

GSS Travel Grant Rubric – Level I (Presenting)

Section 1: Applicant and Conference Information (3 points possible)			
Applicant and Conference Information (3 points possible)	3 points	1-2 points	0 points
	All information is accurate and complete. There are no errors or omissions.	Minor errors or omissions are present, but the overall information is understandable and verifiable.	Significant errors or omissions are present, making it difficult to verify the information or understand the application.
Section 2: Statement of Importance (40 points possible)			
Significance of Conference (15 points possible)	13-15 points	8-12 points	0-7 points
	Outstanding explanation of the conference's importance to the applicant's degree program and career goals. Demonstrates a deep understanding of the conference's relevance and impact.	Good explanation of the conference's importance. Clearly connects the conference to the applicant's academic and professional development but may lack some depth or specific details.	Partial or lacking explanation of the conference's importance. The connection to the applicant's degree program and career is weak or unclear.
Significance of the Presentation (15 points possible)	13-15 points	8-12 points	0-7 points
	Outstanding explanation of the presentation's significance to the field of study. Clearly articulates the research question or creative endeavor and its potential impact.	Good explanation of the presentation's significance. The research question or creative endeavor is well-defined, but the explanation of its impact may be somewhat limited.	Partial or lacking explanation of the presentation's significance. The research question or creative endeavor is unclear or poorly defined, and the impact is not adequately addressed.

<i>Applicant's Role (10 points possible)</i>	8-10 points	5-7 points	0-4 points
	Clear and comprehensive explanation of the applicant's role in research and presentation. Demonstrates a significant contribution to the project. <i>Note: Different roles should require different levels of explanation (i.e. the role of the first author should require less explanation than the role of a fifth author)</i>	Mostly clear explanation of the applicant's role. The contribution is evident, but some details may be missing or unclear.	Lacking explanation of the applicant's role. The contribution is unclear or not adequately explained.
Section 3: Jargon (5 points possible)			
<i>Jargon (5 points possible)</i>	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 points
	Explanation is exceptionally clear and accessible to a non-expert audience. Jargon is minimal or well-defined. Grader is able to read the application without having to Google any terms or language.	Explanation is generally clear but contains some jargon that may hinder understanding for a non-expert audience. Grader is able to read and understand the application but may have had to Google some specific terminology.	Explanation is heavily reliant on jargon and is difficult for a non-expert audience to understand. Even after Googling relevant terminology, the Grader is still confused by the language of the application.
Section 4: Budget and Travel (37 points possible)			
<i>Clarity and Accuracy (5 points possible)</i>	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 points
	Travel details are clear, accurate, and consistent with the rest of the application,	Travel details are mostly clear but contain some inconsistencies or minor inaccuracies.	Travel details are unclear, inaccurate, or inconsistent. Line-item descriptions are

	including the supporting documentation. Line-item descriptions are clear and match relevant expenses.	Line-item descriptions are generally clear but may lack some detail.	confusing or do not match expenses.
	<i>6-7 points</i>	<i>3-5 points</i>	<i>0-2 points</i>
Documentation (7 points possible)	Provides complete and compelling documentation of conference registration and/or travel arrangements, as well as other relevant expenses (i.e. acceptance letters, registration confirmations, hotel bookings, etc.)	Provides sufficient documentation, but some details are missing or unclear. Some documents may be incomplete or difficult to interpret their relevance.	Provides insufficient or irrelevant documentation. Missing key documents or providing documents that do not support the application.
	<i>21-25 points</i>	<i>13-20 points</i>	<i>0-12 points</i>
Justification (25 points possible)	Justification is clear, comprehensive, and persuasive. It fully explains the need for each expense and demonstrates an effort to minimize costs.	Justification is generally clear and explains most expenses but may lack detail in some areas or fail to fully demonstrate cost-effectiveness.	Justification is weak, unclear, and fails to adequately explain the need for the requested funds. May be disorganized or lack a convincing rationale for the expenses.
Section 5: Academic Sponsor Recommendation (15 points possible)			
	<i>4-5 points</i>	<i>2-3 points</i>	<i>0-1 points</i>
Contribution to Field and Professional Development (5 points possible)	Recommendation clearly articulates the importance of this conference or activity to the applicant's	Recommendation mentions the importance of this conference or activity to the applicant's	Recommendation does not adequately address the importance of this conference or activity to the

	professional development and to the applicant's field of study.	professional development and to the applicant's field of study but lacks detail or specific examples.	applicant's professional development or to the applicant's field of study.
Endorsement (5 points possible)	4-5 points Sponsor strongly endorses the applicant and clearly conveys the importance of participation to the student's development. Enthusiasm and support are evident.	2-3 points Sponsor endorses the applicant, but the endorsement may be somewhat generic or lack specific details about the importance of participation to the student's development.	0-1 points Sponsor's endorsement is vague or not overtly positive. Endorsement does not address the importance of participation to the student's development.
Quality and Insight (5 points possible)	4-5 points Recommendation provides meaningful insight into the applicant's abilities and potential and adds significant value to the application.	2-3 points Recommendation provides some insight into the applicant's abilities and potential but may lack depth or specific examples.	0-1 points Recommendation does not add meaningfully to the application or offer a clear assessment of the applicant's abilities.
Total Points Possible: 100			

Notes:

- Conference/activity dates must fall within the current granting cycle (Fall: July 1-December 31, Spring: January 1-June 30). Applications that fall outside of the current granting cycle are ineligible for funding and will be disqualified. Applications that do not list dates for the conference/activity will also be disqualified as ineligible for funding.
- This rubric applies only to Level I applicants, meaning that the applicant is presenting at the conference or contributing in a meaningful way to the activity for which they are applying for funding. Students who will only be attending the relevant conference/activity will be graded according to the Level II rubric.
- Questions about GSS grant applications, rubrics, and eligibility should be directed to the Ways and Means Committee (gsswam@ou.edu).