

GSS International Travel Award Rubric

| Judging Criteria | 1 - Did not meet expectations | 2 - Somewhat met expectations | 3 - Met expectations | 4 - Somewhat exceeded expectations | 5 - Far exceeded expectations |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Introduction | No introduction, or introduction was poorly constructed and did not provide adequate background for the research. | Introduction provides some background information, but is missing information vital to the judge's consideration | Introduction provides adequate background for consideration | Introduction provides adequate background for consideration in a concise manner. | Introduction provides adequate background for consideration in a clear and concise manner. |
| How and why the activity is essential | The importance and purpose of the activity is not listed, or is listed in such a way that it is non-credible | The importance and purpose of the activity is listed, but does not meet the threshold of importance for consideration | The importance and purpose of the activity is listed and meets the threshold of importance for consideration | The importance and purpose of activity is listed in a clear way and meets the threshold for consideration | The importance and purpose of activity is listed in a clear and concise way and meets the threshold for consideration |
| Why the award is critical to applicant's progress in the field | Critical nature of the award is not described. | Critical nature of the award is described, but does not convince the evaluator. | Critical nature of the award is described clearly and with merit | Critical nature of the award is described clearly and convincingly | Critical nature of the award is described clearly and convincingly, with relevancy current. |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Statement is written for a general audience | Statement is not clear or concise. | Statement is approaching clarity and/or being concise, but lacking. | Statement is generally clear and concise. | Statement is understood by the reviewer with some added effort (eg. Googling a word, etc.) | Statement is written for a general audience and is clearly understood by the reviewer. |
| Expense item listed | Expense item not listed | - | - | - | Expense item listed |
| Approximate cost listed | Approximate cost is not listed | - | - | - | Approximate cost is listed |
| How will the item be utilized | Item utilization is not listed | Item utilization is not clear | Item utilization is understandable | Item utilization is clear and obviously reasonable | Item utilization is clear, obviously reasonable, and written concisely |
| Justification for the item | Justification of item is not listed | Item obviously not justified | Item seems to be justified, but there is reasonable doubt | Item seems justified without a reasonable doubt | Item is obviously justified |
| Critical or non-critical listed | Critical or non-critical not listed | - | - | - | Critical or non-critical listed |
| Rounded estimate, external funding, internal funding, and total estimate of | Running cost not listed | - | - | - | Running cost listed |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| requested funds listed | | | | | |
| Properly blinded | Proposal not properly blinded | - | - | - | Proposal properly blinded |
| Overall quality of CV | No CV included | CV is included | CV is included and is understandable | CV is included and clear | CV is included, clear, and matches with the subject matter of the research |