

**Graduate and Professional Student Council
GPSC Travel Grants Evaluation Rubric**

Dear GPSC Travel Grants Judge,

Thank you for serving as a GPSC Travel Grants Judge! The GPSC awards travel grants for graduate and professional students who are attending or presenting research at academic or professional conferences/events. As you complete your review of the applications, please follow the GPSC Travel Grant Evaluation Rubric below. The applications are evaluated on the following four criteria:

1. Professional Development:	10 points
2. Description of Work:	10 points
3. Description of Event and Efforts to Secure Funding:	10 points
4. Budget:	10 points

Total Points: 40 points

Please enter each of the individual scores and the Total Score for each applicant in the online judge evaluation form, at http://gpsc.arizona.edu/webform_list.

The travel grant applications are competitive and the available funds are very limited. Please give careful attention to the evaluations, and provide general comments in the space provided in the online evaluation form, for the applicants' reference should they not receive GPSC travel grant funding this time around.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at UNION-gpsc-funding@email.arizona.edu, if you have any questions as you evaluate the travel grant applications.

Score 1: Professional Development

The applicant must explain in detail how attending this conference/event will help his or her professional development. Did the applicant express the value of the proposed travel to his or her professional development? Did you get the sense that the applicant really thought about what he/she put into the application? The more detailed and the more extra components added to the application, the higher the score should be.

Where an applicant will not be making a presentation, the student statement and the faculty letter of recommendation must explain, in detail, how attending this conference/event pertains to the applicant's academic, research, or professional interests; any networking opportunities; and the applicant's plans to present his or her research in the future

Criteria	Rating
The applicant provides specific details, such as topics, concepts and issues, and clearly explains how these details are related to his or her professional development.	10
The applicant provides a clear but general explanation of how the conference/event promotes his or her professional development.	9
The applicant explains the importance of this conference/event to his or her professional development; however, the explanations may be slightly ambiguous or unclear, may contain some incompleteness in representation.	8
The conference/event may be irrelevant or tangentially related to the applicant's professional development.	6
Relevance of the conference/event to the applicant's professional development is unclear or under-developed.	4
Does not state how the conference/event will benefit applicant's professional development.	0

Score 2: Description of Work

The applicant must explain the work that he or she will be presenting at the conference/event. The applicant can explain his or her work by providing an abstract and/or by explaining the work in the personal statement.

If the only description comes from the letter of recommendation, please count this against them. If an applicant will not be presenting, the applicant should explain in detail his or her academic, professional, or research interests.

Criteria (If Presenting)	Rating
The applicant provides an abstract. In the personal statement, the applicant summarizes the work to be presented in clear, precise terms that non-experts can understand.	10
The applicant provides an abstract. In the personal statement, the applicant summarizes the work to be presented that mostly replicates the contents of the abstract.	9
The applicant provides the abstract only.	8
The applicant describes the work in the personal statement only, without providing an abstract. The description is clear and precise.	6
The applicant describes the work in the personal statement or letter of recommendation only, without providing an abstract. The description is unclear or under-developed.	4
No description of work provided.	0

Criteria (If Not Presenting)	Rating
In the personal statement, the applicant summarizes his or her academic, professional, or research interests in clear, precise terms that non-experts can understand.	10
In the personal statement, the applicant summarizes his or her academic, professional, or research interests in general or overly specialized terms.	9
The applicant's academic, professional, or research interests is unclear or under-developed.	6
The applicant's academic, professional, or research interests are summarized in the letter of recommendation only.	4
No description of interests provided.	0

Score 3: Description of Event and Efforts to Secure Funding

The applicant must describe the type of event (e.g., conference, workshop, poster sessions and other professional development events which may be non-conference related) he or she will be attending, and the chances the applicant will have to interact with other professionals or experts in their field.

Funding is extremely limited and applicants should show that they are actively trying to get funding from as many sources as they can. A lack of effort to obtain other funding should be counted against them. The focus is on the applicant's efforts to obtain funding, regardless of whether the applicant actually received other funding. In this case, the application should mention the lack or difficulty of obtaining alternative funding.

Criteria	Rating
The applicant provides specific details, such as the names of experts and session titles. The applicant describes efforts to obtain other funding, providing names and amount requested (This may be listed in the budget).	10
The applicant provides a clear but general description of events and efforts to secure funding, without specific names and figures.	9
Both description of the event and efforts to obtain funding may be slightly ambiguous or unclear, and they may contain some incompleteness in representation.	8
The applicant either does not describe the event or explain efforts to obtain funding.	4
The applicant does not describe the event nor explain efforts to obtain funding.	0

Score 4: Budget

The budget must appear reasonable and realistic with regards to the amount spent for each component. As such, the budget must be adjusted according to the following criteria:

- The GPSC Travel Grant only covers travel (airfare, including international, as well as transportation in the conference location), hotel, per diem, and registration. If an 'Other' category is present, make sure that the applicant explains what those other costs include.
- The per diems from the suggested websites in the budget template are the maximum figures allowed. The actual figures in the budget should be lower than those general estimates.
- The GPSC will only cover 3 nights in a hotel and 4 days per diem. This means that the "Current Request to GPSC" column cannot exceed these amounts even though their "Total Funding" column may.
 - Ex: If an applicant is staying a total of 5 nights at a rate of \$79/night, his or her total hotel cost would be \$395. However, s/he can only request up to \$237 from GPSC (3 x \$79). Therefore, the maximum amount that should appear (though it could be less) in the "Current Request to GPSC" column is \$237; the applicant will list \$395 in the "Total Funding" column.
- The amount requested should match the available funds, including funding from own pocket.

Criteria	Rating
The budget is clear, reasonable, follows the GPSC guidelines, and the applicant provides detailed explanations for the amount requested.	10
The budget is clear, reasonable, and follows the general GPSC guidelines.	9
The budget follows the GPSC guidelines but does not reflect efforts to find the cheapest alternatives (e.g., requests the maximum amount of funding without reasonable justification).	8
The budget does not follow the GPSC guidelines (e.g., the applicant requests over three nights' hotel stay in the "Current Request to GPSC" column; amount requested does not match available funding).	4
The applicant does not provide a budget.	0

REFER TO SAMPLE BUDGET ON PAGE 6.

SAMPLE BUDGET – WHAT TO LOOK FOR

Conference Title:	Date From:	Date To:		
Annual Conference of the American Anthropological Association	11/25/2014	11/30/2014	Current Request to GPSC	Total Budget

Airfare (a): Roundtrip from Tucson to Louisiana		\$100.00	\$350.00
Hotel (b): Sharing room with one person at the Radisson (\$120/2=\$60)			
\$80.00 X 4 night (s)		\$240.00	\$320.00
Per Diem (c):			
\$50.00 X 5 night (s)		\$200.00	\$250.00
Car/Local Transportation (d):			
Public Transportation		\$60.00	\$100.00
Conference Registration:		\$150.00	\$200.00

Adjusted the Hotel Expenses for three nights (\$80x3=\$240)

Adjusted the Per Diem Expenses for four days (\$50x4=\$200)

Total Budget	\$1220.00
Funding from GPSC**	\$750.00
Funding from Other Sources (including pending):	\$400.00
JBC Memorial Award (\$100), Due November 1)	
School of Anthropology Travel Award (\$300, pending)	
Funding from Own Pocket	\$70.00
TOTAL FUNDING (Must match total budget)	\$1220.00

Funding requested from GPSC does not exceed the \$750 maximum

Total funding matches total budget