

INSTITUTE *for the* ARTS & HUMANITIES

IAH Faculty Fellowship Rating Rubric

This document has been designed for you, as a member of the fellows selection committee, to record notes on each candidate as you review his/her application materials. You will also be asked to choose a holistic rating for each candidate.

As you review materials, please keep the following components in mind:

- 1) The importance of the project as a contribution to its disciplinary or interdisciplinary field of study:
 - How will this project advance research or creative activity in the applicant’s field?
- 2) The project design:
 - How well has the applicant planned his/her project?
 - Is it well organized, coherent, and compelling? Does the proposal speak to a larger audience, and refrain from using unnecessary jargon to convey ideas to those outside of one’s field of study?
 - Does it demonstrate an awareness of pertinent questions, possible objections, relevant research materials, and prior scholarship?
- 3) The feasibility of the project:
 - Does the author know what the project entails, and have a workable plan for proceeding?
 - Does the author state the goal (e.g., a book, a collection of essays, creative work)?
 - Is the topic well defined so that it is inclusive but not impossibly wide-ranging?
- 4) The author’s ability to inspire confidence in his/her ability to use the IAH fellowship productively to benefit professional development and the intellectual community at UNC-Chapel Hill

Written Notes

Please capture notes for each proposal as you review. You can do this by typing in the “Notes” boxes in the score sheet, or by printing the document to make manual notes as you go along. Using the above criteria, offer candid, yet constructive feedback. Think of your comments as being addressed not only to committee members but to the applicant as well. Rejected applicants will thereby benefit.

Holistic Rating Options

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Exceptional (5): | <i>The applicant definitely should receive a fellowship.</i> |
| Very Good (4): | <i>The applicant should strongly be considered for a fellowship.</i> |
| Good (3): | <i>The application is worthy of consideration.</i> |
| Satisfactory (2): | <i>The application has some merit but is not recommended for consideration.</i> |
| Not Recommended (1): | <i>The application does not meet the criteria for consideration.</i> |

Note: Please attempt a semi-balanced distribution of scores, and assign a rating of “5” only for those proposals you feel are strongly deserving of a fellowship.