# Department of Food Science, Texas A&M University Graduate Student Annual Evaluation (Deadline to department office is March 30, 2024)

FOOD SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

#### Attach the Following to this Form:

- 1. One page summary highlighting research accomplishments of the past year. This can include data collection, research proposal writing, or any other scholarly activity. Include your goals and plans for next year.
- 2. Current CV

| Na | ame:  |      | Date: Date:   |
|----|-------|------|---|
| М  | ajor: |      | Committee Chair:  |
| UI | N:    |      | Degree:   |
| Se | mest  | er/\ | Year First Enrolled:  |
| A  | cade  | emi  | ic Requirements:  |
|    | 1.    | Ар   | proved Degree Plan Yes No Date:   |
|    | 2.    | Re   | search Proposal Submitted to OGAPS (if applicable) Yes No Date:                                   |
|    | 3.    | Pa   | ssed Preliminary Exam (if applicable) Yes No Date:  |
|    | 4.    | GP   | R:  |
|    | 5.    | Cre  | edits Completed:  |
| _  |       |      |   |
|    | chol  | arly | <b>y Activities in the Past Year</b> (March 30, 2023 – March 30, 2024                             |
| )  | Α.    | Ora  | al Presentations/Posters PRESENTED at Conference IN THE PAST YEAR. If you need more space you may |
|    |       | att  | ach another piece of paper to this evaluation.  |
|    |       | 1.   | Conference:   |
|    |       |      | Date:   |
|    |       |      | Paper/Poster Title:   |
|    |       | 2.   | Conference:   |
|    |       |      | Date:   |
|    |       |      | Paper/Poster Title:   |
|    |       | 3.   | Conference:   |
|    |       |      | Date:   |
|    |       |      | Paper/Poster Title:   |
|    |       |      |   |

**B.** <u>Papers Submitted for Publication in the past year.</u> *If you need more space you may attach another piece of paper to this evaluation.* 

|    | 1.  | . Paper Title:                     |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|----|-----|------------------------------------|----------------|----------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
|    |     | Journal:                           |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    |     | Status:                            | Accepted       | Rejected | Under Review |  |  |  |  |
|    |     | Date of Decision o                 | r Publication: |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    | 2.  | Paper Title:                       |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    |     | Journal:                           |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    |     | Status:                            | Accepted       | Rejected | Under Review |  |  |  |  |
|    |     | Date of Decision o                 | r Publication: |          |              |  |  |  |  |
| С. | Pap | Papers Published in the past year. |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    | 1.  | Citation:                          |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    |     |                                    |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    | 2.  | Citation:                          |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    |     |                                    |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    | 3.  | Citation:                          |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |
|    |     |                                    |                |          |              |  |  |  |  |

## Part 2: To be completed by the student's committee

Faculty Advisor – Please meet with your students to discuss your evaluation of their performance this past year.

Graduate Student Committee – It is encouraged that each student have a committee meeting each year to discuss progress towards degree.

Afterwards, please fill out this section of the form and return the entire evaluation to Lindsey Naufal

|                      | Printed Name | Signature | Exceeds<br>Expectations<br>Meets<br>Expectation<br>Unsatisfactory |
|----------------------|--------------|-----------|---|
| Chair _              |              |           |   |
| Co-Chair or Member _ |              |           |   |
| Member _             |              |           |   |
| Member _             |              |           |   |
| Member _             |              |           |   |
| Committee Comments:  |              |           |   |

Faculty Advisor – Please be aware that it is your responsibility to make sure that the evaluation is submitted by the deadline. If an evaluation has not been received by the deadline, the student will not be considered for a Graduate Assistantship or Graduate Scholarship from the Department. Students will also be blocked from course registration.

| Student Name:<br>Student UIN:<br>Dept/Major:  | Faculty Evaluation of Graduate Student<br>Learning Outcomes | Faculty Name:<br>Committee Role: (Co-)Chair<br>Dept Affiliation: Inside | , Member<br>, Outside |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| Degree Being Pursued:<br>Distance Education Student (Check One): Yes , No<br>Product of Research, if Applicable (Check One): Thesis | , Non-Thesis , Dissertation , Record of Study               |   |                       |

#### INSTRUCTIONS: This section should be completed for ALL students. Check the box most appropriate for this student.

| How well does the student meet   |                                       | *USE THIS DESCRIPTION TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS*                  |   |   |  |      |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|------|
| your expectations in the   | Well Above                            | Above   | Meets Expectations  | Below   | Well Below   | Obse |
| following areas?   | (5)                                   | (4)   | (3)   | (2)   | (1)  | able |
| Exhibits a coherent understanding of discipline-specific knowledge?                                      | -                                     |   | Articulates foundational concepts across the breadth of the discipline; distinguishes between opposing theoretical frameworks; some clarity                                       | Poor clarity on<br>critical concepts                                | No clarity on<br>critical concepts                                   |      |
| Applies discipline-specific knowledge<br>in a range of contexts to solve<br>problems and make decisions? | relevant info; ideal                  | Applies most<br>relevant info;<br>strong resolution               | Applies relevant concepts to justify decisions; may not apply all relevant information; may not come to the ideal resolution  | Relies on some<br>irrelevant info;<br>poor resolution               | Relies on<br>irrelevant info;<br>incorrect<br>resolution             |      |
| Uses a variety of sources and<br>alternative views when critically<br>evaluating ideas and information?  | considers all<br>views; critical      | Strong sources;<br>considers most<br>views; some<br>critical eval | Sources used to evaluate are both relevant and applicable;<br>student seeks multiple perspectives; information considered is<br>generally thorough; some critical thought applied | Mediocre sources;<br>lacking<br>viewpoints; little<br>critical eval | Poor sources;<br>missing critical<br>viewpoints; no<br>critical eval |      |
| Communicates effectively?  |                                       |   | Central message is clear and consistent in written and oral form;<br>ideas presented in logical order; transitions between ideas are<br>adequate                                  | Lacking clarity or<br>order; poor<br>transitions                    | Unclear; illogical;<br>no transitions                                |      |
| Teaches or explains the subject<br>matter in their discipline to a range<br>of audiences?                | ldeal delivery;<br>ideal for audience |   | Delivery techniques and language choices are appropriate for<br>the audience; student has the ability to transition between<br>different audiences; may not be flawless or smooth | Mediocre delivery;<br>somewhat<br>appropriate for<br>audience       | Poor delivery;<br>inappropriate for<br>audience                      |      |
| Exhibits proficiency in technology<br>appropriate to solve problems in<br>their discipline?              | Expert proficiency                    | Advanced<br>proficiency   | Demonstrates basic knowledge of, and basic proficiency in technology and tools specific to the discipline; may rely on others for some guidance                                   | Lacking<br>proficiency  | No proficiency   |      |
| Chooses ethical courses of action in research or practice?   |                                       |   | Recognizes ethical questions; attempts to apply ethical perspectives & concepts to research and practice  | Doesn't recognize<br>all ethical<br>questions                       | Doesn't recognize<br>any ethical<br>questions                        |      |

| How well does the student meet<br>your expectations in the<br>following areas? | Well Above<br>(5)   | Above<br>(4)  | *USE THIS DESCRIPTION TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS*<br>Meets Expectations<br>(3)   | Below<br>(2)  | Well Below<br>(1)  | Not<br>Observ<br>able |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| Develops clear, hypothesis-driven, or<br>data supported research plans?        | ldeal clarity; well<br>supported by<br>data                         | well supported  | Articulates research questions supported by data, or relying on<br>clear hypotheses; may not identify all complexities and nuances<br>inherent to the proposed research               | Somewhat clear;<br>mildly supported<br>by data                    | Unclear;<br>unsupported by<br>data                                   |                       |
| 9<br>9<br>9<br>theoretically consistent research?                              | Ideal controls,<br>quality or<br>reproducibility;<br>ideal analysis | Strong controls,<br>quality or<br>reproducibility;<br>strong analysis | Executes research with appropriate controls, sufficient quality<br>and reproducibility, and valid analysis using methods<br>appropriate to the discipline                             | Poor controls,<br>quality or<br>reproducibility;<br>Poor analysis | No controls,<br>quality or<br>reproducibility;<br>Incorrect analysis |                       |
| Effectively disseminates research<br>results in appropriate contexts?          | Expertly conveys<br>relevance or<br>applicability                   | relevance or  | Information presented attempts to distill a large body of knowledge into relevant points; demonstrates relevance of completed research; articulates broader applicability of research | Poor ability to<br>convey relevance<br>or applicability           | Unable to convey<br>relevance or<br>applicability                    |                       |

### INSTRUCTIONS: The following section should be completed for MS-Thesis Option students & Doctoral Students completing a dissertation.

| 11 Did this student pass his/her final defense? (Check One - If Applicable)  | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| 12 Would you recommend that this student go on to a Ph.D. program or pursue a post-doc position? (Check One - If Applicable) | Yes | No |