



IDEC Foundation Carole Price Shanis Scholarship Reviewer Rubric

PURPOSE

This rubric guides the evaluation of applications to the IDEC Foundation Carole Price Shanis Scholarship. The scholarship supports professional development that enhances an applicant's graduate education in interior design. A total of \$3,000 is available for one to three scholarships.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

The applicant's anonymized written description and responses itemized budget with justification.

REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

- This is a blind review. If the application contains identifying information (name, institution, location, file name with name), it must be disqualified before scoring.
- Score each criterion on a 1–5 scale using the anchored descriptors below. Choose the level that best matches the application; do not split the difference (use whole numbers only).
- Use the comment space at the end to justify scores and document strengths or concerns.
- Final weighted score is calculated automatically in the scoring table (or the companion Excel sheet). The maximum possible weighted score is 5.00.

SCORING SCALE

Score	Meaning
5 - Exemplary	Substantially exceeds expectations; a model response on this criterion.
4 - Strong	Clearly meets expectations with notable strengths.
3 - Adequate	Meets expectations; competent but not distinctive.
2 - Developing	Partially meets expectations; notable gaps.
1 - Insufficient	Does not meet expectations; significant problems.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The four scored criteria reflect the priorities of the scholarship: educational and professional benefit is weighted most heavily, followed by the relevance of the proposed activity, the completeness and feasibility of the budget, and writing quality.

1. Educational and Professional Benefit

Weight: 35%

The application explains specifically how the proposed activity will enhance the applicant's graduate education in interior design and support their educational and professional goals.

5	Makes a compelling, specific, and well-supported case. The activity is clearly connected to current graduate education in interior design and to concrete professional goals; expected benefits are substantive and credible.
4	Presents a clear, specific connection to graduate education and professional goals, with notable strengths and well-explained expected benefits.
3	Presents a reasonable connection, but parts of the educational or professional benefit are general or underdeveloped.
2	Provides only a vague or partial connection to graduate education or professional goals; expected benefits are weakly explained.
1	Provides little or no explanation of educational or professional benefit, or the proposed use is unrelated to the scholarship's purpose.

Score for Criterion 1: _____ / 5

2. Relevance and Quality of the Proposed Professional Development

Weight: 25%

The proposed activity is clearly identified, appropriate to the applicant's goals, and presented as a meaningful professional development opportunity.

5	Clearly identifies the activity by name and link and provides its type, dates, and event location. The opportunity is highly relevant, and the rationale for selecting it is specific and convincing.
4	Describes a clear, specific, and relevant professional development opportunity with only minor gaps in detail or rationale.
3	Identifies a generally appropriate activity, but the rationale or one or more required details are somewhat general or incomplete.
2	Describes the activity vaguely, omits important details, or makes only a weak connection between the opportunity and the stated goals.
1	The activity is unclear, off-topic, or unsupported by a meaningful rationale.

Score for Criterion 2: _____ / 5

3. Budget Completeness, Reasonableness, and Feasibility

Weight: 25%

The budget identifies the exact amount requested, itemizes the required expenses, and justifies costs in relation to the proposed activity.

5	Provides a complete, transparent, and well-justified budget. Registration, detailed travel, lodging, and other costs are addressed as applicable; amounts are reasonable and participation appears feasible.
4	Provides a complete and reasonable budget with a clear justification; only minor details or explanations are missing.
3	Provides a generally understandable and feasible budget, but some costs, calculations, or justifications are underdeveloped.
2	Omits multiple required details, includes questionable costs, or offers weak justification; feasibility is uncertain.
1	The budget is materially incomplete, unreasonable, unexplained, or does not demonstrate a feasible use of funds.

Score for Criterion 3: _____ / 5

4. Quality of Written Communication

Weight: 15%

The written description and budget justification are clear, focused, well-organized, specific, and easy to navigate.

5	Writing is exceptionally clear, concise, specific, and professionally organized. Required headings make the application easy to navigate, and the response uses the available space effectively without crowding.
4	Writing is clear, focused, and well organized, with only minor stylistic or organizational issues.
3	Writing is readable and adequate but uneven, repetitive, overly general, or inconsistently organized.
2	Writing is unclear in places, poorly organized, or difficult to navigate; headings or focus are inconsistent.
1	Writing is significantly unclear, disorganized, or unresponsive to the requested information.

Score for Criterion 4: _____ / 5



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

SCORING SUMMARY

Criterion	Raw Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted (Raw x Weight)
1. Educational and Professional Benefit	_____	0.35	_____
2. Proposed Professional Development	_____	0.25	_____
3. Budget Completeness and Feasibility	_____	0.25	_____
4. Quality of Written Communication	_____	0.15	_____
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (out of 5.00)			_____

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Key strengths of the application:

Weaknesses, concerns, or gaps:
