Rubric for reviewing SESE Graduate Applications   **Jan. 2021**

Recommended Reading Order for Applications
1. Student's statements
2. Transcripts
3. Recommendation Letters

Take notes while reading and use them to write final comments/recommendations.

Best practices indicate that GRE scores, percentile rankings from letter writers, and fine details of student GPA's are not useful indicators of success in graduate school and often disadvantage minoritized and financially vulnerable students.

Explanation of Scores and final **Ranking** are on Page 2.

Applicant Name:		
Research Interests:		
Categories of review	**Strengths or weaknesses and evidence for these in the admissions package**	**Score (1-4, NI)**
Student is persistent and adaptable	*look for examples of a growth mindset in life or academia; 1st gen student, immigrant family, socio-economic disadvantages*	
Student is motivated to pursue scientific research	*look for curiosity, love of problem solving, commitment to learning*	
Student has taken advantage of (or made) opportunities in seeking out research experiences	*consider type of institution and what sort of opportunities would or would not be present*	
Student can work well independently and is self-directed.	*look for description of projects or actions taken on own initiative either in or out of academics*	
Student works well with others and responds well to constructive feedback	*look for evidence of leadership, or contribution to shared or team goals*	
Student communicates in a clear, organized and logical manner.	*Assess writing in submitted statements, as well as any publications taking into account students' academic level and role in the publication.*	
Academic record includes appropriate coursework and level of competence to build from for graduate level research in expressed sub-discipline.	*look for topic-appropriate and foundational coursework (e.g., geo/Earth sci.; chem/bio; math/physics; astronomy; coding), breadth of coursework and challenging coursework, UG and Grad GPA, research experience*	
Overall comments, any concerns		
Suggestions for faculty consideration	*For very strong files let us know if there is someone who shouldn't miss this*	
Overall Ranking (A, B, C)		

Explanation of Scores

1. Unsatisfactory: Little evidence of this skill or cognitive ability, or evidence to the contrary

2. Developing: Minimal evidence or only in the early stages

3. Competent: Sufficient evidence with some examples or points that clearly attest to a high level of preparation or achievement in this area

4. Exemplary: Strong evidence that meets all expectations for preparation for graduate school

NI: No Information provided in the package

Overall Ranking
(Do not use +/-, except for A+)

A+ Recruiting target, exceptional application on all metrics.

A Strong application with evidence addressing and supporting all metrics.

B Potentially admissible but, there is evidence missing for one more metrics that would need to be addressed when starting in the graduate program. *Potential advisor needs to address how these deficient metrics will be addressed.*

C Lacking evidence on multiple metrics; inappropriate background or coursework preparation for expressed topic of study; expressed topics of interest have no overlap with potential mentors in our program.

(Note: a rank of C will be deemed inadmissible)