

MADURA Mentee Performance Evaluation Form

At the end of every Quarter of placement, Placement P.I.s and/or Supervisors are asked to evaluate each student Mentee's performance. Only one evaluation per student Mentee is accepted, but you are welcomed to jointly complete evaluations, should more than one placement leader wish to contribute input. Please simply check appropriate box below, to indicate which individual(s) contributed to this evaluation.

Please submit this evaluation no later than two weeks after each Quarter ends.

Student Name

Placement Mentor Name

Direct supervisor (if different):

Who completed this evaluation? (must select one or more)

placement mentor (1)

direct supervisor (2)

Quarter & Year

Quarterly Wrap-Up Interview:

After completing the following form, please meet with the student to review your responses. This will be a chance for the student to review their performance and learn of suggested areas for improvement and/or recommended steps for continued professional development.

Evaluation Form Instructions

Please respond to the following statements relating to the Mentee's performance while working for your Project. Rate the student's performance level from 1-5, based on the following criteria:

Outstanding – The student intern's performance went greatly above the requirements of the position. The student was consistent in their job duties, achieved all goals, and always contributed to the overall success of the project.

Good - The student intern performed beyond the normal requirements of the position. They completed all assigned tasks and accomplished numerous goals relating to their responsibilities.

Satisfactory – The student intern completed the requirements of the position and displayed adequate performance.

Fair – The student intern did not meet expectations and has multiple areas needing improvement.

Unsatisfactory – The student did not perform the duties required and failed to contribute at the level expected for their stage of training and education.

	Outstanding (1)	Good (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Fair (4)	Unsatisfactory (5)
Quantity of Work – How did the student perform under normal working conditions?	<input type="radio"/>				
Quality of Work – Was the student work organized, accurate, and thorough?	<input type="radio"/>				
Job Knowledge – Understanding of pertinent facts or factors	<input type="radio"/>				
Personal Qualities – Personality, leadership, integrity, ability to get along with co-workers	<input type="radio"/>				
Cooperation – Ability and willingness to work with associates and supervisors	<input type="radio"/>				
Dependability – Conscientiousness, thoroughness, accuracy with time keeping, strong self-management skills, etc.	<input type="radio"/>				
Initiative – seeks increasing responsibilities, able to work independently, self-starting, etc.	<input type="radio"/>				

Please comment to further explain your responses if necessary.

What were the student Mentee's strongest qualities and demonstrated abilities?

What are suggested areas of improvement?

Suggestions for the student, relating to potential educational and/or career paths related to Aging or ADRD research or clinical practice:

Any additional comments you may have:

This feedback was discussed in person with the Student Mentee:

- Yes
- No

Date of feedback discussion (if already completed):
