

## Annual PhD Student Evaluation Form

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

UIN: \_\_\_\_\_

PI: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of previous committee meeting: \_\_\_\_\_

Has the student presented their research at local, national, or international meetings this year?

- Yes
- No

If yes, provide date of research presentations: \_\_\_\_\_

Has the student participated in program-related extracurricular activities (graduate student organization, committees, career club, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

Committee evaluation of progress to degree (check one):

- The student is on trajectory for completion of PhD in \_\_\_\_ 4 years, \_\_\_\_ 5 years, or \_\_\_\_ >5 years
- There is concern regarding trajectory or dissertation project (student and PI should meet with GENE IDP adviser)

If there is a concern for degree completion, please comment below on why:

Committee evaluation of expectations (check one):

- Well above expectations
- Above expectations
- Meets expectations
- Below expectations (Must explain below)
- Well below expectations (Must explain below)

If you marked that the student is not meeting expectations, please comment below on why:

### **“Critical thinking and communication abilities”**

*Instructions:* Please rate the student using the rubric below. The committee should collectively assign a rating for each category and then sign their name on the form:

Well above expectations: a student ready to be an independent scientist (year 0 postdoctoral fellow)

Well below expectations: student with little or no research experience and qualifications to critically analyze literature.

*This evaluation will be used to track student progress yearly and compare to the final defense evaluation*

1) Exhibits overall coherent understanding of their project and the associated scientific literature.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Well above (5)	Above (4)	Meets expectations (3)	Below (2)	Well below (1)
Ideal clarity on critical concepts	Strong clarity on critical concepts	Articulates foundational concepts across the breadth of the discipline; distinguishes between opposing theoretical frameworks; some clarity	Poor clarity on critical concepts	No clarity on critical concepts

2) Effectively communicates the subject matter.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Well above (5)	Above (4)	Meets expectations (3)	Below (2)	Well below (1)
Crystal clear; seamless transitions	Very clear; smooth transitions	Central message is clear and consistent in written and oral form; ideas presented in logical order; transitions between ideas are adequate	Lacking clarity or order; poor transitions	Unclear; illogical; no transitions

4) Effectively communicates their personal critique of scientific literature.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Well above (5)	Above (4)	Meets expectations (3)	Below (2)	Well below (1)
Crystal clear; seamless transitions	Very clear; smooth transitions	Central message is clear and consistent in written and oral form; ideas presented in logical order; transitions between ideas are adequate	Lacking clarity or order; poor transitions	Unclear; illogical; no transitions

List any goals or recommendations you have for the student moving forward. Also, consider whether student is working on their own Career Development.

Advisor's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Names and Signatures of Other Committee Members Present:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member: \_\_\_\_\_