**Supplemental Graduate Fellowship and Recruitment Program (SGFRF) Scoring Guide**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Excellent (9 to 10 Points)** | **Fair (6 to 8 Points)** | **Poor (0 to 5 Point)** |
| **Recruiting** | Recruitment discussion builds the case of excellence in recruitment OR clearly demonstrates gaps in recruitment in relation to how proposed funding can be used to eliminate said gaps (either in student fellowships or through a recruitment program). A strong case for how the funds will aid in adding under-represented students to the program is present. | Recruitment plan provides an overview of either excellence or gaps, but lacks a clear connection to the funding proposed. Some conversation regarding under-represented students sought occurs, but is not compelling. | Recruitment discussion lacks a clear case for excellence or lacks a vision for the department in regard to gaps. Little to no mention regarding the types of under-represented students sought and/or lack of case for the types of underrepresented students sought. |
| **Retention** | Program outlines intentionality in the retention of graduate students. Specific examples outline how students are brought into the department culture; how they are effectively communicated with; and how their progress is being supported through programs, culture, and/or funding. | Retention discussion shows signs of intentionality but lacks depth, innovation, or fails to address the life span of a graduate student. | Retention discussion lacks depth, innovation, and/or fails to address the life span of a graduate student. |
| **Completion and Placement**  | Completion rates indicate high retention of students through the program. Time to completion makes sense in light of the discipline. Indication that students are competitive in securing positions in the academic and/or non-academic workforce. Department prepares their students for the job market through prof. dev./mentoring.  | Data and discussion show promise of thoughtfulness in regard to time of completion, placement type and placement rate.  | Data and discussion show little sign of thoughtfulness in regard to time completion, placement type, and placement rate.  |
| **Use of Funds** | The use of funds seems appropriate as outlined. The use of funds justification makes sense in light of the rest of the narrative.  | Funding and rationale match the narrative, but are not compelling. | Funding and rationale do not match the narrative. |
| **Student Data (Appendix)** | Student data show success in students engaging with the scholarly field outside the university (e.g., conferences; publications). Data show program has strong commitment to funding their students. Overall, data indicate student and program success.  | Data show some student engagement with the scholarly field outside the university. Data show program has some commitment to funding their students. Overall, data indicate potential for student and program success.  | Data not present or show little engagement with the scholarly field outside the university; not a very strong commitment to funding students; and/or poor completion and placement of students.  |