

2018 SHARE Evaluation Rubric

Rank/Category	Excellent (10)	Good (7)	Needs (4-0) Improvement
<b>Potential for Student Intellectual Growth</b>	Project will significantly enhance student's intellectual growth; proposal articulates specific impact(s). Project complements student's educational and professional goals.	Project may enhance student's intellectual growth. Project relates to student's educational and professional goals.	Project not clearly related to student's intellectual growth or educational/professional goals.
<b>Student Interest and Knowledge</b>	Student's response provides a clear picture of the research project and why s/he is interested in contributing to the project.	Student's response is vague in describing the research project and/or in articulating his/her personal interest.	Unclear why student chose this project or finds it of interest.
<b>Quality of Student Proposal</b>	Student's proposal is clearly written and demonstrates accurate spelling and grammar.	Student's proposal contains some minor spelling or grammatical errors, but is generally well written.	Student's proposal is unclear, contains numerous stylistic errors, and/or simply reproduces text from the faculty application.
<b>Role of Student Mentee in Project</b>	Role of the student apprentice is substantive and defined clearly in both faculty and student portions of the application. Educational goals of the research experience described by both faculty and student.	Role of the student apprentice clearly defined in faculty portion of the application; student may function chiefly as a technician. Some description of educational goals of the research experience.	No clear description of student role, and/or student role limited to rote tasks. No clear description of educational goals of the research experience.
<b>Faculty Mentoring</b>	Relationship between project and faculty mentor's research clear. Clear plan for how student will be supervised or progress monitored. Clear statement of planned outcomes (e.g., simulation, coded transcripts, poster presentation).	Relationship between project and faculty mentor's research clear. Some information on how student will be supervised or progress monitored. Some indication of planned project outcomes.	No clear relationship between faculty mentor's research and proposed project. No information on how student will be supervised or progress monitored. Expected project outcomes are not articulated.
<b>Selection of Student as Research Mentee</b>	Mentor addresses the student's ability to complete the project successfully. Mentor provides a clear picture of student's abilities and skills, and makes a compelling case for this choice of mentee.	Mentor addresses the student's ability within the context of the project, but does not provide much additional detail about student.	Mentor does not address the student's ability to complete the project successfully and/or does not seem to know the student well.
<b>Student is:</b>	Freshman or sophomore (+2)	Junior (+1)	

**Total Possible: 60 points** (+2 bonus for early career students)