

## Assessment Rubric for Faculty Mentor Award – Spring 2021

The Office of Undergraduate Research  
Lamar University

Name of Faculty:

Academic Title:

Discipline:

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

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

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Developing (0.0-4.0)</b>	<b>Accomplished (5.0-10.0)</b>	<b>Exemplary (11.0-15.0)</b>
<b>Evidence of UG student mentoring</b> 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.
<b>Evidence of impact and success in mentoring students</b> 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.
<b>Points (max 30pts)</b>			

**\* 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<sup>#</sup>** *Two OUR Advisory Board (AB) members will check the table with the product categories<sup>\$</sup>.*

[illegible]

**# 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.*

*§Two 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.**