

Welcome to the GPSG Awards Committee!

This document will explain how to review the travel award applications. **We are looking to fund travel to events that will have a strong positive impact on the applicant's academic/professional career.** The goal of the review process is to ensure a fair evaluation of all applications. Each application is read by multiple reviewers, and each reviewer's scores are standardized.

You will receive an application document via Google Drive. The document is automatically shared with our GPSG Google account, so once your scores are filled in you don't need to do anything else.

Each application is scored out of 45 points. Three free response questions are worth a possible 10 points each (for a total of 30 points), 5 points for the budget, and 10 points for the overall quality of the application. The rest of this document explains how to evaluate each question.

The most important thing you can do to ensure a fair review process is to be consistent with your scores when evaluating applications:

- Make sure that an 8 for one application is equivalent to an 8 in another application.
- Use the entire numerical scale in each category to prevent clustering of scores that increases the likelihood of ties.
 - While it can feel uncomfortable to give someone a low score, inflating their scores ultimately does not help them and only creates problems when ranking applications.
 - There is also a tendency to inflate scores after reading a few applications, so you may want to re-evaluate the first few applications after you have scored the set to maintain consistency.
- Some parts of the rubric asks you to evaluate the relative importance of the travel compared to other applications. You should read through a few applications before starting to rate applications to establish a baseline to compare applications against.
- Application scores are converted to a ranking to normalize for variability in scoring. **Ultimately, only the order that you rank the applications is relevant to the final score.** Please make an effort to establish a rank with no ties as you evaluate the applications.

On the scoring spreadsheet, there will also be a column for comments/feedback from the reviewer. Providing comments is optional. Comments don't have to be in complete sentences or lengthy but indicating areas of potential improvement is appreciated. If you have any questions about reviewing applications, please email me at gpspawds@indiana.edu.

Thank you for volunteering to read applications. We couldn't offer these awards without volunteers like you!

Abstract or event description

If you are traveling to present: Provide an abstract, including title and number of co-authors, of your presentation. Do not include your own name anywhere in this abstract. If you are not traveling to present: Provide a general description of the event to which you will be traveling. Your response to this question is given to reviewers as a way for them to gain some background on your application, but it does not directly contribute to your application score.

You'll see the answer to this question, but it is not part of the evaluation process. It is given to you for background purposes only. The aim is to give you a better understanding of the application as a whole.

Grading Criteria

Event significance and relevance [10 points]

Explain the perceived importance of the event within your discipline, and optionally the importance of the event in a broader context. Describe the relevance of the event to your area of study.

This question is scored out of 10 possible points. Applicants who are traveling to prestigious and selective events that have direct relevance to their area of study should receive higher scores. It is up to the applicant to explain the significance of the event and how it is relevant to their area of study in their application, and ***your evaluation of the event should be based solely off of what the applicant has written and not based on your prior knowledge of the event.*** The main aim of this question is to evaluate the event that the person is traveling to.

High Scores (7 - 10 points)

The application makes a convincing case that the event is significant within their discipline and attending the event is important in their field.

Average Scores (4 - 7 points)

Applications in this range usually demonstrate some, but not all, of the characteristics of the high scoring applications. This could be due to two different factors:

1. The quality of the answer doesn't give you enough information to evaluate the significance of the event OR the relevance of the event to the applicant's area of study, or
2. The event itself is not as significant as the events in other applications and/or the relevance of the event to the applicant's area of study does not seem as relevant as other applications.

Low Scores (0 - 4 points)

Low scores should be given to applications that don't answer the question with enough information for you to evaluate the significance and relevance of the event or do not meet the criteria of prestigious and relevant events.

Below is a chart you can use to think about some of the important areas of consideration when determining the Event Significance and Relevance. This is a **guide** not a definitive list of all of the potential areas of consideration.

Important Notes:

1. This chart is not completely comprehensive, there are many types of events that applicants are attending so please **use the below chart as a guide.**
 - a. These areas are examples not a comprehensive list.
2. A High Scoring application does **not** necessarily have to include all of the listed areas of consideration.
3. Events will **differ based on the discipline**; for example, the selection process for a Chemistry conference may look different than selection for a Literature event. To the best of your ability, please consider the application in the context of the field.

Area of Consideration	Good	Great	Excellent
<i>Size of Event</i>	Small grad student organization	Mid to large-range organization	Largest conference in the discipline
<i>Who is attending</i>	Other grad students	Grad students & early career scholars	All level of scholars
<i>Is event related to degree</i>	Event relates to discipline (niche aspect of larger field, but not field)	Event relates to field, but not degree	Event relates to field and degree
<i>How participation is determined</i>	Anyone interested can participate	Selected by peers, grad students	Selected by discipline leaders
<i>Type of Professional Development</i>	Networking & attending general workshop/training	Attending specialized workshop/training & networking	Leading workshop/training & networking
<i>What is being presented</i>	Poster	Paper/presentation	Full panel
<i>Specificity & Clarity of Communication</i>	The applicant provided some general information about the event	Applicant provided details about the event significance or relation to their area of study	Applicant clearly articulated the event significance & relation to their area of study

Personal contribution to the event [10 points]

Explain the extent of your participation at the event and preparation for the event. For example, if you are presenting original research, describe your role in the project up to and including the presentation. Describe your contributions so that someone not in your discipline can understand.

This question is scored out of 10 points. This can be the most difficult question to evaluate because the answers vary a lot depending on the kind of travel. The majority of applicants will be traveling to present academic work, and these are typically the easiest applications to evaluate.

**High Scores
(7 - 10 points)**

The highest scores should be given to applicants who will have extended participation in the event. Participation can take many forms, such as presenting research, attending a workshop, organizing a symposium, performing, etc.

- Presentation of original work and organizational involvement (giving a talk or symposium, leading a seminar/workshop, etc.) should take the highest priority, followed by attending workshops/skill-building, with networking being the lowest priority.
- Contributing to the conference in multiple ways is better than just one.
- When presenting research, applicants who are a sole author or are higher listed among multiple authors should take precedence over applicants who are lower-listed authors.

**Average Scores (4
- 7 points)**

Applications in this range usually demonstrate some, but not all, of the characteristics of the high scoring applications. This could be due to two different factors:

1. The quality of the answer doesn't give you enough information to evaluate the applicant's role at the event or
2. The contribution of the applicant to the work or event is not as significant as other those of applications.

**Low Scores
- 4 points)**

(0 Low scores should be given to applications that don't answer the question with enough information for you to evaluate the contribution of the applicant or simply don't demonstrate a strong degree of participation in the event by the applicant.

Below is a chart you can use to think about some of the important areas of consideration when determining the Personal Contribution to the Event. This is a **guide** not a definitive list of all of

the potential areas of consideration.

Important Notes:

1. This chart is not completely comprehensive, there are many types of events that applicants are attending so please **use the below chart as a guide.**
 - a. These areas are examples not a comprehensive list.
2. A High Scoring application does **not** necessarily have to include all of the listed areas of consideration.
3. Events and the definition of “significance” will **differ based on the discipline.** To the best of your ability, please consider the application in the context of the field.

<i>Area of Consideration</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Great</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>Paper Presentation</i> <i>Who authored work?</i>	Applicant is among many listed authors (ie. not first author)	Applicant is first author among a large group of authors	The applicant is the only author or is first author among few authors
<i>Significance of Presentation</i>	One of many papers/posters during session	Special panel with few presenters	Special paper presented at all-conference event
<i>Workshops</i> <i>Applicants role?</i>	Attendee	Invited participant	Session leader/Invited session leader
<i>Significance of Workshop</i>	Introduces other grad students to knowledge	Introduces knowledge to grads and early career scholars	Introduces new knowledge to scholars all levels
<i>Auditions</i> <i>How they became involved?</i>	Self-selected to attend		Competitively selected internally or externally (invited by IU or event)
<i>Significance of Auditions</i>	Participate in small performance event	Participate in regional performance event	Participate in large-scale event for major audience
<i>Specificity & Clarity of Communication</i>	Applicant provided general information	Applicant provided details about personal contribution & its significance	Applicant clearly articulated their personal contribution & its significance

Professional impact [10 points]

Describe the impact of attending this event on your professional

development at this stage in your career.

This question is scored out of 10 points. The purpose of this question is to establish how relevant the proposed travel is to the applicant's professional development. The best responses will demonstrate that the event itself and the participation in the event will have a meaningful impact on the applicant's career.

This score often trends with the 'Personal Contribution...' category, which is often because applicants who have work to present or know what opportunities they will be pursuing at the event tend to have a good idea of how that will positively impact their career. This is expected, but not mandatory. After all, many of these categories are about effectively communicating these points rather than inferring based on perceived importance of the work.

**High Scores
- 10 points)**

- (7) The highest scores should be awarded to applicants who clearly explain the relevance of the travel to their professional development and demonstrate that the event will have a significant impact on their career.
- Applicants who are presenting dissertation or other work that may be more substantial in helping influence their career (i.e. finding a post-doc, professorship, or industry position) should score higher than someone presenting their first project.
 - Strong applicants should effectively illustrate to you:
 - How this conference fits into their careers goals/intended progression, and
 - How they will leverage their attendance at the event to further their career.

**Average Scores
- 7 points)**

- (4) Applications in this range usually demonstrate some, but not all, of the characteristics of the high scoring applications. This could be due to two different factors:
1. The quality of the answer doesn't give you enough information to evaluate the impact of the event at the same level as other applications, or
 2. The impact of the event is not as significant as other applications, even if it is well-articulated.

**Low Scores
- 4 points)**

- (0) Low scores should be given to applications that don't answer the question with enough information for you to evaluate the impact of the event on the applicant's professional development, or simply don't demonstrate a strong degree of impact.

Below is a chart you can use to think about some of the important areas of consideration when determining the Professional Impact. This is a **guide** not a definitive list of all of the potential areas of consideration.

Important Notes:

1. This chart is not completely comprehensive, there are many types of events that applicants are attending so please **use the below chart as a guide**.
 - a. These areas are examples not a comprehensive list.
2. A High Scoring application does **not** necessarily have to include all of the listed areas of consideration.
3. Events will **differ based on the discipline**. To the best of your ability, please consider the application in the context of the field.

<i>Area of Consideration</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Great</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>Conference Presentation</i> <i>Relation to degree</i>	Line on CV/general project collaborate on, but not degree related	Related to preliminary research for degree	Portion of thesis/dissertation
<i>Workshop</i> <i>Relation to degree</i>	Helpful knowledge for discipline	Necessary knowledge for degree	Necessary knowledge for degree and career goals post-grad school
<i>Auditions</i> <i>Relation to degree</i>	Good opportunity for practice	Good opportunity for resume building	Necessary for career
<i>Auditions</i> <i>Who is involved</i>	Other grad students/young professionals	Senior scholars/industry officials/professionals in your field	Senior scholars/industry officials/professionals who are integral to your work/area of study
<i>Specificity & Clarity of Communication</i>	Provides general information on professional impact	Clear description of professional impact	Clear and specific description of impact & explanation of the intention behind networking/development

Budget [5 points] *

Provide and justify your budget for this project. If you are driving, please use IUB's current figures for mileage reimbursement, located at <http://www.indiana.edu/~travel/traveling/travelingbycar.shtml#mileage>.

This question is scored out of 5 points. High scores should be given to applicants who provide a reasonable and complete budget (including travel, lodging, and other associated expenses depending on the nature of the travel).

**High Scores
(3 - 5 points)**

Describes a reasonably complete budget (travel, lodging, and other associated expenses) with realistic expenses. Frugality is appreciated, but do not unilaterally give lower budgets higher scores.

If the GPSG Travel Award (\$500) is not going to be enough to cover the entirety of travel costs, do they have a plan of how to cover the remaining expenses?

- Even if they do not have the funding secured, showing they have a plan to apply to other awards or otherwise acquire funding should be rewarded.
- Outlined plans are better than vague assertions that they'll figure it out.

**Average Scores
(2 - 3 points)**

The applications in this range have less complete budgets and/or aspects of the budget are unrealistic or not carefully thought out.

**Low Scores
- 2 points)**

(0 The budget is missing crucial information, does not demonstrate a realistic grasp of travel costs, and/or demonstrates flagrant disregard for tactful spending.

Below is a chart you can use to think about some of the important areas of consideration when determining the Budget. This is a **guide** not a definitive list of all of the potential areas of consideration.

Important Notes:

1. This chart is not completely comprehensive, there are many types of events and costs that are associated with travel so please **use the below chart as a guide.**
2. While frugality is appreciated, do not unilaterally give higher scores to lower cost budgets. Applications should clearly justify their budget expenses.
3. A High Scoring application does **not** necessarily have to include all of the listed areas of consideration.
4. Events will **differ based on the discipline.** To the best of your ability, please consider the application in the context of the field.

<i>Area of Consideration</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Great</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>Is the Budget reasonably complete?</i>	Provides a general estimate of most costs associated with the travel	Provides detailed costs associated with travel	Uses specific quotes for all costs associated with travel
<i>Are the listed costs reasonable?</i>	Provides general information on costs	Provides justification for included costs	Provides justification for costs and a consideration for ways to lower expenses where possible
<i>If GPSG award does not cover full costs, does applicant have a plan?</i>	Provides vague assertion that they will identify funds	Identifies additional awards/funds they will/have applied for or received	Lays out a clear plan for covering additional costs (ie. other awards, use of personal funds, etc.)

Rate the overall quality of the application [10 points].

The final component to the application score is an overall quality score. This is out of 10 points, and there is no specific question associated with this score. Due to our use of a ranking system

and the relatively low total number of points, taking off even a few points in a single category can move the applications up or down the ranks by quite a bit. This category is intended to be a way to reward applications that might have had a slight weakness but were otherwise strong.

You are evaluating the application as a whole.

These scores may correlate somewhat with the scores you have given to the other sections.

High Scores (7 - 10 points) The highest scores should be awarded to applicants who provided clear and concise information throughout the entire application. They have effectively explained their personal contributions and the professional impact of their travel with details about *why* and *how* the event will impact them. The application is professional and mostly free of grammatical errors.

Average Scores (4 - 7 points) Applications in this range usually demonstrate some, but not all, of the characteristics of the high scoring applications. This could be due to several different factors:

1. The quality of the answers throughout the application do not give you enough information to fully evaluate the impact of the event at the same level as other applications, or
2. The impact of the event is not as significant as other applications, even if it is well-articulated.
3. As a whole, the application has some readability issues that made it difficult to understand the applicant's responses. The application may be overly simplified and lacking details or overly complex with too many unnecessary details that make the some answers harder to understand.

Low Scores (0 - 4 points) Low scores should be given to applications that consistently didn't answer the question with enough information for you to evaluate the impact of the event on the applicant's professional development, or simply don't demonstrate a strong degree of impact.

Below are questions that will help think about some of the important areas of consideration when determining the Overall Quality of the Application. This is a **guide** not a definitive list of all of the potential areas of consideration.

Important Notes:

1. For this question, you are considering all of the different elements of the application and your overall impression on the applicant's ability to communicate the impact of the

travel.

2. These areas of consideration are not completely comprehensive, there are many types of events that applicants are attending so please **use the below questions as a guide.**

3. A High Scoring application does **not** necessarily have to include all of the listed areas of consideration.

4. Events will **differ based on the discipline.** To the best of your ability, please consider the application in the context of the field.

Areas of Consideration:

- How effectively will this travel meaningfully advance the applicant's education and career?
 - Does the work evidence movement towards the degree? Set them up for their post-graduate career?
 - Will presentation of work impact future employers' impression of the student?
- How effectively will this travel encourage the applicant's professional development?
 - Are they giving their first talk on their dissertation research, or is it presenting their fifth poster?
 - Does travel help build relationships necessary to an applicant's career?
 - Could this funding serve as a bridge to future financial support?
- How well-written (e.g. clear, concise, comprehensible, and convincing) is the entire application?
 - Try to avoid marking down for errors that may result from an applicant whose first language is not English.
 - Is the application concise or does it ramble on?
 - Does the application have a professional tone?