

San Diego State University College of Graduate Studies
Graduate Student Travel Fund Scholarship (GSTF) Rubric Fall 2026 Cycle
*(*Updated starting the Summer 2026 Cycle - Please review carefully*)*

#	Criterion	Non-eligible 1	Weak 2	Adequate 3	Promising 4	Outstanding 5
1	Elementary evidence of academic merit (Graduate Cumulative GPA)	GPA provided is <3.0.	Weak GPA (3.0 - 3.2).	Adequate GPA (3.21 - 3.5).	High GPA (3.51 - 3.8).	Very high GPA (>3.8).
2	<i>*If travel is for a conference*</i> Level of student's participation	The student is not presenting or otherwise serving in an eligible scholarly presentation role, or the application does not provide sufficient evidence of participation. <i>(Applications receiving a 1 may be deemed ineligible for funding.)</i>	Student's presentation role is minimal or not clearly described, or the scholarly contribution is not well justified.	Student is co-presenting original research or creative work, or presenting in a less prominent but substantive role (e.g., panel presentation, workshop, demonstration, or equivalent).	Student is presenting original research or creative work as the lead author/presenter (oral presentation, poster, juried exhibition, performance, or discipline-equivalent scholarly contribution).	Student has a major scholarly role, such as an invited presentation, keynote, competitive symposium presentation, juried exhibition/performance, or is the lead presenter of original research.
	<i>*If travel is for research*</i> Student's statement how GSTF would enhance their education and advance their long-term goals	Does not demonstrate that the travel is necessary for the proposed research, or the research purpose is unclear, unsupported, or ineligible. <i>(Applications receiving a 1 may be deemed ineligible for funding.)</i>	The proposed travel has limited connection to the student's research or degree progress, or the research plan is insufficiently developed or justified.	The travel supports the student's research, but the justification, research plan, or anticipated outcomes lack detail or demonstrate only a moderate impact on the project or degree.	The travel will make a substantial contribution to the student's research or creative project. The research plan is well developed, the need for travel is well justified, and the expected outcomes are clearly described.	The travel is essential to the student's research and degree progress. The application clearly demonstrates that access to a specific site, archive, collection, laboratory, field location, community, or research facility is necessary and that the proposed activities are well planned, feasible, and likely to result in significant scholarly or creative outcomes.
3	Strength of faculty letter of support	Faculty letter of support is not submitted or is incomplete, extremely brief, or does not adequately support the student. Provides little or no information about the student's qualifications or the purpose and value of the travel.	Faculty letter provides minimal support. Contains vague or generic statements with little evidence of the student's qualifications or the value of the proposed travel.	Faculty letter supports the student's application but provides mostly general statements. Offers limited discussion of the student's accomplishments or the impact of the travel. Contains few specific examples.	Faculty letter provides a positive endorsement with good detail about the student's accomplishments and potential. Explains the value of the travel and its anticipated benefits. Includes some specific examples but may not be as comprehensive or compelling as an excellent letter.	Faculty provides a strong, detailed endorsement of the student. Clearly describes the student's academic achievements, research or creative activities, professionalism, and potential. Explains the significance of the proposed travel and how it will advance the student's academic and professional development. Includes specific examples demonstrating the student's qualifications and likelihood of benefiting from the award.
4	Strength of application submission	The application is substantially incomplete or missing required components. The abstract is not understandable to a general academic audience, the travel costs submitted are inadequate or absent, required regulatory approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, or equivalent) are not addressed, or the application otherwise cannot be fully evaluated.	The application is incomplete or lacks important supporting information. The abstract is difficult for a multidisciplinary audience to understand, the travel costs lack justification, or information regarding required regulatory approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, or equivalent) is incomplete or unclear.	The application meets the basic requirements but contains some weaknesses, such as a technical abstract, limited travel costs justification, or incomplete information regarding required regulatory approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, or equivalent).	The application is complete and well prepared with only minor omissions or areas needing clarification. The abstract is understandable to a broad audience, the travel costs submitted are reasonable, and any required regulatory approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, or equivalent) are appropriately addressed.	The application is complete, well organized, and of outstanding quality. All required components are included and thoughtfully prepared. The project abstract is written in clear, accessible language appropriate for a multidisciplinary review committee. Any required regulatory approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, or equivalent) are addressed or documented. The travel costs documentation is complete and realistic.