

### Andrew W. Mellon Predoctoral Fellowship Rubric (2020/21)

The 2020-2021 Mellon selection committee will be applying the rubric printed below. Research has shown that the use of rubrics can help evaluators compare different types of proposals using one set of metrics and can mitigate the effects of unconscious bias. As the selection committee evaluates nominees, members will apply the below rubric and assign a separate score for each of the three categories specified.

Criterion	Evidence	Pts	Evaluation standards
<b>#1</b> The clarity and accessibility, especially to non-specialist readers, of the student statement  <b>4 points</b>	Student statement	4	The research statement is excellent, conveying clearly and compellingly the rationale for the research, the methodology to be used, and the potential impact of the research.
		3	The statement is clear and conveys to the non-specialist reader the rationale for the research, the methodology to be used, and the potential impact of the research.
		2	The statement fails to communicate well at least one of the three fundamental requirements, rationale, methods, or impact, and/or the statement is challenging for a non-specialist to understand.
		1	The statement does not fully communicate to a non-specialist reader more than one of the three fundamental requirements, rationale, methods or impact.
<b>#2</b> Originality and potential impact of the proposed and/or ongoing research  <b>3 points</b>	Student statement; recommendation letters; departmental memo	3	The proposed research is original and exciting. It seems likely that the research will have a substantial impact in the nominee's field.
		2	The proposed research is original, and the impact is likely to be moderate to strong.
		1	The originality and/or the impact of the proposed research is not addressed in the available materials or the originality and impact are likely to be modest to moderate.
<b>#3</b> Additional factors <sup>a</sup> <i>Examples:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress and productivity of the student in the field and degree</li> <li>Aspects of the student's background, skill set, or initiative that make the student an especially compelling candidate</li> <li>Likely benefit to the student of the Mellon Fellowship, e.g., a student who has received nearly all prior support in the form of</li> </ul>	Courses history; grades; publications; recommendation letters; CV; departmental memo; student statement	3	The additional factor or factors make this student particularly outstanding or deserving relative to other nominees.
		2	The number and types of additional factors are typical of the very talented nomination pool.

<p>TA appointments, or a student who must do research off campus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In cases where the student has previously held a competitive fellowship, an evaluation of how well the resource was used</li> </ul> <p><b>3 points</b></p>		<p><b>1</b></p>	<p>The number and types of additional factors are less compelling than for typical students in the pool.</p>
--	--	-----------------	--

<sup>a</sup> A student need not have strengths in all these areas (and other factors can be considered) to get the maximum score. One student with a very compelling additional factor could receive a 3 while another who has two or more additional factors might receive a 2.