

## **Pre-Meeting Workshop on Holistic Review**

### **Table Discussion #1**

Some strategies for decreasing attention on the GRE are listed below. Would any of these work on your campus? Why or why not? Have you implemented strategies other than those listed here?

- a. Use GREs as you have been, but convert raw scores to within-group percentiles (based on international/domestic, race, gender)
- b. Reduce the emphasis on GRE scores by making them only one indicator of a broader “academic preparation” criterion on a rubric (complemented by GPA, rigor of previous curriculum, etc.).
- c. Request that your graduate school or a particular department hide GRE scores or make them optional.
- d. Request that GRE scores be placed toward the bottom of the application rather than the top, to avoid anchoring bias.

### **Table Discussion #2**

On each table is a thumbnail of a student applications and a partial rubric. Read through the profiles and complete the rubric, then discuss with other people at your table.

- a. How easy was it to apply the rubric to the task?
- b. What would you have changed?
- c. To what extent was there consistency across raters at your table? If inconsistent, how could the wording of the rubric be changed?
- d. Are there any applicant characteristics you would include or exclude based on your own disciplinary specialization?

**2017-18 Rubric for Fellowship Selection Committees**

In the 2017-18 year, we are again asking members of fellowship selection committees to holistically review nominations and to think broadly about each nominee’s capacity to be successful in graduate school. To facilitate this process, we are asking reviewers to provide scores of High, Medium, or Low for each of the four broad (and overlapping) areas identified below and to record those rankings on a spreadsheet. Each of the four areas represent important aspects of nominees’ profiles that should be considered as part of their assessments. We ask reviewers to determine whether each nominee scores as High, Medium, or Low *generally for each area*, not to provide a ranking for each attribute in each list. The lists of attributes are not intended to be exhaustive, nor will there be evidence of every attribute in every file. The lists are provided to help reviewers think broadly about each nominee. Rankings should be determined relative to other students in the nomination pool; reviewers should utilize all three scores (H/M/L).

Once reviewers have completed their assessments, we ask them to take the entire file into account, and provide the overall scores for each candidate between 1.0 (high) and 3.9 (low). (This procedure is used every year). These scores are not to be mathematically derived from the H/M/L judgements and we do not suggest any particular weighting of the four areas. Rather, the decision on the numerical score should be informed by the holistic evaluation of the file including consideration of the H/M/L area rankings. Numerical scores will be recorded in App Review.

We also ask reviewers to bring their spreadsheets to the committee meeting to use as a reference during the deliberation on nominees. The Graduate Division staff will lead a discussion on this rubric at the end of the committee meeting and consider whether to continue, discontinue, or modify it in future years.

H	M	L	<b><i>Academic Performance</i></b>	H	M	L	<b><i>Motivational Attributes</i></b>
			Research experience				Achievement orientation
			Publications				Conscientiousness
			Conference presentations				Collegiality, collaboration, teamwork
			Writing samples				Curiosity
			Performance in courses in discipline				Creativity
			Overall GPA				Independence
			Evidence of improvement				Breadth of perspective
							Initiative
							Positive self-concept
							Realistic self-appraisal
							Leadership and community involvement

H	M	L	<b><i>Skills and Research Potential</i></b>	H	M	L	<b><i>Diversity Contributions</i></b>
			Communication skills				First-generation of family to attend college
			Mastery of the discipline				Economically disadvantaged background
			Analytical / critical thinking ability				Non-traditional background (e.g., veteran, refugee, from rural community)
			Use of literature				Evidence of overcoming adversity
			Organization				Potential as exemplar for others
			Reasoning and argumentation				Potential for leadership in increasing equitable access
			Past research experience				Research and/or community engagement informs discussion of diversity in higher education
			Relevant work experience				
			Scholarly and professional engagement				
			Fit: alignment of research interests with faculty				
			Promise of innovative scholarship				
			Technical skills				

## Student 1

**Objective:** PhD, Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology

### **Undergraduate Institution 1:**

State University, GPA: 3.76  
Bachelor of Science, Human Services

**GRE:** V: 144 / 23%  
Q: 133 / 1%  
W: 3.5 / 42%

**Date of Birth:** 7/12/1993

**Military Service:** Not Applicable

**Military Dependent:** No

**Language at Home:** Spanish

**First Gen College:** Yes

**Siblings:** 2

**Siblings in College:** 0

### **Undergraduate Institution 2**

2-year College, GPA: 3.75  
Associate of Arts, Psychology

**Father's Highest Degree:** Some High School

**Mother's Highest Degree:** Some High School

**Father's Occupation:** Other/Not Classified

**Mother's Occupation:** Personal and Household Services

**Parents' Income:** \$0.00

**IPEDS Racial/Ethnic Background:**  
Mexican /Mexican American / Chicano

**Gender Identity:** Female

## Statement of Purpose

“My thirteen-year-old sibling was unable to obtain mental health services to treat early signs of an obsessive compulsive disorder due to my mother’s native language barrier, foreign culture, and lack of health insurance. I have often referred to this unsettling moment as pivotal, one in which I began to question the intersection between culture and mental health...

Through my experiences as a Mexican-American born to immigrant parents, I have been inspired to use my firsthand exposure to problems in the Latina/o community as a tool to guide my research on mental health and mental illness...

My first opportunity to investigate the barriers to mental health services has been through the Ronald E. McNair Scholars Research Program ... In a year-long project I explored Latina/o college students’ perceptions of mental health and factors that impede their use of mental health services... I developed measures, submitted an Institutional Review Board application, and followed ethical guidelines to sample 100 college students from three different departments.. This work served as greater motivation to move forward with exploring stress and resilience among Latina/os living in low socioeconomic communities.

I volunteered as a lead research assistant, co-facilitator, and Spanish translator for the Resilient Families Program... I was able to provide culturally relevant services to Latina/o families living in low socioeconomic communities... As lead research assistant, I translated measures and administered surveys in Spanish, as well as assisted with data entry and analysis... made me discover my desire to conduct mixed method designs and community based research projects to continue the development of effective and culturally relevant programs.”

## Personal Achievements / Contributions Statement

- I am a strong persistent Latina who faces adversity with boldness and resilience
- I have used the obstacles presented before me as opportunities to grow as a person and a professional committed to social change and justice.
- Ultimately, my experiences with chronic homelessness and domestic abuse inspired me to pursue psychology and a career as a scholar who seeks to improve Latina/os' access to quality mental health services.
- Experiences built my resilience and serve as a foundation for my interest in understanding the intersection of race, culture, and mental health.
- My goal of working directly with Latina/os gave me the strength I needed to persist.
- I helped launch a successful peer mentoring program and had the opportunity to help a group of incoming students achieve short and long term goals. My time as a mentor made me realize that the students I was working with had tremendous potential, but they also had low levels of self-efficacy and confidence. Upon realizing this, I was motivated to seek out more leadership opportunities to continue serving as a source of support for my fellow students.

## Letter of Recommendation

Ratings: Intellectual Ability: Upper 10%

Imagination/Creativity: Upper 2%

Oral Expression: Upper 2%

Writing Ability: Upper 10%

Overall Percentile: Upper 10%

- "Outstanding achievement in her academic endeavors.
- scores on all exams and papers have been excellent, typically scoring in the top 95%
- demonstrated critical thinking and research skills
- demonstrates classroom leadership skills
- presents cogent points during discussions and leads the class
- indicates maturity and independence so essential for success in graduate school
- culturally sophisticated and competent

### Writer 2

Ratings: Intellectual Ability: Upper 2%

Imagination/Creativity: Upper 10%

Oral Expression: Upper 2%

Writing Ability: Upper 2%

Overall Percentile: Upper 2%

- "Joy in research is matched with her capability...one of the brightest students I have met... talented, competent, and insightful, strong thinker, capable of integrating complex theories and concepts
- Hardworking, self-motivated, reliable, and quite mature.
- Despite not having a strong familial foundation, [Student] is incredibly resilient...no doubt that she will become a leader and mentor in the field.
- My goal for [Student] is that she finds a nurturing mentor as a graduate advisor. She tends to doubt herself often due to her own inner critic."

**Sample Rubric for CGS Workshop on Holistic Review, Scottsdale, Arizona, December 2017**

Based on rubric developed by Casey Miller, Rochester Institute for Technology

		High	Medium	Low
<b>Research</b>	<b>variety/duration</b>	two years in research	one year in research; only REUs	nothing more than coursework laboratories
	<b>presentations</b>	conference in the discipline; OR written thesis with oral presentation	only on campus	no evidence of presenting outside of courses
	<b>quality of work</b>	multiple indications of excellence	clearly made significant contributions to the project	limited intellectual or technical contribution to projects
	<b>technical skills</b>	a variety of academic skills relevant for the discipline	has developed only one class of skill	nothing more than coursework
	<b>dispositions</b>	clear commitment to and enthusiasm for research; AND understands what the process entails	clear commitment to and enthusiasm for research; OR understands what the process entails	not clear if they know what they are getting into with a PhD; seems lukewarm about research
	<b>clarity of interests</b>	student states interests, understands details, and expresses understanding of the big picture implications	student can state interests but they are general or superficial	student does not have clearly stated interests
<b>Non-Cognitive Competencies</b>	<b>Achievement Orientation</b>	Consistently strives to improve or meet a high standard of excellence in all areas	Has demonstrated a high standard of excellence in selected areas	No evidence of striving for excellence provided in application or student record
	<b>Conscientiousness</b>	Takes responsibility for personal performance, both the good and the bad; AND demonstrates efficiency and organization	Takes responsibility for personal performance, both the good and the bad; OR demonstrates efficiency and organization	No evidence of taking responsibility for performance AND minimal evidence of efficient, organized work
	<b>Initiative</b>	Consistently seeks out or acts on opportunities AND takes leadership	Consistently seeks out or acts on opportunities OR takes leadership	Has not sought out or taken advantage of opportunities AND does not have a record of leadership
	<b>Teamwork and Collaboration</b>	Successfully worked with others toward shared goals in research and/or extracurriculars	May have a preference for individual work, but application describes prior work with others.	No clear evidence of prior collaborative work
	<b>Empathy</b>	Takes an active concern for others' feelings and concerns	Nothing especially positive or negative in the application about the student's emotional engagement with others.	No evidence in the application about the student's emotional engagement with others.
	<b>Trustworthiness</b>	Clear strengths in integrity and ethics; Others lean on the applicant	Nothing positive or negative in the application about the student's integrity	Application contains suggestions or specific concerns about student integrity
	<b>Perseverance</b>	Application indicates successful coping with failures/ obstacles	Basic or perfunctory description of overcoming challenges	Application does not describe experience with failure/obstacles
	<b>Positive self-concept</b>	Expresses confidence they can complete challenging goals; Positive statements about abilities	Shows confidence and independence, but may be unsure about adequacy or skills	Application sends signals of low self-esteem
	<b>Realistic Self Appraisal</b>	Thoughtful & clear assessment of strengths and weaknesses; Evidence of working on self development	Basic statements about strengths and weaknesses	One dimensional assessment of abilities (over or understated); little evidence of self-assessment or learning from experience
	<b>Preference for long (vs short) term goals</b>	Communicates long-range goals beyond the PhD AND Has a record of engaging in long-term endeavors	Communicates long-range goals beyond the PhD OR Has a record of engaging in long-term endeavors	Primary goal is PhD completion



# MESM Admissions Rubric 2016-2017

**Statement of Purpose:** Give a brief statement outlining your reasons for undertaking a graduate program, your particular area of specialization within the major field, your past academic work, and your plans for future occupation or profession. Also include any additional information that may assist the selection committee in evaluating your preparation and aptitude for graduate study at UC Santa Barbara.

## Distinguished (4-5 points)

- Student provides a compelling analysis of an environmental issue; clearly and very thoughtfully communicates academic or professional goals
- Writing is clear, concise, engaging
- No mistakes in grammar, spelling, or punctuation; use of proper syntax; professional language

## Proficient (2-3 points)

- Student provides a strong narrative/analysis of an environmental issue; thoughtfully communicates academic or professional goals
- Few mistakes in grammar or spelling; strong, professional language

## Unsatisfactory (0-1 points)

- Fails or does an insufficient job addressing the prompt; language is simple and lacking in professionalism
- Document lacking in organization or structure; rambling or sometimes incoherent language
- Errors in grammar, spelling or punctuation

**Score for Statement of Purpose:** \_\_\_\_\_ out of 5 points maximum

**Resume/CV:** List your positions of employment or volunteer work/community service since high school, either full or part-time, including the hours per week worked and the nature and dates of employment or service.

## High level of professional preparedness (4-5 points)

- 4+ years of professional (post-baccalaureate) work experience
- Managed employees, projects, teams
- Resume/CV demonstrates high quality, detailed work experience with chronological date order with job title, organization, and location
- Professional resume/CV, clearly explains duties and key accomplishments; free of errors
- Experience will add to cohort's learning experience

## Reasonable level of professional preparedness (2-3 points)

- 1-3 years of professional work experience
- Has had some leadership experience or roles, either as a volunteer, intern, or full-time professional (ex: Peace Corps)
- Resume is of average quality, though might contain occasional errors
- Experience brings some value to the cohort's learning experience

## Minimal professional preparedness (0-1 points)

- < 1 years of work experience
- No leadership or management experience
- Brief or incomplete positions held
- Grammar, spelling, or formatting errors prevalent in resume; lacks dates, locations, responsibilities, or other important information; resume is disorganized or hard to follow
- Student relies on something other than work experience to add value to the cohort's learning experience

**Score for Resume/CV:** \_\_\_\_\_ out of 5 points maximum

**Academic Preparedness:** MESM program prerequisites are as follows: 3 quarters or 2 semesters of natural science; 1 semester or 2 quarters of calculus; and 1 semester or 1 quarter of statistics.

## Excellent academic preparation (4-5 points)

- Student meets all of the Bren School's prerequisite requirements
- Student performed well in prerequisite courses (B or higher)
- Overall, student's undergraduate academic performance and GPA at his/her institution is very impressive and indicative of strong academic abilities
- ~3.7 GPA or higher on U.S. 4.0 scale

## Good academic preparation (2-3 points)

- Student meets all or most of the prerequisite requirements
- Student performed well in prerequisite courses (B or higher)
- Students who do not meet all of the requirements have adequately addressed in a supplemental memo how they will have completed the requirement(s) in advance of matriculation
- Overall, student's undergraduate academic performance is good
- ~3.2 – 3.69 GPA (or equivalent) on U.S. 4.0 scale

## Unsatisfactory academic preparation (0-1 points)

- Student does not meet all of the prerequisite requirements, nor has the student addressed how she/he will complete this coursework in advance of matriculating to the Bren School
- Student struggled in science, quantitative, or English composition courses (B- grades or lower)
- Student does not meet UCSB's minimum GPA requirements of 3.0 (or equivalent) and would require an exception request to the Graduate Division for admittance)

**Score for Academic Preparation:** \_\_\_\_\_ out of 5 points maximum

**Personal Achievements/Contributions:** Please describe any aspects of your personal background, accomplishments, or achievements that you feel are important in evaluating your application for graduate study. For example, please describe if you have experienced economic challenges in achieving higher education, such as being financially responsible for family members or dependents, having to work significant hours during undergraduate schooling or coming from a family background of limited income. Please describe if you have any unusual or varied life experiences that might contribute to the diversity of the graduate group, such as fluency in other languages, experience living in bicultural communities, academic research interests focusing on cultural, societal, or educational problems as they affect underserved segments of society, or evidence of an intention to use the graduate degree toward serving disadvantaged individuals or populations.

**Distinguished (4-5 points)**

- Student provides a compelling narrative that is thoughtfully written; no red flags
- Writing is clear, concise, and engaging; no mistakes in grammar, spelling, or punctuation; use of proper syntax; professional language
- Applicant demonstrates an ability to set goals or face challenges strategically and successfully

**Proficient (2-3 points)**

- Student provides a well-written narrative
- Few mistakes in grammar or spelling; strong, professional language
- Applicant demonstrates maturity, though may still need development to effectively face challenges or achieve goals

**Unsatisfactory (0-1 points)**

- Fails or does an insufficient job addressing the prompt; language is simple and lacking in professionalism
- Document lacking in organization or structure; rambling or sometimes incoherent language, or document is too short in length
- Student signals something that indicates he/she may not have the emotional capacity to excel at Bren

**Score for Personal Achievements/Contributions:** \_\_\_\_\_ out of 5 points maximum

**Letters of Recommendation (5 points max):** A minimum of 3 letters of recommendation are required by UCSB. We would appreciate your recommenders' personal impressions of your intellectual ability, aptitude in research, and professional skill. Please ask your recommenders to comment on your character, quality of previous work, and promise of productive scholarship, among other important aspects.

**Strong letters (4-5 points)**

- Recommenders clearly understand student's previous professional and academic accomplishments
- Recommenders express confidence in applicant's preparedness for graduate-level studies
- Recommenders understand the connection between the applicant's goals and a MESM degree
- Consistently high rankings (Upper 2% or Upper 10%)

**Good letters (2-3 points)**

- Recommenders are confident in applicant's ability to succeed in graduate-level education
- Clear that recommenders have relationship with applicant
- Mostly good rankings (Upper 25% or higher)

**Poor letters (0-1 points)**

- Recommenders shows no strong ties or connections to applicant
- Letters written with reservations
- Rankings fairly low across all three recommenders (Upper 50% or below)

**Score for Letters of Recommendation:** \_\_\_\_\_ out of 5 points maximum

**English language skills (*international applicants only; no point value awarded*):** If an applicant's native language is not English, then s/he is *required* to complete either the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exam. Please note these possible score ranges: IELTS: Maximum possible points = 9; TOEFL internet-based test (iBT): Maximum possible points = 120; TOEFL paper-delivered test (PBT): Maximum possible points = 677.

**Strong command of English language**

- TOEFL: 100+ iBT or 630+ PBT
- IELTS: 8+ overall bandwidth

**Good command of English language**

- TOEFL: 95-99 iBT or 600-629 PBT
- IELTS: 7 or 7.5 overall bandwidth

**Poor command of English language**

- TOEFL: Below 95 iBT; below 600 PBT
- IELTS: below a 7 overall bandwidth

**Graduate Record Exam scores (*no point value awarded*):** The GRE is required for all graduate degree programs and consists of three sections: Verbal Reasoning (170 max. score), Quantitative Reasoning (170 max. score), and Analytical Writing (6 max. score).

In 2016, ETS (the company that administers the GRE and the TOEFL) released a GRE Guide to the Use of Scores, in which they state "the GRE tests provide measures of certain types of developed abilities and achievement, reflecting educational and cultural experience over a long period. Special care is required in interpreting the GRE scores of students who may have had educational and cultural experiences different from those of the traditional majority." The UCSB Graduate Division further states that there is "no evidence that performance on the GRE correlates with intelligence." Because of this, the Recruitment, Admissions and Support (RAS) Committee is to view GRE scores as secondary admissions criteria, considered in relation to overall academic performance.

**SP + CV + AP + PA + LR = \_\_\_\_\_ [25 points maximum]**

## Sample Wayne State University Personal Statement Rubric

The purpose of the rubric is to provide a standardized assessment of the personal statement across applications. Admissions committees reach final admissions decisions through discussion and consensus and in accordance with Wayne State University's recommendations.

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<b>1. Writing Style/Mechanics</b>	<i>Incomplete or run-on sentences, little and/or poor punctuation</i>	<i>Sentence structure and punctuation needs editing</i>	<i>Sentences varied, some awkward. Punctuation appropriate for the most part, no major errors</i>	<i>Excellent sentence structure, varied in composition and length. Punctuation appropriate, error-free reflecting thorough proofreading</i>	
<b>2. Quality of Research or Scholarly Experience</b>	<i>No research experience, including no relevant research coursework</i>	<i>Research experience limited to coursework; no additional research experience</i>	<i>Research experience outside the field of interest with transferrable skills to proposed area of study OR Some basic research experience beyond coursework (e.g., data entry, scheduling appointments)</i>	<i>Excellent research experience in the field of interest (e.g., meaningful and extensive contributions and/or research skills, perhaps evidenced by honor's thesis, publications, presentations, or other scholarly products;)</i>	
<b>3. Persistence and Motivation</b>	<i>No evidence of persistence in achieving long-term goals or motivation for the field of study</i>	<i>Some evidence of persistence and motivation but not explicitly stated</i>	<i>Evidence of persistence and motivation provided with no accompanying information about relevance for the field of study</i>	<i>Evidence of persistence and motivation including initiative in seeking out opportunities and/or explanation of how the evidence is relevant to the field of study</i>	
<b>4. Other qualities specified by program admissions committee (e.g., ability to contribute a unique perspective; leadership skills; applied skills relevant to the degree program)</b>	<b>USING "Unique Perspective" as an example:</b> <i>No evidence of ability to share unique perspectives to enhance learning or contribute to the program needs/goals.</i>	<i>Some evidence ability to share unique perspectives but not explicitly stated</i>	<i>Evidence of ability to share unique perspectives with no accompanying information about relevance for the field of study</i>	<i>Evidence of ability to share unique perspectives and an explanation of how the evidence is relevant to the field of study</i>	
<b>Average Score*</b>					<u>        </u> = <b>Total/ # of Items</b>

\*Insert Average into Full Application Rubric.



**Criteria 1: Knowledge, Skills and Abilities**

Professional References	References describe an individual who is: professionally motivated, sound decision maker, intellectually capable, responsible, ethical, and open to growth.	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Poor</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Good</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>Outstanding</td><td>20</td></tr> </table>	Poor	0	Good	10	Outstanding	20	Score (out of 20)																																																									
Poor	0																																																																	
Good	10																																																																	
Outstanding	20																																																																	
GRE/RSI	<p>Use GRE or RSI.</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="3">RSI: Averaged Scores from all 5 respondents</td></tr> <tr><td>Score</td><td>Value</td><td>Score</td></tr> <tr><td>&lt;1.2</td><td>-10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1.2-2.0</td><td>-5</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2.01-2.5</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2.51-3.5</td><td>10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>&gt;3.5</td><td>20</td><td></td></tr> </table>	RSI: Averaged Scores from all 5 respondents			Score	Value	Score	<1.2	-10		1.2-2.0	-5		2.01-2.5	0		2.51-3.5	10		>3.5	20		<table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="3">GRE: Verbal Reasoning</td></tr> <tr><td>&lt;146</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>146-155</td><td>5</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>&gt;155</td><td>10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="3">GRE: Quantitative Reasoning</td></tr> <tr><td>&lt;148</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>148-156</td><td>5</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>&gt;156</td><td>10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="3">GRE: Analytical Writing</td></tr> <tr><td>&lt;3.0</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3.0-4</td><td>5</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>&gt;4</td><td>10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="3">Sum all three areas</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="3">Multiply by .67</td></tr> </table>	GRE: Verbal Reasoning			<146	0		146-155	5		>155	10		GRE: Quantitative Reasoning			<148	0		148-156	5		>156	10		GRE: Analytical Writing			<3.0	0		3.0-4	5		>4	10		Sum all three areas			Multiply by .67			Score (out of 20)
RSI: Averaged Scores from all 5 respondents																																																																		
Score	Value	Score																																																																
<1.2	-10																																																																	
1.2-2.0	-5																																																																	
2.01-2.5	0																																																																	
2.51-3.5	10																																																																	
>3.5	20																																																																	
GRE: Verbal Reasoning																																																																		
<146	0																																																																	
146-155	5																																																																	
>155	10																																																																	
GRE: Quantitative Reasoning																																																																		
<148	0																																																																	
148-156	5																																																																	
>156	10																																																																	
GRE: Analytical Writing																																																																		
<3.0	0																																																																	
3.0-4	5																																																																	
>4	10																																																																	
Sum all three areas																																																																		
Multiply by .67																																																																		

**Criteria 2: Academic Capacity**

Prior Academic Experience	<p>Choose one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undergraduate overall GPA</li> <li>Calculated GPA from last 30 undergrad attempted credit hours</li> <li>For those with graduate work of at least 24 credit hours, use graduate overall GPA</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>GPA</td><td>Points</td></tr> <tr><td>&lt;2.5</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2.5-2.75</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>2.76-3.00</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>3.01-3.40</td><td>30</td></tr> <tr><td>&gt;3.41</td><td>40</td></tr> </table>	GPA	Points	<2.5	0	2.5-2.75	10	2.76-3.00	20	3.01-3.40	30	>3.41	40	Score (out of 40):
GPA	Points														
<2.5	0														
2.5-2.75	10														
2.76-3.00	20														
3.01-3.40	30														
>3.41	40														

**Criteria 3: Depth of Experience**

Statement of Goals	Evaluate the statement using 3 criteria	<p>Correct use of grammar &amp; written form</p> <p>Clarity &amp; specificity of goals for graduate work</p> <p>Evidence of drive and focus</p>	<p>Poor = 0 Good = 5 Outstanding = 10</p> <p>Poor = 0 Good = 5 Outstanding = 10</p> <p>Poor = 0 Good = 5 Outstanding = 10</p>	<p>Out of 10:</p> <p>Out of 10:</p> <p>Out of 10:</p>	Score (out of 20):
Professional Experience	Evaluate quality of professional experience:	<p>Degree of responsibility consistently increases over time</p> <p>Evidence of decision making responsibility</p>	<p>Poor = 0 Good = 5 Outstanding = 10</p> <p>Poor = 0 Good = 5 Outstanding = 10</p>	<p>Out of 10:</p> <p>Out of 10:</p>	Score (out of 20)

<b>Total Points</b> (out of 120 total)
---

Evaluating The Total Score <i>Note: a zero score in any area results in a denial of admission</i>	<90 Requires Program Director Review >90 Program acceptance
--	--