



College of Graduate Studies Awards Evaluation Rubric – Finch

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.

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

Academic excellence (33%)

Overview

As demonstrated by past academic results, transcripts, awards and distinctions.

Potential Indicators & Sources

- Past academic results and transcripts *evaluated via university transcripts*
- Course load *evaluated via university transcripts*
- Referee Comments *evaluated via referee assessments*
- Scholarships/awards (consider competitiveness, amount, duration, and prestige) *evaluated via the application*
- Duration of previous studies *evaluated via academic background section of the application and university transcripts*

Research ability or potential (33%)

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

- 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 research potential commensurate with the career stage of the candidate, taking into consideration the life and career trajectory outlined by their academic history and/or referee assessments.

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. If you are unsure about how to assess the research achievements of an applicant who is outside of your field of expertise, please consult with a committee member in that research discipline. If you do not know who to connect with please email graduateawards.ok@ubc.ca.

Potential Indicators & Sources

- Quality and originality of contribution to research and development *evaluated via the contributions to research document of the application and/or referee assessments*
- Relevance of work experience and academic training to field of proposed research *evaluated via the work experience section of the application and/or referee assessments*
- Research proposal (consider the feasibility, merit, and significance) *evaluated via the outline of*



proposed research

- Critical thinking, application of knowledge, judgement, originality, initiative, autonomy, and enthusiasm for research *evaluated via the referee assessments*

Involvement and participation in entrepreneurship, local economic development, community development or innovation (33%)

Overview

As demonstrated by the applicant's past involvement and participation in entrepreneurship, local economic development, community development or innovation.

Potential Indicators & Sources

- Entrepreneurial activities
- Local economic development
- Community development
- Innovation
 - *All evaluated via the Involvement and participation in entrepreneurship, local economic development, community development or innovation section of the application, work experience section of the application, and referee assessments*