

APMSA Travel Grant Evaluation Rubric

Travel Grant applications are evaluated on the following four criteria:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Description of Work: | 5 points |
| 2. Professional Development: | 5 points |
| 3. Individual Development: | 5 points |
| 4. Efforts to Secure Funding: | 10 points |
| 5. Budget: | 15 points |
| 6. Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar: | 5 points |
| 7. Funding Recommendation: | 5 points |

Total Points: 50 points

Score 1: Description of the Work

The applicant must explain the work that he/she will be presenting at the conference/event. The applicant can explain his/her work by providing an abstract and/or by explaining the work in the personal statement.

If an applicant will not be presenting, the applicant should explain in detail his/her academic, professional, or research interests in relation to the importance of attending the conference/event.

Does the applicant sufficiently defend the importance of attending and/or presenting at the conference?	
Criteria (If Presenting)	Rating
The applicant provides an abstract and acceptance letter for the presentation (or similar documentation). In the personal statement, the applicant summarizes the work to be presented in clear, precise terms that non-experts can understand.	5
The applicant provides an abstract and acceptance letter for the presentation (or similar documentation). In the personal statement, the applicant summarizes the work to be presented with mostly replicated content from the abstract.	3
The applicant provides an abstract and acceptance letter for the presentation only.	2
The applicant describes the work in the personal statement only, without providing an abstract or acceptance letter OR the description is unclear or under-developed.	1
No description of work provided.	0

Does applicant sufficiently defend importance of attending the conference if they are not presenting research or a project?	
Criteria (If Not Presenting)	Rating
The applicant's academic, professional or research interests explaining the importance of attending is summarized in clear, precise terms that non-experts can understand.	5
The applicant's academic, professional or research interests explaining the importance of attending is in general or overly specialized terms.	3
The applicant's academic, professional or research interests explaining the importance of attending is unclear or under-developed.	1
No description of importance is provided.	0

Score 2: Professional Development

The applicant must describe the type of event (e.g., conference, workshop, poster sessions) he/she will be attending, and the chances the applicant will have to interact with other professionals or experts in the field of podiatry.

How well does the applicant explain the importance of this conference to the applicant's professional development?	
Criteria	Rating
The applicant provides specific details, such as topics, concepts and issues, and clearly explains how these details are related to his/her professional development.	5
The applicant provides a clear but general explanation of how the conference promotes his/her professional development.	4
The applicant explains the importance of this conference to his/her professional development; however, the explanations may be slightly ambiguous or unclear, may contain some incompleteness in representation.	3
Relevance of the conference to the applicant's professional development is unclear or under-developed.	2
The conference may be irrelevant or tangentially related to the applicant's professional development.	1
The applicant does not state how the conference will benefit applicant's professional development.	0

Score 3: Individual Development

How well does the applicant explain the importance of this conference to the applicant's individual development?	
Criteria	Rating
The applicant provides specific details, such as topics, concepts and issues, and clearly explains how these details are related to his/her individual development.	5
The applicant provides a clear but general explanation of how the conference promotes his/her individual development.	4
The applicant explains the importance of this conference to his/her individual development; however, the explanations may be slightly ambiguous or unclear, may contain some incompleteness in representation.	3
Relevance of the conference to the applicant's professional development is unclear or under-developed.	2
The conference may be irrelevant or tangentially related to the applicant's professional development.	1
The applicant does not state how the conference will benefit applicant's individual development.	0

Score 4: Efforts to Secure Funding

Funding is limited and applicants should show that they are actively trying to get funding from as many sources as they can. A lack of effort to obtain other funding should be counted against them. The focus is on the applicant's efforts to obtain funding, regardless of whether the applicant actually received other funding. In this case, the application should mention the lack or difficulty of obtaining alternative funding. We are also trying to fund as many applicants as possible, therefore we give preference to students who have not received APMSA Travel Grant funding before.

Has the applicant received an APMSA Travel Grant before?	
Criteria	Rating
Yes, the applicant had received an APMSA grant before.	0
No, the applicant has not received an APMSA grant before.	5

Has the applicant been awarded funding from another source?	
Criteria	Rating
Yes, the applicant has received funding from another source.	0
The applicant has applied for funding from other sources, but either has not heard back on the status of funding or has not been funded from other sources.	3
No, the applicant has not received funding from another source.	5

Score 5: Budget

The budget must appear reasonable and realistic with regards to the amount spent for each component.

Is the budget organized and reasonable for the travel proposed?	
Criteria	Rating
The budget is clear, reasonable, follows the APMSA guidelines, and the applicant provides detailed explanations for the amount requested.	5
The budget is clear, reasonable, and follows the general APMSA guidelines.	4
The budget follows the APMSA guidelines but does not reflect efforts to find the cheapest alternative (ex: requests the maximum amount of funding without reasonable justification).	3
The budget is not organized and is not reasonable.	1
The applicant does not provide a budget.	0

Does applicant specify which items will be covered by APMSA funding?	
Criteria	Rating
Yes, items are clearly marked as being covered by APMSA versus other funding sources.	5
No, the applicant did not show which items would be covered by APMSA funding.	0

Did applicant ask for the appropriate amount of funding?	
Criteria	Rating
Yes, the applicant did follow the APMSA guidelines for what type of travel expenses can be funded.	5
No, the applicant did not follow APMSA guidelines (ex: applicant asked for more than can be awarded for travel grant funding).	0

Score 6: Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar

Is the writing clear and free of spelling or grammatical errors?	
Criteria	Rating
Application contains no spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors.	5
Application contains a spelling mistake and/or 1-2 grammatical or punctuation errors.	4
Application contains multiple spelling mistakes and/or 3-4 grammatical or punctuation errors.	3
Application contains regular spelling mistakes and/or 5-6 grammatical or punctuation errors.	2
Applications consistently contains spelling mistakes and/or numerous grammatical or punctuation errors.	1

Score 7: Funding Recommendation

Do you recommend funding this application?	
Criteria	Rating
Definitely yes.	5
Probably yes.	4
Might or might not.	3
Probably not.	2
Definitely not.	0