



Travel Grant Evaluation Rubric FY/AY 2021-2022

Applicants to the GPSC Travel Grant program will be asked to submit a proposal narrative of no more than 1000 words. Students who wish to apply to the GPSC Travel Grant Program as a group can submit a single application if all students will be traveling/attending the same event (or other reason for travel). Group travel is **limited to 5 students per application** and may include one undergraduate student. Applicants who apply to the GPSC Travel Grant program as a group will be asked to submit a proposal narrative of no more than 1500 words. Proposal narratives should include:

1. A clear, concise, and jargon-free **description of the event or other reason for travel**, including what the applicant(s) intends to do there, why the named location is the best venue for the activity, and why the travel is relevant to the applicant's current program of study.
 - a. If applying as a group, the proposal narrative needs to include what each individual will be doing and how it is relevant to their current program of study
 - b. To abide by GPSC's confidentiality clause, each individual needs to be listed as "person A, B, C, etc." within the proposal narrative.
2. A detailed **description of how attending the event will contribute to or impact:**
 - a. The applicants own knowledge, professional development, or career.
 - i. If applying as a group, individuals should again be listed as "person A, B, C, etc." and the benefits for each individual should be clearly stated.
 - b. The broader community (such as, but not limited to, the applicant's team or department, the University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities).
3. A brief justification of the amount of funding requested from GPSC, and an explanation of proactive attempts to obtain other sources of funding. GPSC recognizes that additional funding may not be available to all applicants; in this case it is sufficient for the applicant to state that no additional sources of funding are available.

Proposals will be evaluated based on inclusion of all of the above criteria, as well as the **professionalism and strength of argumentation** in support of their proposed funding.

Applicants are also asked to submit and will be evaluated on:

- A detailed, well-justified budget that includes all sources of funding including funds requested from GPSC, other awards (may be marked as “pending” or “applied”) and expenses the applicant will pay for (out-of-pocket expenses).
- A brief letter of support from a faculty recommender no more than 1 page in length, which addresses the following points: (1) the name of the conference, event, or purpose of travel, (2) the date(s) and place(s) of the conference, event, or purpose of travel, and (3) a statement indicating the faculty member supports the travel and endorses the applicant. The faculty letter of support should avoid including the applicant’s name in the letter or in the file name to maintain standards of double-blind reviewing. If applying as a group, the faculty letter must also mention the number of students traveling.

The rubrics below are intended to assist applicants in preparing a strong proposal and assist judges in fairly and accurately evaluating the strength of submitted proposals.

Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Criterion 1. The proposal includes a description of the event or experience for which funding is requested, clearly stating the event name, dates, and location. The proposal also needs to include an explanation of what the applicant or **each** individual in the group application intends to do there, why the named location is the best venue for the activity (e.g., “the animals I study only live in this region”, “it is a prominent regional conference at which notable scholar Dr. X, who I cite extensively in my research, will be giving a keynote talk,” “I plan on networking/discussing my research with Dr. X”), “I plan on attending skill building session Y, plenary session Z, etc. that can only be found at this meeting,” and why the travel is relevant to their program of study, without using specialist jargon.

<i>Poor</i>	<i>Below Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Above Average</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<u>All or most major details</u> about the proposed travel <u>are missing</u> . The proposal does not discuss what the applicant intends to do, or why the travel site is the best venue for the activity.	<u>Major details</u> about the proposed travel are <u>missing</u> . Description of the proposed activities and venue is <u>limited, vague, or difficult to understand</u> for a non-specialist reviewer.	<u>Most major details are enumerated</u> , but description of applicant’s activities, purpose of travel, or relation to program of study <u>lacks specifics</u> .	<u>All major details are clearly enumerated</u> . Description of applicant’s activities and suitability of venue are <u>mostly well-described</u> .	<u>All major details</u> are clearly and accurately enumerated using <u>specific details</u> . Description of applicant’s activities and suitability of venue are described <u>clearly and convincingly for a non-specialist reviewer</u> .

Criterion 2. The proposal clearly enumerates, using specific details, the impact the travel will have on the applicant's or **each** individual's (for group applications) research, skills, professional development, or career. The proposal should also address the impact of the travel on the broader community (such as, but not limited to, the applicant's research team or department, University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities). The description of these impacts makes it clear that attending the event will positively impact the applicant's career or professional development (i.e., networking, presentation skills). If networking is the primary objective, applicants need to be **specific** about who they plan on networking with and the impacts that will result from networking.

<i>Poor</i>	<i>Below Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Above Average</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<u>Little to no description of specific impacts</u> on applicant's professional development or the broader community (such as, but not limited to, the University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities).	Discussion of impact on applicant's professional development or broader community (such as, but not limited to, the University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities) is <u>limited and vague</u> .	Impacts on applicant's professional development or broader community (such as, but not limited to, the University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities) are discussed, <u>but the benefits to attending but do not go beyond the usual</u> (i.e., networking, developing presentation skills).	The proposal convincingly argues that attending the event will have a major impact on the applicant's professional development <u>OR</u> the broader community (such as, but not limited to, the University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities). If networking is primary objective, specific details regarding who and why are included	The proposal convincingly argues, <u>using specific details</u> , that attending the event will have a major impact on the applicant's professional development <u>AND</u> the broader community (such as, but not limited to, the University of Arizona, GPSC, local communities) <u>in more than just the usual ways</u> (i.e., beyond networking and presentation skills for a conference)

Criterion 3. The proposal contains a justification of the total amount of funding requested from GPSC, as well as an explanation of proactive attempts to secure other sources of funding and steps taken to reduce costs. If no other funding is available, this should be **clearly** mentioned, and will **not** count against the applicant. Examples of steps to reduce cost can be individuals sharing rooms, multiple individuals commuting together, student/group rates, etc.

<i>Poor</i>	<i>Below Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Above Average</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<u>No justification of funding request, and no explanation of attempts to secure other funding</u> present.	Proposal may <u>briefly or vaguely</u> explain their amount request, but <u>does not discuss attempts to secure other sources of funding or lack thereof</u> .	Justification of amount requested and/or attempts to secure other sources of funding are present, <u>but vague or lacking details</u> . Proposal may mention that no/limited other funding sources are available, but <u>lack an explanation</u> .	Justification of amount requested and attempts to secure other sources of funding are <u>detailed, complete, and reasonable</u> . If no/limited other funding sources are available, <u>this is clearly explained</u> .	Justification of amount requested and attempts to secure other sources of funding <u>detailed, complete, and reasonable</u> . Proposal shows, <u>using specific details</u> , evidence of having considered all other possible funding sources (including own pocket).

Criterion 4. The proposal is free of spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation errors. The proposal is organized in a clear, logical, easy to follow manner, and overall shows a high degree of professionalism.

<i>Poor</i>	<i>Below Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Above Average</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
The organization and/or quantity of spelling/grammatical/punctuation errors make the proposal <u>unintelligible</u> .	The number of spelling/grammatical/punctuation makes the proposal <u>difficult to understand</u> . The proposal is not logically organized and it is <u>difficult to see how rubric criteria are being addressed</u> .	There may be <u>some</u> spelling/grammatical/punctuation errors that affect overall proposal readability, but the flow of the proposal is <u>mostly clear and logical</u> .	The proposal is <u>free</u> from spelling/grammatical/punctuation errors, and it is <u>logically organized in a manner that is coherent and easy to follow</u> . The reader can easily identify where <u>most</u> rubric criteria are being addressed.	The quality of the proposal is on par with a submission for a major national grant. The proposal is <u>free</u> from spelling/grammatical/punctuation errors, and it is <u>logically organized in a manner that is coherent and easy to follow</u> . It is very easy for a reader to identify where <u>each</u> rubric criteria is addressed.

Budget Evaluation

Criterion 1. Each budget item is listed completely and accurately.

<i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
Budget items are missing, incomplete, or not listed accurately.	All budget items are listed completely and accurately.

Criterion 2. The budget clearly illustrates all other sources of funding (including “pending”/” applied”, and funding from own pocket).

<i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
Other funding sources are not clearly illustrated in the budget.	Other funding sources (including own pocket) are clearly and unambiguously listed on budget, or it is clearly indicated that no other sources are available to them.

Criterion 3. The total estimated expenses match the available funds, including funding from own pocket, pending funding applications, and the amount requested from GPSC.

<i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
Total estimated expenses do not match available funds.	Total estimated expenses match available funds.

Criterion 4. The amount requested from GPSC is no more than the established limits listed on the GPSC website and follows all budget guidelines outlined below.

<i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
GPSC/FSO budget guidelines are not met and/or amount requested is not within limits for type of travel.	All GPSC/FSO guidelines are met and amount requested is within limits for type of travel.

The items requested *may* include, but are not limited to:

- Airfare
- Lodging: Requested daily rates must not exceed those listed in the FSO Meals/Lodging Cost Index (<https://policy.fso.arizona.edu/fsm/1400/1471>)
- Meals: Requested daily rates must not exceed those listed in the FSO Meals/Lodging Cost Index (<https://policy.fso.arizona.edu/fsm/1400/1471>). Meal rates are listed in the posted manuals as “M&IE.”
- Local Transportation
- Mileage: Request rates must not exceed those listed in the FSO Transportation policy (<https://policy.fso.arizona.edu/fsm/1400/1415>)
- Event registration fees
- Workshop fees
- Membership fees **only if membership is required to attend the conference/event**

If the applicant is taking personal time during or after the proposed GPSC travel, a justification memo must also be included.

Faculty Letter of Support Evaluation

Note to applicants: Please advise your faculty supporters that they will be asked to upload a brief letter no more than 1 page in length addressing all of the points mentioned below. For group travel, the support letter should include the number of students traveling. Please also ask them to NOT include any applicant names in the letter of support or in the name of the file. This helps us maintain standards of double-blind reviewing.

Faculty letters of support must be uploaded by 11:59 PM on the day of the application deadline to be included in the application. Faculty will not receive an email request to upload their statements until the application is submitted by the applicant. To allow time for your faculty recommender to submit their statement of support, plan on submitting your application ahead of the deadline.

Criterion 1. The faculty letter of support states (1) the name of the conference, event, or purpose of travel, (2) the date(s) and place(s) of the conference, event, or purpose of travel, and (3) a brief statement indicating the faculty member supports the travel and endorses the applicants.

<i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>
The faculty letter of support is not included OR does not address all of the above criteria.	The faculty letter of support is included and addresses all of the above criteria.