

CADET EVALUATION SYSTEM

Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets

Cadet Evaluations are an essential element of the leadership development program of the Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets. As in the active military, evaluations exist primarily for the purpose of providing information for promotion and assignment selection, and secondarily as a means for giving cadets feedback on performance and opportunities for improvement. As such, it is important that evaluations be written carefully and accurately to provide the most opportunity for the development of cadets as they look to their future careers. Writing effective evaluations is an important skill for aspiring officers and leaders.

This evaluation system utilizes a weighted grading system to help the rater provide an accurate assessment of the cadet's overall performance and development. There are four or five main categories each cadet will be evaluated on (non-supervisory cadets are NOT rated on "Subordinate Development"). Each category has suggested factors to consider and appropriate point values for given levels of performance. In the narrative blocks, the evaluator must cite specific examples of what the cadet did and how their performance impacted the unit or others. Beware of just using generic adjectives to describe a cadet without providing specific examples. Describe the specific accomplishment of the cadet and the impact of that accomplishment on the unit. The written narrative must support the rating. The more a rating deviates from the "satisfactory" score of three (3), the more substantial text must be written in the narrative. Ratings of 1 or 5 in particular demand complete and comprehensive narratives justifying that score. The "Overall Score" block is automatically calculated based on the scores in the four/five rating areas, and weights for that calculation are shown below. The evaluator and commander each provide their Overall Rating, and should use the scale below as a guide in making their assessment, based on the Overall Score.

Evaluation Category Weights:		
	Supervisor	Non-Supervisor
Performance	25%	30%
Personal Development	25%	30%
Subordinate Development	20%	
Unit Contribution	15%	20%
Demeanor/Attitude	15%	20%

Overall Performance Scale:	
4.6 – 5.0	Outstanding
3.6 – 4.5	Above Average
2.6 – 3.5	Satisfactory
0.0 – 2.5	Unsatisfactory
	Do Not Retain

Cadet Responsibilities for Evaluations:

- **Evaluated Cadet:** the cadet receiving an evaluation. This cadet's responsibility is to read and acknowledge receiving the evaluation. Signing the acknowledgement is not an indication of concurring with the evaluation. If the evaluated cadet does not concur with all or part of the evaluation, the cadet has a right to provide additional documentation to be included with the evaluation.
- **Evaluator Cadet:** the immediate supervisor of the evaluated cadet, who has daily opportunity to observe and interact with him/her. The evaluator's main responsibility is to provide an accurate and complete evaluation, as well as an overall rating and recommended future leadership position for the evaluated cadet.
- **Reviewer:** the reviewer is generally the immediate supervisor of the evaluator. This cadet should note any observations about the evaluated cadet, as well as review the comments of the evaluator to ensure that the written narrative is consistent with the numerical scores. The reviewer may, in the course of supervising the preparation of evaluations, ask the evaluator to adjust scores or written text in the evaluation. The reviewer has the responsibility of ensuring that the evaluations are fair and consistent within his/her part of the organization.

- Commander:** the commander is the immediate cadet commander of the evaluated cadet. In the event that an evaluated cadet works directly for a commander, the commander will sign as both evaluator and commander, and the reviewer will be the commander's supervisor. The commander provides an overall rating for the evaluated cadet, as well as a numerical ranking of that cadet within his/her peer group (class) within the unit. The commander has the responsibility of total quality control for all evaluations within the unit, as well as ensuring that the evaluations are fair and consistent across his/her entire unit.

Rating Criteria:				
Performance: Evaluates a cadet's general performance, uniform and room standards, execution of assigned duties, participation in Corps activities. What are the person's strengths and weaknesses? How did the person demonstrate leadership? Were they effective? Did they complete all tasks in a timely manner and with good quality? Did they perform as you expected? Better or worse?				
5	4	3	2	1
A clear front runner among cadets. Performed well beyond expected. Scored high on all Corps and fitness tests. Consistently set the standard for others. Aggressively sought out additional responsibility. A self-learner and self-starter. Results had a significant positive impact on unit or the Corps.	Performed above expected and showed great qualities of a leader. Effective in achieving the goals set for them and were an asset to the team. Scored well on all corps and fitness tests.	Performed as expected in most if not all aspects of the position. Did the job to a satisfactory level, but definitely could have been better. Test scores were average.	Did not do as well as expected and needs further development to be an effective member of the team. Scored below average on tests and lacked dedication to the mission.	Failed in their duties as a cadet. Showed no effort in completing the mission.
Personal Development: Evaluates the personal growth and development of the cadet over the past semester. Did they meet or make significant strides to achieving their goals? Did they improve themselves in a noticeable way? Did they seek out opportunities to lead or serve?				
5	4	3	2	1
Met all of their personal goals and developed themselves in a significant way. Made large strides in developing themselves in the whole person concept. Continued to seek out opportunities in every aspect of daily life to make themselves better. Demonstrated a remarkable change in who they are as a person and a leader.	Met most of their goals or made great strides towards achieving them. There is a noticeable change in the person and true growth in their abilities as a leader and person. Continues to seek out opportunities to make themselves better.	Developed in only the opportunities that were given to him/her. Did not seek other opportunities for personal growth but made some strides towards achieving their goals.	Made little effort to achieve their goals and showed little interest in developing themselves as a leader or person. No demonstrable improvements in their personal development.	Made no effort to increase their self-worth or abilities. Did not attempt to better themselves. Sought out no opportunities to develop themselves.

Subordinate Development: Evaluates the capacity of the cadet to develop those under their responsibility, and develop their unit as a team. Did they help their team achieve their goals or make significant strides to completing them? Did they put a lot of effort into working with their team to develop them as a leader and cadet? Did they help their team achieve academically? Did they work on their team's weaknesses and strengths to help them achieve their goals? Did they provide the necessary support and challenge to grow their team into effective leader(s)?

5	4	3	2	1
Put an unprecedented amount of effort into developing their subordinate as a leader and person. Adapted their leadership style to lead their team, resulting in significant results. Coached and encouraged others to reach new levels of performance. Clearly inspired subordinates to succeed and improve.	Went above the normal job requirements to help grow their subordinates. Invested a significant time and energy into developing their subordinate. Encouraged others to expand their roles, handle important tasks and learn by doing.	Performed as expected and did not go above and beyond the job requirement. Helped develop subordinates during the normal Corps activities, but did not put much extra time into helping to make subordinates better.	Did not perform as expected. Failed to show the dedication required to improve their team. Their team showed very little growth or leadership.	Failed to perform their duties and showed no dedication to their team. Had a negative impact on their subordinate(s).

Unit Contribution: Evaluates how much the cadet was an effective member of the unit. Did they help the unit succeed? What was their contribution? Did they lead the planning of morale and unity activities? Were they present in the unit area? Did they participate in unit events or did they avoid them?

5	4	3	2	1
Volunteered to organize unit events and attempted to help the unit in any way possible. Provided clear formal or informal leadership to the unit.	Helped the company succeed and volunteered for a few events. Attended all events and were engaged in the company. Did above what was expected.	Helped when it was convenient for them but did not make any extra effort to volunteer for events. They were present in the unit area and fulfilled their requirements, but did nothing extra.	Tried to avoid tasks and did little to support the company. Attempted to get out of many corps and company events. Did not volunteer to help with many, if any, tasks.	Was a detriment to the unit and did nothing to help the company. Attempted to get out of almost all events. Put no effort into the company and is of no benefit to the unit.

Demeanor/Attitude: Evaluates the cadet's attitude to staff and cadet leadership, to organizational change, and to the Corps as a whole. Did they welcome change and show a great attitude to the Corps? Did they attempt to be part of the solution and not part of the problem? Were they a positive influence on others in the unit? Did they work to make the best of situations?

5	4	3	2	1
Always had a superior attitude to the Corps and was a champion for events and activities. Actively sought out opportunities improve the Corps and promote a positive attitude among other cadets.	Consistently demonstrated a positive attitude and got behind decisions that the leadership made. Expressed criticism appropriately and with a view to positive change. Never complained to subordinates.	Attitude was acceptable, but they allowed others to express negative opinions in non-constructive ways. Rarely helped find solutions to problems or issues.	Attitude was often negative, and sometimes expressed opinions to others. Did not care to help find solutions.	Approach to Corps participation was detrimental to others and consistently negative. Never found the positives in the situation and displayed outward contempt for leaders. Actively worked to undermine the organization.