



College of Graduate Studies Awards Evaluation Rubric - Master's

You may find that your group of applications ranges broadly within your general discipline or areas of expertise, and that some applications belong to fields only loosely related to your own. We ask that you keep an open yet critical mind when reviewing applications where you might not be as familiar with the content. If you wish, you may consult colleagues in confidence regarding specific proposals.

Please submit scores and brief comments for each application.

Evaluation Criteria, Scores, and Guidelines

Academic Excellence (50%)

- The applicant's record of scholarly engagement and scholarly achievement. Indicators may include, but are not limited to: transcripts, awards, distinctions, duration of previous studies, type of program and courses pursued, course load, and relative standing.
 - 6 – Applicant is in all aspects outstanding
 - 5 – Applicant, while not among the very best with respect to the entirety of those reviewed, are strong and highly competitive
 - 4 – Applicant is good, but there are one or two weaknesses
 - 3 – Applicant shows potential but some improvements are required
 - 2 – Applicant is below average
 - 1 – Applicant is among the least competitive within the group reviewed

Research Ability or Potential (30%)

- The potential of the project to advance the field of study in which it is proposed and make an original and significant contribution to knowledge;
- The quality of the proposal with regard to its methodology, scope, theoretical framework, and grounding in the relevant scholarly literature;
- The feasibility of the project and the likelihood that the applicant will execute the work within the proposed timeframe;
- The quality and originality of contributions to research and development;
- Relevance of work experience and academic training to field of proposed research.
 - 6 – Project and applicant are in all aspects outstanding
 - 5 – Project and applicant, while not among the very best with respect to the entirety of those reviewed, are strong and highly competitive
 - 4 – Project and applicant are good, but there are one or two weaknesses
 - 3 – Project and/or applicant show potential but some improvements are required
 - 2 – Project and/or applicant are below average
 - 1 – Project and/or applicant are among the least competitive within the group reviewed

Personal Characteristics, Interpersonal and Leadership Skills (20%)

- The applicant's work and leadership experience, personal characteristics, as demonstrated by the applicant's past professional and relevant extracurricular interactions and collaborations.
 - 6 – Applicant is in all aspects outstanding



- 5 – Applicant, while not among the very best with respect to the entirety of those reviewed, are strong and highly competitive
- 4 – Applicant is good, but there are one or two weaknesses
- 3 – Applicant shows potential but some improvements are required
- 2 – Applicant is below average
- 1 – Applicant is among the least competitive within the group reviewed

We strongly encourage reviewers to use the full range of scores available, including .5-point increments (with the lowest possible score being 1 and the highest possible score being 6), so as to better discriminate among proposals. Awarding too many high scores reduces the power of the endorsement. While the applications you review may not be a representative sample of all those submitted, please rank comparatively those that you are reviewing. In other words, please use each score only a few times.

In addition to a numerical score, please provide brief comments (in the comments section) explaining your assessment.



College of Graduate Studies Awards Evaluation Rubric - Doctoral

You may find that your group of applications ranges broadly within your general discipline or areas of expertise, and that some applications belong to fields only loosely related to your own. We ask that you keep an open yet critical mind when reviewing applications where you might not be as familiar with the content. If you wish, you may consult colleagues in confidence regarding specific proposals.

Please submit scores and brief comments for each application.

Evaluation Criteria, Scores, and Guidelines

Academic Excellence (30%)

- The applicant's record of scholarly engagement and scholarly achievement. Indicators may include, but are not limited to: transcripts, awards, distinctions, duration of previous studies, type of program and courses pursued, course load, and relative standing.
 - 6 – Applicant is in all aspects outstanding
 - 5 – Applicant, while not among the very best with respect to the entirety of those reviewed, are strong and highly competitive
 - 4 – Applicant is good, but there are one or two weaknesses
 - 3 – Applicant shows potential but some improvements are required
 - 2 – Applicant is below average
 - 1 – Applicant is among the least competitive within the group reviewed

Research Ability or Potential (50%)

- The potential of the project to advance the field of study in which it is proposed and make an original and significant contribution to knowledge;
- The quality of the proposal with regard to its methodology, scope, theoretical framework, and grounding in the relevant scholarly literature;
- The feasibility of the project and the likelihood that the applicant will execute the work within the proposed timeframe;
- The quality and originality of contributions to research and development;
- Relevance of work experience and academic training to field of proposed research.
 - 6 – Project and applicant are in all aspects outstanding
 - 5 – Project and applicant, while not among the very best with respect to the entirety of those reviewed, are strong and highly competitive
 - 4 – Project and applicant are good, but there are one or two weaknesses
 - 3 – Project and/or applicant show potential but some improvements are required
 - 2 – Project and/or applicant are below average
 - 1 – Project and/or applicant are among the least competitive within the group reviewed

Personal Characteristics, Interpersonal and Leadership Skills (20%)

- The applicant's work and leadership experience, personal characteristics, as demonstrated by the applicant's past professional and relevant extracurricular interactions and collaborations.
 - 6 – Applicant is in all aspects outstanding



- 5 – Applicant, while not among the very best with respect to the entirety of those reviewed, are strong and highly competitive
- 4 – Applicant is good, but there are one or two weaknesses
- 3 – Applicant shows potential but some improvements are required
- 2 – Applicant is below average
- 1 – Applicant is among the least competitive within the group reviewed

We strongly encourage reviewers to use the full range of scores available, including .5-point increments (with the lowest possible score being 1 and the highest possible score being 6), so as to better discriminate among proposals. Awarding too many high scores reduces the power of the endorsement. While the applications you review may not be a representative sample of all those submitted, please rank comparatively those that you are reviewing. In other words, please use each score only a few times.

In addition to a numerical score, please provide brief comments (in the comments section) explaining your assessment.