Assessment Rubric for Faculty Mentor Award – Spring 2021

The Office of Undergraduate Research Lamar University

Name of Faculty:	Academic Title:	Discipline:
ivaille of faculty.	Academic ride.	Discipillic.

Part I. Point Rating the Documentation Criteria (please give integer scores)

Criterion	Missing or Unacceptable (-3.0)	Developing (0.0 – 3.0)	Accomplished (4.0 - 6.0)	Exemplary (7.0-10.0)
		The letter is written casually	The letter responds to	The letter responds to all
Applicant letter	No letter of interest.	OR it is more than 3 pages.	some evaluative criteria.	evaluative criteria with
Score:				enough evidences.
		The CV only contains	The CV only contains	The CV contains applicant bio,
Curriculum Vitae	No CV or it is on more than 3	applicant bio but no	applicant bio and brief	detailed information about
(CV)	pages. The list of publications	information about UG	information about the	students mentored in
	does not go into this page	students mentored or	students mentored in	research, student
Score:	count.	evidence of products with	research.	presentations and
		UG students.		publications, and student
				awards received.
		The LOR is written casually	The letter is written with	The letter is written with
Colleague's letter	No colleague letter of	with minimal evidences on	good evidences on the	strong evidences on the
	recommendation/nomination	the applicant's success in	applicant's success in	applicant's success in
Score:	(LOR).	mentoring undergraduates.	mentoring	mentoring undergraduates,
		OR it is more than 2 pages.	undergraduates, also	offering strong examples of
			offering meaningful	success. The letter strongly
			examples of success.	supports the applicant for this
				award.
		The letters indicate	The letter does indicate	The letters are carefully
Student Letter	Less than 2 letters for students.	minimum collaboration	good collaboration	written by a student
	OR at least one letter from	between the candidate and	between the candidate	mentored by the candidate
Score:	another student than a mentee	the student. The applicant	and the student, and it	and bring strong evidences of
	of the faculty applicant OR both	was not his/her research	includes relevant	successful collaboration, and
	letters are more than one page.	mentor. OR one letter is	examples of successful	also, strongly support the
		more than one page.	mentorship of the	faculty for this award.
			student-recommender	
			and other students.	
Points (max 40pts)				

Part II. Point Rating of the Evaluation Criteria (please give integer scores)

Criteria	Developing (0.0-4.0)	Accomplished (5.0-10.0)	Exemplary (11.0-15.0)
Evidence of UG student mentoring Score:	Mentored 2 or less students research projects*. Some documentation of efforts.	Mentored 3 to 5 students research projects*. Adequate research documentation.	Mentored 5 or more student research projects*. Significant research documentation.
Evidence of impact and success in mentoring students Score:	Little impact on student's pursuing graduate school or career; receive one award for student presentations and publications; <= 2 internal OUR grants; little evidence of the impact of mentoring experience on student's ongoing success.	Some impact on student's pursuing graduate school or career; receive <= 3 awards for student presentations and publications; <= 4 internal OUR grants; one external student grant; some evidence of the impact of mentoring experience on student's ongoing success.	Significant impact on student's pursuing graduate school or career; receive >= 4 awards for student presentations and publications; >= 5 internal OUR grants; >= 2 external student grants; significant evidence of the impact of mentoring experience on student's ongoing success.
Points (max 30pts)			

^{*} Classroom project (as part of the classroom instruction) or class extra credit assignments should not be considered research project

Grand Total Points per AB voting member from Part I+ Part II:

Comment on the faculty merit in student mentorship:

Recommendation for the award:

Part III. Point Rating of the PRODUCT CATEGORY Criteria Two OUR Advisory Board (AB) members will check the table with the product categories.

Criteria	Developing (0.0- no cap score)	Product Category (from low to high merit)		
	Applicants are required to enter the data on numbers of		Count	We
	research products authored or co-authored by UG students by	Conferences at Lamar (EXPO, HASBSEB, TX STEM)		
Evidence of UG	product category . Product categories are listed below in increasing order of merit, and the count per category will be	Regional conferences (UG student 1 st author)		
student productivity	weighted accordingly. Oral and poster presentations at any	State conference (faculty or grad student 1st author)		
Score:	conference are weighted equally. A faculty who applies for	State conference (student 1 st author)		
	FMA should fill the table with the product categories providing a correct count per category. A list of publications attached to	National/International conference (non-UG as 1st author)		
I	the CV is required. The publications (conferences and papers)	National/International conference (UG student 1st author)		
	should be listed according to the table with the product	Publication, student focused journal (UG student 1st author)		
	categories. The number of pages in the list of publications with	Publication, professional journal		
Max possible score is	students will not count toward the limit of 3-pages on the CV.			
30pts.				

⁵Two OUR Advisory Board members will check if the table with the product categories is aligned with the list of publications offered by the faculty applicant and will report the final score for the PRODUCT CATEGORY item to the voting members. The score of Part III will be added to the overall score as a separate column in the spreadsheet with individual scores of each voting member. In this way, the PRODUCT CATEGORY will be added one time to the total score for each applicant and not individually by each voting member. The correctness of the scoring process will be checked by the OUR Secretary. The OUR Director can audit the scoring process, if necessary.

The score of Part III will be entered in the spreadsheet by each voting member anonymously. The OUR Secretary will add a new column with the score of each faculty applicant received for Part III.

^{*}NOTE for REVIEWERS: All products must be peer reviewed. A product with multiple UG students may only count once. Conference products entered in more than one category, must have evidence of project development or change in presentation format; otherwise just one category should count. For examples, the same project presented as a poster at the LU EXPO and then presented at a national conference with no substantial change can only count in one scoring product category. Projects may be counted as both a presentation and a journal publication, ONLY when the publication is not in the conference abstract book or Proceedings. If the faculty feels strongly that the quality of the work is not reflected by product categories below, then the applicant should make note in his/her letter of interest or have a colleague clearly stating this in his/her LOR.