Welcome to the GPSO Awards Committee!

This document will explain how to review the travel award applications. **We are looking to fund travel to prestigious, selective 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. 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. In particular, there is a tendency to inflate scores after reading a few applications. You may want to re-evaluate the first few applications after you have scored the set to make sure that you maintained consistency. When your application scores are received, they 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.

You will receive applications and a score sheet as Excel documents. You will fill in the score sheet to record your evaluations and then email the document back to me at gpsofnds@indiana.edu.

Each application is scored out of 35 points. There are a possible 10 points each for the answers to two free response questions (for a total of 20 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. (Again, these scores are converted to rankings after you submit your evaluations. Thus the order of scores is more crucial than the actual numbers).

Some parts of the rubric will ask 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 so that you have a baseline to compare applications against.

If you have any questions about reviewing applications, please email me at gpsofnds@indiana.edu.

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

Josh de Leeuw
Chair, GPSO Awards Commitee
15. 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. (max. 300 words)

If you are NOT traveling to present: Provide a general description of the event to which you will be traveling. (max. 300 words)

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.
16. Explain the perceived importance of the event within your discipline, and optionally the importance of the event in a broader context. If you had to apply or meet some kind of selectivity requirement (e.g. submitting a paper through a peer-review process), make sure to mention that. Describe the relevance of the travel to your professional development and area of study. (max. 300 words)

Response will be evaluated based on the significance of the event, the prestige of attendance, and the relevance of the event to your professional development.

This question is scored out of 10 possible points. Applicants who are traveling to prestigious and selective events that have direct relevance to their professional development should receive higher scores. It is up to the applicant to explain the significance of the event and how it is relevant to their professional development in their application, and your evaluation of the event should be based solely off of what the applicant has written. The main aim of this question is to evaluate the event that the person is traveling to.

**High Scores**

The application makes a convincing case that (1) the event is significant within their discipline, (2) the event is prestigious and selective, and (3) attending the event is highly relevant to their professional development.

**Average Scores**

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 impact on the applicant’s professional development, or (2) The event itself is not as significant and selective as the events in other applications and the impact of the event on the applicant’s professional development does not seem as relevant as other applications.

**Low Scores**

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.
17. If you ARE traveling to present: Describe your role in the project being presented and the importance of that role at this stage in your career. Explain your contributions to the project so that someone not in your discipline can understand. (max. 300 words)

If you are NOT traveling to present: Describe the necessity for attendance at this stage in your career, and how this event will impact your professional development. (max. 300 words)

Response will be evaluated based on the significance of your contribution towards the project being presented and/or the necessity of the travel towards your professional development.

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. For other kinds of travel, you need to evaluate the application based on how the travel will impact the professional development of the applicant. Since most reviewers are familiar with academic presentations, this is a good barometer to measure the necessity and impact of professional development events. Applicants who are traveling to present typically have to give a 15-30 minute talk about their work or present their work as a poster during a poster session. Other kinds of involvement, such as participating on a panel, attending workshops, or performing in an audition, that are equally demanding of the applicant should be scored highly.

**High Scores**

For applicants who are traveling to present work, higher scores should be given to applicants who had a larger role in the project. Sole authorship or first authorship of the presentation should earn the highest score. Applicants should provide sufficient detail of their contribution to the project to receive a high score.

For applicants who are not traveling to present, higher scores should be given to applicants who make a convincing case that the travel would contribute substantially to their professional development at this point in their career. This can include, but is certainly not limited to, events such as an audition, workshop, or professional development conference.

**Average Scores**

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 in the project OR the necessity of attendance at this point in their career, or (2) the contribution of the applicant / the necessity of attendance is not as significant as other applications.

**Low Scores**

Low scores should be given to applications that don’t answer the question with enough information for you to evaluate the contribution of the
18. Provide and justify your budget for travel.

If you are driving, please use IUB’s current figures for mileage reimbursement, located at http://www.indiana.edu/~travel/traveling/travelingbycar.shtml#mileage.

Responses are evaluated based on the completeness of the budget and how realistic the budget is.

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**  Describes a reasonably complete budget (travel, lodging, and other associated expenses) with realistic expenses.

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

**Low Scores**  The budget is missing crucial information.
Rate the overall quality of the application.

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. Instead, you should evaluate the application as a whole, using the following questions as a lens:

How effectively will this travel meaningfully advance the applicant’s education and career?
How effectively will this travel encourage the applicant’s professional development?
How well-written (e.g. clear, concise, comprehensible, and convincing) is the entire application?

Naturally, these scores will correlate somewhat with the scores you have given to the other sections.