

## Scoring Rubric for Professional Advancement Travel Resource Committee

Applicant Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Student

Staff (*MPP are not eligible*)

Faculty

For items 1-6 below, rate each criterion using the following scale based on the quality of the application, comments are not required.

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

1.	<p><b>The travel destination and timeframe are clearly described and appropriate.</b> <i>Comments:</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
2.	<p><b>The funding request is clearly described, justified, itemized, and reasonable. <i>Expenses follow CSU Travel policy as well as CSUSM Travel Procedures.</i></b> <i>Comments:</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
3.	<p><b>The travel activities are clearly described and feasible.</b> <i>Comments:</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
4.	<p><b>The description of how travel will enhance the applicant’s professional growth is clear.</b> <i>Comments:</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
5.	<p><b>The relevance of the travel to the applicant is well defined and indicates how participation will make an important contribution to the university mission and vision.</b> <i>Comments:</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5
6.	<p><b>The desired outcome of travel is clearly described.</b> <i>Comments:</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5

7. Applicant is seeking additional sources funding for proposed travel.  Yes  No

8. Applicant has applied to be a presenter  Yes  No