

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
TRADITIONAL GRADUATE FELLOWS PROGRAM - FY 2012-13

RATING FORM

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution/Dept: \_\_\_\_\_

Each consultant will rate each proposal based on the weighted scale in categories I-IV.

**I. Quality Considerations (40 points)**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 25 pts.

1.1 Will the anticipated academic contribution of the targeted graduate students be likely to elevate to higher levels of performance departments or units which have attained--or show clear promise of attaining--regional, national, or international standards of eminence commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 15 pts.

1.2 Will the standards that have been established by the department or unit ensure that targeted students are of superior academic ability?

**II. Economic Development Considerations (20 points)**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.

2.1 Will the anticipated academic contribution of the targeted graduate students be likely to elevate to higher levels of performance departments or units which have promoted--or show clear promise of promoting--economic development in the State?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.

2.2 Will the targeted students' educational and research interests and activities have the potential to advance the economic development of the State?

**III. Feasibility Considerations (30 points)**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 9 pts.

3.1 Has the department or unit's past and current record of graduate recruitment been a successful one? If the department or unit's track record has been less than successful, does the plan for improvement hold significant promise for success?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 6 pts.

3.2 Does the department or unit have a program for recruitment of minorities and women in those fields at Louisiana institutions of higher education in which there has been historical under-representation? If so, does it appear to have the potential to be effective?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.

3.3 Is the strategy for recruitment adequate and feasible?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 4 pts.

3.4 Are the selection procedures and criteria well thought out and fair?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 3 pts.

3.5 Are the standards that have been set to determine satisfactory progress adequate?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 3 pts.

3.6 Is the plan for tracking student progress adequate and feasible?

**IV. Budgetary Considerations (10 points)**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.

4.1 Are the amounts of the stipends to be awarded reasonable, yet adequate to recruit truly superior students?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.

4.2 Is the institution offering to share costs in an appropriate and significant manner?

\_\_\_\_\_ RATING TOTAL

**V. Bases of Rating**

Summarize briefly the notable features of each proposal which influenced most decisively the ratings given. Views of the entire committee relative to each proposal will be summarized in the general report.

**GENERAL RANKING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Ratings of individual consultants will be averaged to derive a single score for each proposal. Proposals will then be ranked based on this score. The ranking of proposals will be included in review panel's general report.

(Rev. 5/2012)