



College of Graduate Studies Awards Evaluation Rubric – International Doctoral Fellowship

General Instructions

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 comments for each application you review.

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.

Please also use the relevant rubric for the appropriate award adjudication. Each rubric lists the evaluation criteria (or scoring categories) and their weight, a general overview of the criteria, special considerations when evaluating the criteria, and finally the potential indicators and sources for the criteria. Please note that the potential indicators and sources are not intended to be an exhaustive list, but rather simply to direct reviewers to the most common indicators and sources.

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

Scores

Please rank all applicants in each category on a scale of 1-6, 6 being the strongest, and 1 being the weakest. A general break down of the range is below:

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



Evaluation Criteria & Guidelines

Research Ability and Potential (50%)

Overview

Demonstrated by the candidate's research history, his/her interest in discovery, the proposed research and its potential contribution to the advancement of knowledge in the field, and any anticipated outcomes.

Considerations

Sex- and Gender Based Analysis Plus (SGBA+): In assessing the quality of the applicant's research proposal, consideration of sex, gender and diversity in the research design must be considered, if applicable:

- Rationale and methodology for including sex, gender and diversity in the research (from its design to the analysis of research findings) are clearly described
- Should be evaluated in terms of scientific rigour and usefulness of the proposed research

Potential Indicators & Sources

- Academic training and relevant work experience *evaluated via the experience and interests section of the application, work experience section of the CV, personal leadership statement (where applicable), and/or referee assessments*
- Contribution to research and development *evaluated via the experience and interests section of the application, research contributions listed in the CV and/or referee assessments*
- Research proposal (consider the feasibility, merit, and significance) *evaluated via the experience and interests section of the application and/or outline of proposed research (where applicable)*
- Critical thinking, application of knowledge, judgement, originality, initiative, autonomy, and enthusiasm for research *evaluated via the statement of intent, personal leadership statement (where applicable), and/or referee assessments*



Relevant Experience and Achievements Obtained Within and Beyond Academia (50%)

Considerations

In the case of those with non-traditional academic paths, consideration should be given to standards of research productivity, etc. for their level of experience/qualifications relative to a PhD student.

Consider individual workstyles, contributions, commitments, and variations in disciplinary, community and cultural standards. For example: collaboration, teamwork and mentoring are important and valid contributions to research and to training highly qualified personnel.

- The gender of the applicant should not have an impact on how these contributions are valued
- Similar expectations apply to single-authored and multi-authored publications

Evaluate excellence/productivity commensurate with the career stage of the candidate, taking into consideration the life and career trajectory outlined in the Personal Leadership Statement. Note that the Vanier CGS application form does not allow nominees to include a special circumstances document; career interruptions, for any reason, should be outlined in the Personal Leadership statement instead.

Evaluators should guard against placing too much value on the number of contributions; focus must be on the impact and significance of the contributions. Impact factor and citation rates vary between disciplines and contexts; members must be mindful of this when considering them as part of their evaluation

Potential Indicators & Sources

- Scholarships, awards, and distinctions (consider competitiveness, amount, duration, and prestige) *evaluated via CV*
- Academic record *evaluated via university transcripts (taking into consideration duration of previous students, program requirements and courses pursued, course load, and relative standing in program [if available])*
- Referee Comments *evaluated via referee assessments*
- Personal achievement *evaluated via impactful involvement and achievement in professional programs/association such as sports, arts, science, business, etc.; entrepreneurial achievement (start-up company, establishing an NGO or charitable initiative, establishing arts/sports-based festivals/competitions); foreign study*
- Involvement in academic life *evaluated via mentoring/teaching activities; supervisory experience; involvement in student government, the academic institution, and/or the community including participating in committees, teams, senate, boards, ethics committees, etc.; project/lab management; roles in academic/professional societies; organization of conferences, meetings, courses, etc.*
- Volunteerism/community outreach *evaluated via involvement in charity or not-for-profit organizations*
- Civic engagement *evaluated via parliamentary page positions and internships; political activity; elected positions*
- Goal achievement *evaluated via a developed personal vision for the future that defines an impactful/meaningful change for the community, a group, a cause, or an organization; strategies on how to achieve desired outcomes; specific, realistic, and timely goals*
- Other characteristics *evaluated via creativity, initiative; curiosity; ability to deal with*



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

College of Graduate Studies

The College of Graduate Studies
Okanagan Campus
EME2121
Tel: 250-807-8772
Email: graduateawards.ok@ubc.ca

complexity; strong sense of reality; courage; strategy, big-picture thinking; solution-focused mindset; capability to produce extraordinary results; ability to solve real problems and create real products