



TRAVEL GRANT APPLICATION 2020-2021
TRAVEL GRANT FUNDING GUIDELINES (ASSESSMENT RUBRIC)

Application Information

The application cover page is intended to elicit basic applicant information, as well as data on the student's engagement with GPSS and the relative value of this potential \$500 award. Consistent with Committee recommendations, the assessment rubric below prioritizes applicants that have a high degree of financial need for a conference that plays a significant role in their academic development. The Committee favors those that have made efforts to secure other funding and/or reduce total costs, and those that have put effort into their application. All applications will be reviewed and ranked, giving the top applicants priority with funding.

Should the need for additional assessment arise, submitted transcripts and conference abstracts may be used to further differentiate among similarly strong candidates. Scores from the grading rubric are used as a baseline for committee discussion, and do not directly equate to final allocation decisions.

Requirements

- 1. Is the applicant a student?
2. Did the applicant give proof of the cost of the conference/event?
3. Is the application complete at the time of review?

If any of these criteria are not met, reach out to the applicant. If there is no contact, disqualify.

Optional

- 4. Is the applicant's GPA over 3.0? (3.0 is the passing GPA)

Financial Section (11 point max)

- 1. Funding need (Points may be awarded on a scale of 1 to 7)

Table with 4 columns representing point values (7 pts., 5 pts., 3 pts., 1 pt.) and rows of bullet points describing grant necessity and student effort.

Student Self-Assessment (23 point max)

The student assessment section of the application is intended to elicit information on the relative importance of this conference event in the applicant's academic and professional development, as well as their financial need. Owing to the assumed amount of work that is required for individual paper/poster presentations (over co-authored work and panel chairing), the former receive slightly higher point values. Students that have not attended similar events (either because they are less frequent or funding has been inadequate in the past) garner a higher degree of credit here as well, and even more if they have already used private funding to do so. Less frequent participation earns additional points because the Committee wants to facilitate participation for less-experienced students to the extent reasonable. Finally, students that have sufficient funding available from elsewhere should not be receiving GPSS grants, as this is intended to be a "source of last resort." Additional comments that strengthen the application may earn points, but not enough to override other components.

1. Number of conferences attended – no points awarded for this, as it is just information for the committee
2. This student attempts to articulate their work. (Yes = 1 pt, No = 0 pt)
3. Nature of student participation (Points may be awarded on a scale of 1 to 3)

3 pts.	2 pts.	1 pt.
The student is presenting their work in the conference more than once.	The student is presenting their work in the conference once or is intimately involved with the management of the conference.	The student is simply attending the conference and has no other ties to the management of the conference.

4. Importance of conference event participation to student's academic and professional development (1 to 4 points)

4 pts.	3 pts.	2 pts.	1 pt.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation is extremely critical to student's academic and prof. development. ● Student clearly attempts to explain themselves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation is very important to student's academic and professional development. ● Student shows somewhat of an attempt to explain themselves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation is somewhat important to student's academic and professional development. ● Student shows little effort in attempt to explain themselves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation is not important to student's academic and professional development. ● Student does not attempt to explain themselves.

5. Students plan to engage community on return, with an emphasis on specific, discrete goals for outreach. (1-3 points)

3 pts.	2 pts.	1 pt.
Student details a specific, discrete goal for outreach that directly impacts other students of the UW.	Student details some aspects of a community outreach plan.	Student details a community outreach plan that is vague or indirect in nature.

6. Grader opinion: Should the student be funded? (0-2 points)

7. Additional comments: Does this response add significantly to the application quality in a way not captured above? If so, add 0–2 pts.

Faculty Assessment (16 point max)

The faculty assessment section of the application is intended to elicit information on the relative importance of this conference event in the applicant's academic and professional development, as well as their financial need. It may be used to corroborate and/or enrich responses submitted by the student applicant. Information specifically related to the student's course of study and/or research projects is not being requested because GPSS reviewers are not qualified to assess this. The recommendations of faculty that have more familiarity with applicants receive more points than those without. Applicants who are presenting significant work that is potentially critical to their development receive higher point values. Those that have significant funding from elsewhere (other grants, lab allocations, etc.) should not be receiving GPSS grants. As in the case of student assessments, additional comments that strengthen the application may earn points, but not enough to override other components.

1. Importance of conference event participation (Points may be awarded on a scale of 1 to 7.)

7 pts	5 pts.	3 pts.	1 pt
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student's participation is effectively described as active and substantive. ● Participation is extremely critical to academic and prof. development. ● Conference is very important in the student's field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student's contribution is characterized as substantial and important. ● Participation is very important to student's academic and professional development (important work, rare event, &c.). ● Conference is considered to be important to the student's field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation is somewhat important to student's academic and professional development. ● The event is fairly typical and student contribution is not particularly significant within course of study at UW. ● Assessment lacks desired specificity. ● Responses fail to address all questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation is minimally important to student's academic and professional development. ● Assessment lacks desired specificity. ● Responses fail to address all questions.

2. Personal recommendation (Points may be awarded on a scale of 1 to 5.)

5 pts.	3 pts.	1 pts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member fully recommends the conference for the student. ● Faculty member wants to make sure the student attends the conference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member somewhat recommends the conference to the student. ● Faculty member wants to make sure the student attends the conference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member either does not recommend the conference or does not mention a recommendation.

3. Additional comments: Does this response add significantly to the application quality in a way not captured above? If so, add 0–2 pts.