Scoring Rubric for Admission into Master’s and PhD Spanish graduate programs

1. **Strength of research interests as stated in the statement of purpose**

10 Excellent/ 8 Very good/ 6 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Potential of candidate’s experiences, perspectives, and/or future research to contribute to the diversity of the field**

10 Excellent/ 8 Very good/ 6 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Quality of the writing sample, such as the articulation of a clear argument**

10 Excellent/ 8 Very good/ 6 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Demonstrated academic achievement as shown on the transcript in humanities classes or strong potential for academic achievement such as improvement in grades over time**

10 Excellent (Bs or above) / 8 Very good/ 6 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Indication of immersion in Spanish language, such as evidence of being a heritage speaker or native speaker, study abroad experiences and/or significant formal training**

10 Excellent/ 8 Very good/ 6 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Alignment of proposed research with SIP faculty research interests and graduate program**

5 Excellent/ 4 Very good/ 3 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Potential for proposed research to intersect with interdisciplinary initiatives at UVa**

5 Excellent/ 4 Very good/ 3 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

1. **Quality of the recommendation letters, keeping in mind the capacity of the letter writers to evaluate the student’s potential, their indication of students’ preparedness, and the common and subtle gender/race/class disparities that occur in recommendation letters when describing student potential**

5 Excellent/ 4 Very good/ 3 Good/ 2 Poor/ 1 Unqualified

**Please pull one or two key statements from the recommendation letters that summarize your evaluation.**

*Common disparities in recommendation letters for women and minorities:*

* *Shorter length of the letter (16% shorter on average for women)*
* *Minimal assurances and hedges rather than ringing endorsements*
* *Adjectives describing effort (e.g. hard-working, diligent, dependable) rather than ability or achievement (e.g. excellent, brilliant, knowledgeable)*
* *Positive descriptions of soft skills when describing women (e.g. caring, helpful, warm) or judgment for perceived lack of soft skills (e.g. challenging, difficult)*