SSG Selection Committee Review and Assessment (2023-2024)

I. Introduction

The SSG Selection Committee is composed of senior members of the graduate student body who have had either Council experience, are past members of other graduate student committees, or have won an SSG previously. The Committee is chaired by the non-voting positions of the President and Vice President for the Graduate Student Council; all funding decisions are made by the members of the Committee.

Selection Committee members should closely review the components of each application and utilize the SSG rubric outlined below to assess the various application components on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest score). This rubric will help provide relative scaling for final decision making during our award process.

II. Parameters

1. If a particular component cannot be wholly assessed at a whole integer provided below, please note this in your final tally as either 2, or 4; refrain from decimals unless absolutely necessary

2. **Evaluating Budgeted Items**

   a. Amounts funded will be rounded for tractability of the overall budget (e.g. a request of $563.73 may receive an award of $550 or $560)

   b. Applications that clearly take into account cost-savings measures will be prioritized

   c. We <u>cannot</u> fund per diems

   d. We <u>cannot</u> fund reimbursements for classes that would normally be offered at Fordham (essentially, Fordham cannot pay itself)

   e. We generally choose not to fund minor travel expenses such as taxis to the airport, but this can be on an application by application basis

   f. Memberships to societies can be funded via DDFs; SSGs are geared towards things like conference fees

3. **Conference Track Notes**

a. If the applicant has not yet been accepted to the conference, the reviewer should include that information in their decision; an award may be subject to revision if no proof of acceptance is received

b. Narratives that are simply conference abstracts with no effort to explain/justify how this experience builds their professional development are not always considered for funding; it is up to the applicant to make a case for their application (this is particularly the case when an application is simply for attending a conference i.e. not presenting; why is the conference a good networking/professional development opportunity?)

c. Applications for the same conference are often compared for quality, cost-saving measures, and justification--thus, not all students may be funded

d. Presenting a paper/talk at a conference _out-prioritizes_ posters and participation

   i. An existing exception to this rule includes applications from Psychology & Biology, fields where posters are also highly competitive and often the only means of presentation for graduate students. In these instances, we have prioritized the highest quality poster applications that clearly justified this value

4. Research Track Notes

a. Applicants who are requesting funds necessary to complete their Ph.D. thesis _do not_ automatically receive priority for their projects over other applicants. The applicant reviewer's emphasis should be on the quality of the application and its relationship to professional career development, not to the student's degree directly

b. Sometimes it is not helpful to partially fund research grants (e.g. if a student is requisition $2,000 and the committee just awards $500, the student might not be able to fund $1,500, in which case the award would not be helpful), so in the past committees have prioritized fully funding applications that are deemed the most eligible

c. Consider, for example, how this student's research fits into their advisor's research and if it was explicitly stated that this research would not be funded under another research grant

5. Alternative Learning Experience (ALE) Track Notes

a. A strong narrative is needed here to justify this additional experience (additionally, see _Section II.3.d_)

b. If applicant is funding the majority, then small amounts of co-funding by a SSG are justifiable

CODE	Project Narrative	1	3	5
LINK1	Linkage between the proposed project and the applicant's progress on either their program or skills	Unclear; uncompelling	Somewhat clear; linkages are partially compelling	Clear; Compelling
FEAS	Proposed project feasibility (how the proposal will be carried out, and the steps required to achieve completion)	Infeasible; proposal does not clearly communicate steps	Somewhat feasible; completion of most aspects of the proposal is communicated	Highly feasible; completion of all aspects of the proposal is communicated
ARTI	Articulation of specific outcomes and/or deliverables	Unclear; unaligned with proposed project activities	Somewhat clear; average alignment with proposed project activities	Clear; well aligned with proposed project activities
QUAL	Overall quality of the proposal and potential impact of the project on the applicant's scholarly and/or professional goals	Low quality; low impact; funding is unlikely to help propel progress and goals	Average quality; medium impact; funding may help proposal progress and goals	High quality; high impact; funding is very likely to propel progress and goals

CODE	Budget Proposal & Justification	1	3	5
LINK2	Linkage between the budget and the goals/requirements of the proposed project	Unclear; uncompelling	Somewhat clear; partially compelling	Clear; Compelling
COMP	Individual budget components (including how researched these costs seem to be, and how reasonable the budget comes across given the location of expense)	Not researched; not economical; most components reflect unreasonable expenditures	Semi-researched and economical; some components reflect reasonable expenditures	Fully-researched and economical; all components reflect reasonable expenditures
NATU	Nature of expenses required (is there ample justification for the expenses therein?)	Unexplained and/or justified, including unusual or non-traditional expenses	Semi-explained/ justified, including unusual or non-traditional expenses	Clearly explained and/or justified, including unusual or non-traditional expenses
COST	Cost-saving strategies undertaken	Not evident (when necessary)	Somewhat evident (when necessary)	Clearly evident (when necessary)