



External Funding Application Review Rubric

	Major revisions needed (0)	Revisions necessary (1)	Shows potential (2)	Strong application (3)
Content				
Answered questions in entirety	Did not follow instructions; lacks clarity	Lacks detail in some sections; repetitive	Followed instructions; provided adequate details; clear	Statements align with goals and desired outcomes of the organization
Shows intellectual merit	Too broad; unfocused; omitted academic/ career goals	Topic lacks potential to advance knowledge; no citations; potential issues not addressed	Rigorous methods; appropriate citations; demonstrates acquired research skills	Poses new or interesting concept; shows collaboration
Broader impacts	Does not address societal benefits of topic; includes assumptions; promises too much	Societal benefits of research not supported by literature; BI activity not connected to research	Research benefits society; efforts to improve public's scientific literacy; engaged with underrepresented individuals	Has far-reaching social benefits; public engagement with science and technology; proposes sustainable BI activities
Professional Characteristics				
Intellectual/disciplinary knowledge	Does not describe knowledge or skills; lacks direction	Lacks examples of problem-solving abilities or creativity	Uses discipline-related terms; demonstrates scholarly writing; innovative	Demonstrates higher order thinking skills and understanding of issues/trends
Leadership potential	Does not address leadership skills or experience in any setting	Mentions service or volunteer activities, but does not include clear plans for future leadership roles	Describes skills gained from leadership experiences; plans for leadership/ advocacy	Active in disciplinary organization; peer mentoring; able to document strong leadership/ team abilities
Potential to establish research career	No engagement in research or scholarly activity; research not included as a career goal	Lacks detail; skills not connected to future plans; team skills unclear	Solid team work; problem solver; learns from mistakes	Range of research/ outreach skills; collegial
Characteristics and abilities	Passive voice; flippant or arrogant tone in essays	Too modest or negative-sounding	Ethical; confident; dependable; shows initiative and ability to collaborate	Articulate; insightful; innovative or visionary; demonstrates achievement of excellence
Writing Mechanics				
Format and page limit	Did not follow instructions; key sections omitted	Exceeds page limit; hard to locate specific sections; overuse of bold or italics	Exactly followed instructions; consistent format and font; no errors; citations included	Effective presentation - clean look (uses subheadings, bold and italics to effect)
Readability	Grammatical errors; typos; awkward wording; lacks clarity	Boring; repetitive; weak verbs; overuse of "I" to begin sentences; no transitions; wordy	No errors; good flow; succinct; transitions btw paragraphs; highly understandable	Scholarly use of discipline-related terms; compelling writing; statements complement one another

Adapted from Self-Assessment Rubric for GRFP Applicants: Critique Your Drafts and Online Application Form by Robin G. Walker, PhD