Conference Presentation Grant Review Rubric

Type of Presentation	Budgetary Layout	Conference Relevance	Academic and Career Trajectory	Quality of Application
Excellent The applicant is presenting original research in the form of a paper talk or oral presentation. The applicant may have organized a panel or been invited to participate in a roundtable discussion.	Excellent The applicant provides a detailed budget, follows all submission requirements, and distinguishes travel costs incurred for the conference from other travel costs not covered by CPG funding. The applicant shows an aim at frugality wherever possible.	Excellent The applicant articulates both their own research topic, and more importantly, its connection to the conference. A non-specialist can understand the significance of the project, and the necessity of presenting at this particular venue.	Excellent The applicant demonstrates how this presentation fits within their trajectory, aids their career prospects, and advances their work. The applicant references publication plans and/or how this presentation reflects their wider research. The applicant specifies networking goals and specific scholars or panels they hope to see at the conference.	Excellent The application itself is well organized, well written, and contains all required components. The reviewer should come away with a comprehensive sense of the conference, the applicant's own work, and the logistics of travel and cost. The reviewer will be excited by the application and the presentation opportunity.
Good The applicant is presenting original research in the form of a poster presentation or other display format, rather than giving an oral presentation or paper talk.	Good The applicant provides a detailed budget with only minor errors in submission requirements. No unreasonable expenses are apparent. Some efforts at frugality are noticeable.	Good The applicant accessibly describes their research. The reviewer can easily see the correlation between the project and the conference theme, but the application may not be explicit in connecting the two.	Good The applicant articulates how this presentation fits into their overall trajectory and/or plans for publishing, but may not provide a detailed plan. The applicant makes mention of career trajectory or networking opportunities but does not include specifics.	Good All components are provided but the application may be too brief to include all relevant information. The application may contain negligible errors. The reviewer comes away with a general sense of the project and some enthusiasm.

Passable The applicant is presenting synthetic work, providing comment, or chairing a panel without presenting original work.	Passable The applicant submitted a budget, but with several errors. Expenses are somewhat unclear, but there is a general impression of planning.	Passable The applicant describes their own project, but a non-specialist may struggle to understand the significance of the presentation or the correlation with the specific conference.	Passable The applicant mentions how this presentation fits into their graduate trajectory in general terms, but without satisfying detail. There is little or no mention of networking possibilities at the conference, and no mention of publication plans.	Passable The application is complete but not compelling in its pitch. The reviewer may have some understanding of the presentation and conference, but without the enthusiasm of a truly good application. Errors are present.
Poor The applicant is attending the conference, but it remains unclear from the application whether they are presenting.	Poor The applicant submitted an incomplete budget with errors, and expenses are not clearly justified. There is confusion as to what costs might be associated with the conference as opposed to other travel.	Poor The applicant may describe their own research but makes no mention of its relevance to the conference or vice versa. A non-specialist reviewer struggles to comprehend the significance of the presentation.	Poor The applicant alludes to how this presentation fits within their wider dissertation and graduate work, but with no detail. There is no mention of networking or publishing aspirations, and the application makes no explicit references to career development.	Poor The application is poorly written and contains notable errors. There may be incomplete components or the application may be too brief. The reviewer comes away with the sense that the application was hastily thrown together without much effort.
Unacceptable The applicant makes no explicit mention of presenting at the conference.	Unacceptable The applicant submitted no budget, included clearly unnecessary expenses in their request, and made no noticeable efforts to cut costs. There is a high level of confusion about what the funds will be used for.	Unacceptable The applicant describes neither their own project or the conference in any detail. There is no certainty whether the conference is at all relevant or necessary to their work.	Unacceptable The applicant makes no mention of how the presentation or conference fits into their wider graduate work, or how the conference will aid them in their career or publishing plans.	Unacceptable The application is incomplete and contains many errors. The applicant may have simply cut and pasted their conference abstract in lieu of an application, or shown very minimal effort it putting something together.

A note on Seniority-

The Conference Presentation Grant Review Committee, while it does not use seniority as a direct category of assessment, does factor in an applicant's graduate timeline in several ways. For instance, a junior graduate student might be evaluated more leniently on what type of presentation they are giving, or the significance of the conference level, whereas a more senior graduate student should be giving oral talks or presenting papers and attending higher level conferences if at all possible. More senior graduate students should be making explicit references to publication plans, career trajectory, and how their presentation fits within their dissertation project. In months where funds are limited and the applicant pool is large, preference will be given to seniority when all other factors are equal.

A note on Travel Itineraries-

Applicants should take care to be explicit in budgets that include additional travel and expenses outside CPG, noting which costs they expect to be covered by CPG and which they plan to cover through other sources of funding or out of pocket. If there is multi-city travel, or additional days of lodging beyond the conference dates, applicants should address this in their application, making it clear that these expenses are not included in your requested funds from CPG. Otherwise, the reviewers will be unable to properly assess your budget and itinerary.