods - Cannot solve problems independently - No engagement with learning opportunities - Cannot apply learning to work tasks

### Communication and Collaboration (20%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Excellent written and verbal communication - Proactively communicates progress and challenges - Outstanding collaboration and teamwork - Actively contributes to team discussions - Professional in all interactions

**Proficient (3)**: - Good communication skills for undergraduate level - Regular communication about work progress - Works well with team members - Contributes to team when asked - Generally professional behavior

**Developing (2)**: - Basic communication skills with room for improvement - Inconsistent communication about work - Some challenges in team collaboration - Limited contribution to team activities - Occasionally unprofessional behavior

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Poor communication skills affecting work - Fails to communicate about progress or problems - Difficulty working with team members - No meaningful contribution to team - Unprofessional behavior or attitude

### Initiative and Professional Development (15%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Shows exceptional initiative and self-direction - Actively seeks additional responsibilities - Strong commitment to professional growth - Excellent time management and organization - Demonstrates leadership potential

**Proficient (3)**: - Shows good initiative within assigned work - Willing to take on additional tasks when asked - Some engagement with professional development - Good time management and organization - Shows potential for growth

**Developing (2)**: - Limited initiative, mostly follows directions - Reluctant to take on additional responsibilities - Minimal professional development activities - Some time management or organization issues - Unclear about professional goals

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - No initiative, requires constant direction - Unwilling to take on any additional work - No engagement with professional development - Poor time management and organization - No evidence of professional growth mindset

## Postdoc Evaluation Rubric

### Independent Research Leadership (35%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Exceptional independent research program - Innovative approaches and significant contributions - Strong publication record and impact - Successful grant writing and funding acquisition - Recognition as emerging leader in field

**Proficient (3)**: - Strong independent research program - Good research contributions and publications - Some success with funding applications - Growing reputation in research community - Demonstrates research leadership skills

**Developing (2)**: - Developing independent research program - Some research contributions but limited impact - Limited success with funding applications - Basic recognition in research community - Shows potential for research leadership

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Weak or unfocused research program - Few or low-impact research contributions - No success with funding applications - Little recognition in research community - Limited evidence of leadership potential

### Mentoring and Supervision (25%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Outstanding mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students - Students show exceptional growth and achievement - Develops effective mentoring relationships - Contributes to lab mentoring culture - Receives excellent feedback from mentees

**Proficient (3)**: - Good mentoring with positive student outcomes - Students show solid growth and development - Maintains supportive mentoring relationships - Participates in lab mentoring activities - Generally positive feedback from mentees

**Developing (2)**: - Basic mentoring skills with mixed outcomes - Students show some growth but inconsistent - Developing mentoring relationships - Limited participation in mentoring activities - Mixed feedback from mentees

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Poor mentoring skills or negative outcomes - Students show little growth or development - Difficulty maintaining mentoring relationships - No contribution to lab mentoring culture - Negative feedback from mentees

### Collaboration and Service (25%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Exceptional collaboration within and outside lab - Significant service contributions to profession - Strong leadership in collaborative projects - Builds productive external partnerships - Excellent reputation as collaborator

**Proficient (3)**: - Good collaboration and teamwork - Some service contributions to profession - Participates effectively in collaborative projects - Develops some external partnerships - Generally positive reputation as collaborator

**Developing (2)**: - Basic collaboration skills - Limited service contributions - Minimal participation in collaborative projects - Few external partnerships - Mixed reputation as collaborator

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - Poor collaboration skills - No service contributions - Difficulty participating in collaborative work - No external partnerships - Negative reputation as collaborator

### Career Development and Transition (15%)

**Excellent (4)**: - Clear career goals and strategic planning - Excellent preparation for next career stage - Strong professional network and visibility - Successful job market performance - Serves as model for career development

**Proficient (3)**: - Good career planning and preparation - Adequate preparation for next career stage - Developing professional network - Some success in job market activities - Shows good career development progress

**Developing (2)**: - Basic career planning with some gaps - Limited preparation for next career stage - Small professional network - Minimal job market activity - Slow career development progress

**Needs Improvement (1)**: - No clear career planning or goals - Poor preparation for next career stage - No professional network development - No job market activity - No evidence of career development

## Using This Rubric

### Evaluation Process

1. **Self-Assessment**: Individual completes self-evaluation using rubric
2. **Supervisor Assessment**: Supervisor completes independent evaluation
3. **Discussion**: Meet to discuss ratings and develop improvement plans
4. **Goal Setting**: Establish specific goals for next evaluation period
5. **Documentation**: Record evaluation and goals in individual files

### Evaluation Schedule

* **Graduate Students**: Semester evaluations, annual comprehensive review
* **Undergraduate Researchers**: Monthly check-ins, semester evaluation
* **Postdocs**: Quarterly reviews, annual comprehensive evaluation

### Improvement Planning

For any area rated “Developing” or “Needs Improvement”: - Identify specific improvement goals - Develop action plan with timeline - Identify resources and support needed - Schedule follow-up check-ins - Document progress toward goals

**Remember**: This rubric is a tool for growth and development, not punishment. Use it to identify strengths to build on and areas for focused improvement.