

VTCC INSTRUCTION 1610.1

From: Commandant, Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets

Subj: VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC CORPS OF CADET EVALUATIONS

Ref: (a) VTCC Standard Regulations

Encl: (1) First Year Cadet Evaluation Form - (End of Red Phase)

(2) Cadet Evaluation Form

(3) Evaluation Categories and Rating Criteria

1. Purpose. To provide guidance regarding Cadet Evaluations. This instruction is a complete revision and should be reviewed in its entirety.

2. Cancellation. VTCC Standard Regulations - DTD Jan 2023, Annex G: Cadet Evaluation System

3. Authority. All sections carry the full authority of their governing directives in levying responsibilities on addressees.

4. Action. All Commanding Officers (COs) shall ensure cadets in their charge are familiar with the guidance provided in this document.

RANDAL D. FULLHART, Maj Gen, USAF (Ret)  
Commandant, Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets

Distribution:

Electronic only via VTCC Web site

<https://vtcc.vt.edu/resources1.html>

## **CADET EVALUATION SYSTEM**

### **Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets**

Cadet Evaluations are an essential element of the leader 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.

Evaluations are completed on the following occasions:

- First-year Cadets: First-year Cadet Evaluation due no later than Caldwell I.
- All Cadets: Cadet Evaluations due no later than the last day of classes each semester
- Cadets assigned to the Citizen-Leader Track will receive additional end-of-semester evaluations, as prescribed below, from their VPI Battalion chain of command, separate and distinct from their evaluation in the VTCC line unit. These evaluations will assess performance and potential within the scope of the Citizen-Leader Track

#### **First-year Cadet Evaluation**

First-year Cadet Evaluation will be completed on all First-year Cadets at the end of Red Phase Training by the New Cadet's Squad Leader (Evaluator) and reviewed by the New Cadet's Platoon Leader (Reviewer) using enclosure (1). The evaluation form will be completed in its entirety, noting whether the New Cadet has Met or Not Met Red Phase Training Objectives. The Evaluator will provide an "Overall Rating" for each New Cadet of Above Average, Average, Below Average. The Reviewer will provide comments as appropriate.

Company First Sergeant will provide a relative ranking for all New Cadets in the training company, identifying each New Cadet as Top 1/3, Middle 1/3, or Bottom 1/3. This relative ranking must be evenly distributed and should align with each New Cadets overall rating (for example, a New Cadet rated as Above Average should not be ranked below a New Cadet rated as Average or Below Average).

The Company First Sergeant or Executive Officer will review the First-year Cadet Evaluation in person with each New Cadet. The evaluated New Cadet will sign the evaluation acknowledging this review and "Concur" or "Do Not Concur" with the written evaluation. If a New Cadet does not concur with the evaluation, they will be allowed to provide a written explanation for their non-concurrence. This written non-concurrence will not be edited in any way by the chain of command and will be included with the First-year Cadet Evaluation as it is forwarded for review by the chain of command.

The Company Commander or Executive Officer will review all New Cadet First-year Cadet Evaluations and indicate whether they "Concur" or "Do Not Concur" with the Evaluator and Reviewer assessments. They will recommend "Retain" or "Do Not Retain" for each New Cadet. All "Do Not Retain" recommendations will include a detailed written justification (on the

evaluation form or a separate memorandum) and include with the First-year Cadet Evaluation as it is forwarded for review by the chain of command.

By marking “Do Not Retain”, the Commander is expected to provide substantive, written comments on the form that would support their recommendation. “Do Not Retain” evaluations will be forwarded to the Commandant of Cadets by the Deputy Commandant with an appropriate endorsement. While not required, “Do Not Retain” evaluations should be accompanied by a series of documented disciplinary cases that have not resulted in desirable changes in behavior.

All First-year Cadet Evaluations will be forwarded to the Commandant’s Office for inclusion in the Cadet’s record no later than three weeks after Caldwell I.

### **Cadet Evaluations**

Cadet Evaluations (enclosure (2)) use a weighted grading system to help the Evaluator provide an accurate assessment of the Cadet’s overall performance and development for the assigned period. There are four or five main categories listed in enclosure (3) that 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. 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.

In the narrative block, the Evaluator must cite specific examples of what the Cadet did and how their performance impacted the unit or others. The written narrative must support the rating. 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 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 Evaluator then provides their “Overall Rating,” and should use the scale below as a guide in making their assessment, based on the “Overall Score.” The Reviewer will provide additional comments on the Evaluated Cadet as appropriate.

A Cadet Officer in the Cadet’s chain of command will review the Cadet Evaluation in person with each Cadet. The evaluated Cadet will sign the evaluation acknowledging this review and “Concur” or “Do Not Concur” with the written evaluation. If a Cadet does not concur with the evaluation, they will be allowed to provide a written explanation for their non-concurrence. This written non-concurrence will not be edited in any way by the chain of command and will be included with the Cadet Evaluation as it is forwarded for review by the chain of command.

The Commander’s role in the evaluation process is to provide a level of consistency across the company and rank cadets within the company in order of merit. The Commander has the responsibility of quality control for all evaluations within the unit, as well as ensuring that the evaluations are fair and consistent across the entire unit.

- Commanders shall ensure that all Cadet Evaluations are administratively correct. This means that all blocks of the evaluation are filled in properly, including signatures. One

area of particular interest is ensuring the “Overall Score” and “Overall Rating” blocks align in accordance with the Overall Performance Scale.

- The Commander is responsible for the “CO’s Rating” and “CO’s Ranking” of each cadet.
  - o The ranking of cadets should be accomplished with input from the Executive Officer, the First Sergeant, Platoon Leaders, and Platoon Sergeants as appropriate, but is the Commander’s decision alone.
  - o “CO’s Rating” should reflect the cadet’s relative position in the “CO’s Ranking,” that is to say, a cadet rated as Satisfactory, should be ranked below a cadet rated as Above Average.
  - o While the “CO’s Rating” need not conform to the “Overall Rating” by the Evaluator, consideration should be given to reevaluating the ratings if disparity exists. It is hard to justify ranking a Cadet with an Overall Score of 3.6 over a cadet with an Overall Score of 4.5 even though both are Above Average.
  - o Guard against rating inflation. Not all Cadets are above average, and it is unlikely that the Cadet ranked 10 of 10 is outstanding. It is also unlikely that all Cadets in a class are Satisfactory.

The above requirements are time consuming, especially since Commanders are responsible for reviewing and ranking scores of evaluations. Therefore, regressive planning is important to ensure evaluations are completed by the end of each semester. Commanders should establish internal timelines to ensure all evaluations are complete, including time to correct discrepancies, and delivered to the Battalion Deputy Commandant/Senior Enlisted Advisor no later than the last day of classes each semester.

All Cadet Evaluations will be forwarded to the Commandant’s Office for inclusion in the Cadet’s record no later than three weeks after the end of the Semester.

### **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 acknowledgment 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 the daily opportunity to observe and interact with him/her (see matrix below). 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 (see matrix below). 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 normally the immediate Cadet Commander of the evaluated cadet. Exceptions are Cadets whose evaluator or reviewer is their Commander as assigned in the matrix below. In those cases, the Commander shall be the next senior Commander in the Cadet's chain of command. 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.

Cadets evaluations will be conducted by cadets with direct observation of the cadet being evaluated using the following matrix

<b>Evaluated Cadet</b>	<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
Squad Member (to include Fire Team Leaders) *	Squad Leader*	Platoon Leader*
Squad Leader/ Platoon Sergeant	Platoon Leader	Company Commander
First Sergeant	Company Commander	Battalion Commander
Platoon Leader	Company Commander	Battalion Commander
Company XO	Company Commander	Battalion XO
Company Commander	Battalion Commander	Regimental Commander
Primary Staff Officers and NCOs at Battalion and Regimental Levels	Respective XO	Respective Commanders
Battalion XO	Battalion Commanders	Regimental XO
<b>End of Red Phase</b>		
First-Year Cadets	Squad Leaders	Platoon Sergeants
Evaluations of Regimental Staff will be submitted to the Commandant		

- \*Cadets will not be evaluated by cadets of a lower cadet class. For Seniors in a squad with no additional duties, the Evaluator will be the Platoon Leader and the Reviewer will be the Company Commander.
- Using this table, Commanders shall establish a by name matrix of Evaluator and Reviewer for each cadet in the company, considering the cadet's primary duties and assigning the appropriate supervisor as Evaluator.
- Evaluations of cadets at Company and Battalion level will be submitted to Deputy Commandants
- Evaluations of Regimental Staff will be submitted to the Commandant



**CADET EVALUATION FORM**  
 Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets

**CLEAR FORM**

<u>NAME</u> (Last, First MI)		<u>RANK</u>	<u>LINE</u>	<u>CLASS</u>	<u>TRACK</u>	<u>SEMESTER EVALUATED</u>	<u>DATE</u>
<u>PT SCORE</u> OF		<u>PT S&amp;PI</u>		<u>MILITARY PROBATION</u> Yes: No:		<u>DISCIPLINARY CASES THIS SEMESTER</u>	
<u>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</u>		<u>PRIMARY VTCC POSITION</u>					
<u>OTHER POSITIONS</u>							
<u>POSITION DESCRIPTION</u>							
<u>PERFORMANCE</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cadets will be evaluated in each trait in accordance with the rating criteria listed in annex one of the VTCC regulations: 5 = Outstanding 4 = Above Average 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Significant Problems					
<u>PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<u>UNIT CONTRIBUTION</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<u>BEHAVIOR/ATTITUDE</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<u>SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<small>(only for cadets in supervisory positions)</small>							
<u>EVALUATOR COMMENTS:</u> (Must address 3 or 4 trait grades and "unsatisfactory" or "do not retain" overall rating directly in comments)							
<u>OVERALL SCORE</u>	<u>OVERALL RATING</u>	<u>RECOMMENDED POSITION</u>	<u>EVALUATOR</u> (Last, First MI)	<u>EVALUATOR POSITION</u>	<u>EVALUATOR CADET SIGNATURE</u>		
D.O							
<u>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</u>							
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CADET EVALUATION</u> I acknowledge that I have seen and been counseled on the results of this semester evaluation. Attach additional comments for any DO NOT CONCLUDE or DO NOT RETAIN.				<u>REVIEWER NAME</u> (Last, First MI)		<u>REVIEWER POSITION</u>	
<u>CONCUR</u> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>EVALUATED CADET SIGNATURE</u>			<u>DATE</u>	<u>REVIEWER SIGNATURE</u>		<u>DATE</u>
<u>DO NOT CONCUR</u> <input type="checkbox"/>							
<u>COMMANDER NAME</u> (Last, First MI)		<u>CO's RATING</u>	<u>CO's RANKING</u>	<u>COMMANDER SIGNATURE</u>	<u>DATE</u>		
			THIRD				
<u>Commandant Staff Comments</u>			<u>SE RANKING</u>	<u>DEPUTY COMMANDANT SIGNATURE</u>			
			OF				

**Evaluation Categories and Rating Criteria:**

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

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

**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?

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
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.



<b>Personal Development:</b> 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 themselves in only the opportunities that were given to him. 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.
<b>Subordinate Development:</b> 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 the subordinates during the normal corps activities, but did not put much extra time into helping to make their 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).

## Enclosure 3

<b>Unit Contribution:</b> 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.

<b>Demeanor/Attitude:</b> 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.