



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

IDEC Foundation Graduate Scholar Award

Reviewer Rubric

PURPOSE

This rubric guides the evaluation of applications to the IDEC Foundation Graduate Scholar Award. The award supports interior design graduate students who are preparing for careers as interior design educators. Up to three \$1,000 scholarships are awarded annually to help recipients attend the IDEC Annual Conference.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

The applicant's two-page response to the four required questions: degrees held; motivation for graduate study; professional plans; how attending IDEC will help achieve the goals.

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 criteria below are weighted to reflect the priorities of the award: a clear commitment to teaching interior design is weighted most heavily, followed by motivation, coherence of trajectory, and writing quality.



1. Demonstrated Commitment to Teaching Interior Design

Weight: 35%

The application makes a credible, specific case that the applicant intends to enter the interior design teaching profession.

5	Articulates a clear, specific commitment to interior design education with concrete supporting evidence (e.g., teaching experience, mentoring, program participation, pedagogically oriented research interests). Pathway to becoming an educator is well-developed and convincing.
4	Strong, clear commitment to teaching interior design with some supporting evidence. Pathway is plausible and reasonably developed.
3	States interest in teaching interior design; commitment is plausible but somewhat general or under-developed.
2	Mention of teaching is vague, secondary, or aspirational without supporting reasoning.
1	Little or no demonstrated commitment to teaching interior design.

Score for Criterion 1: _____ / 5

2. Motivation & Purpose for Graduate Study & IDEC Attendance

Weight: 25%

The applicant's reasons for pursuing a graduate degree in interior design are clear, thoughtful, and grounded in the field.

5	Compelling, specific, and reflective account of what propelled the applicant to graduate study and to attend IDEC; clearly grounded in interior design and reveals depth of thinking.
4	Clear, thoughtful motivation supported by specific examples or reflection.
3	Reasonable explanation of motivation; somewhat general or surface-level.
2	Motivation is unclear, generic, or weakly connected to interior design.
1	Motivation is missing, off-topic, or inconsistent with the field of interior design.

Score for Criterion 2: _____ / 5



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

3. Coherence of Academic & Professional Trajectory

Weight: 20%

Degrees held, current graduate study, and stated professional plans connect into a coherent path toward a career in interior design education.

5	Strong, clearly reasoned coherence among prior education, current graduate program, and stated professional plans. The trajectory feels purposeful and well-considered.
4	Trajectory is well-aligned; minor gaps or ambiguities.
3	Trajectory hangs together; some elements feel disconnected or under-explained.
2	Notable inconsistencies or gaps between background, current study, and stated plans.
1	Trajectory is unclear, contradictory, or poorly justified.

Score for Criterion 3: _____ / 5

4. Quality of Written Communication

Weight: 20%

Responses are clear, focused, well-organized, and within the one-page limit. Headings are used as required by the call.

5	Excellent writing — clear, concise, well-organized, and professionally presented. Headings used as required; full use of the one-page space without crowding.
4	Strong writing with minor organizational, stylistic, or formatting issues.
3	Adequate writing; readable but unevenly organized, wordy, or formatted inconsistently.
2	Writing is unclear in places, poorly organized, or fails to use headings as instructed.
1	Writing is significantly unclear, disorganized, or formatting requirements are ignored.

Score for Criterion 4: _____ / 5



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

SCORING SUMMARY

Criterion	Raw Score (1–5)	Weight	Weighted (Raw × Weight)
1. Commitment to Teaching	_____	0.35	_____
2. Motivation for Graduate Study	_____	0.25	_____
3. Coherence of Trajectory	_____	0.20	_____
4. Quality of Writing	_____	0.20	_____
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (out of 5.00)			_____

Reviewer Comments

Key strengths of the application:

Weaknesses, concerns, or gaps:
