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ETS Engagement with the Graduate Community
About ETS

ETS is a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) organization

Mission is to help advance quality and equity in education

70+ years of experience in educational research and assessment

Develops, administers and scores 50 million tests annually in 180 countries, including programs for the U.S. and other governments

Significant annual investment in researching solutions to 9 big educational challenges
Who are we, what are we doing, and why are we doing it?

• **Who**
  - A year ago, ETS created an **Office for Graduate Education Engagement** that includes five key **strategic advisors** with years of “boots on the ground” experience in graduate education from different campuses.
  - More recently, ETS has also created an **Academic Partnerships Team** to work with you to understand your challenges and work together to solve those challenges, and an **Academic Support Team** to provide training and answer questions regarding GRE tests and services.

• **What**
  - “Visiting” **campuses** nationwide to **learn about graduate admission practices from you** and to **share with you** our knowledge base about Holistic Admissions.

• **Why**
  - **Explore** how **together** we can collaborate in the future on admissions issues as well as solutions to address needs within the entire graduate student lifecycle.
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The GRE® Board

The Board is an independent board with members appointed by the Association of Graduate Schools and the Council of Graduate Schools. It oversees GRE tests, services and research in consultation with its committees, and establishes all policies for the GRE Program, which ETS administers. Its standing committees are:

- Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
- Executive
- Finance
- Research
- Services
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Graduate Admissions and Some of the Challenges
Some of the Challenges We Are Hearing From Colleagues Across The Nation

“We are looking for the best students who match my research needs/interests and who will persevere and finish the program”

“There are just too many applications and not enough time to review them so we have to use a cut score so we can get through all of these”

“I have no training in how to evaluate applications”

“We want to recruit and admit URM students, but we can’t get them in the pool of applicants”

“There is never enough money to fund the students I want to admit”
Additional Challenges

“We find the best students but they often decline our offer and go to University X because that University has a better ‘reputation’ and they always get all the good students”

“If only we could bring them here to meet our faculty and see our facilities, they would seriously consider us”

“COVID, COVID, COVID ... our practices have changed and we are not sure if that is a good thing.”

“What do we do with or how do we evaluate Pass/Fail grades?”

"Biases – Conscious or Unconscious biases are a challenge we face”
Using a Holistic Admissions Process
Foundational work for holistic admissions “promising practices” and subsequent materials

Campus visits
71 interviews with deans and faculty in the following disciplines:
- Life sciences
- Physical sciences
- Engineering
- Social sciences
- Arts & humanities
- Education
- Business

Literature review
Examined published works related to graduate admissions from early 1950s to present

Other sources
More than a dozen other sources, including Holistic Review in Graduate Admissions: A Report from the Council of Graduate Schools

See sources at www.holisticadmissions.org/navigate/more-information/
What are the benefits of a truly holistic process?

✓ Gain a clearer picture of an applicant’s potential fit
✓ Identify applicants most likely to be successful in your program
✓ Support fair review of all applicants

"Central to the concept of holistic application review is looking at everything a candidate has submitted, understanding unconscious biases and being aware of inequities in access to opportunities."

Mark J.T. Smith
Dean of the Graduate School and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
GRE Board Chair
What is “holistic admissions”?

- What Criteria Are Considered?
- Who Is Considering the Criteria?
- In What Order Are Criteria Considered?
- How Are Criteria Weighted Based on Goals?
Poll #1

What is currently most important to your graduate program(s)?

A. Increasing the number of applicants
B. Increasing diversity
C. Increasing retention
D. Increasing completion rates
E. Increasing funding opportunities
Holistic practices can be embedded within each step of the admissions process

- Preparing for the Admissions Process
- Collecting Applicant Information
- Evaluating the Admissions Process
- Selecting Applicants
- Reviewing Applicant Files
Preparing for the Admissions Process

Set goals and guiding principles.
Structure processes to achieve your goals.
Consider committee composition and training.

"We must commit to holistic evaluation to get a true sense of who an applicant is and can become."

Janet Rutledge
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC), and GRE Board Past Chair
Preparing: Set Goals and Guiding Principles

- Define success and evidence of success.
- Set goals that align with mission of the program.
- Establish guiding principles so all parties understand how the goals will be achieved. Specifics help clarify expectations.
- Once established, goals and guiding principles can inform every step of the process.

Setting Goals
A discussion guide to facilitate a conversation on your campus

Download [here](#).
Preparing: Consider Committee Composition and Training

✓ Consider whether there is a balance of influence among team members.

✓ Ensure a variety of perspectives and experiences are reflected.

✓ Provide faculty opportunities to:
  • Learn about less familiar undergraduate schools.
  • Work with undergraduate students from underrepresented groups.

✓ Discuss or offer training about the role of implicit (unconscious) bias and how to avoid it.

Training the Committee
Cornell Graduate School provides an excellent faculty resource

Implicit Bias Resources Webpage
Shares curated videos and links to other training materials

Visit here.
Poll #2

Do you have meetings prior to your admissions deliberations to discuss/decide how the different pieces of the admissions portfolio will be weighted?

• Yes
• No
Poll #3

Is there any formal training for new people added to the admissions committee prior to beginning admissions deliberations?

• Yes
• No
Collecting

Collecting Applicant Information

Determine evidence needed to evaluate applicants.

Ensure application explicitly requests it.

Collect comparable information from all applicants.

“A complete assessment of each applicant is important to identifying the best graduate students for your program. Using GRE scores is essential in having a full understanding of the potential of each applicant.”

Maureen Grasso
Professor of Textile Sciences and Former Dean of the Graduate School, North Carolina State University, former Dean of the University of Georgia Graduate School, and Graduate Education Advisor with ETS
Evidence should be broad in scope, drawing from:

✓ Personal Statement, Statement of Purpose, and résumé/CV

✓ Undergraduate GPA, major GPA and transcript

✓ Standardized assessments, such as the GRE® General Test.

✓ Personal attributes documentation, such as personal statement and letters of recommendation
## Application Criteria Purpose, Benefits, Drawbacks and Mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGPA and Transcript</th>
<th>GRE® Scores</th>
<th>Personal Statement</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Résumé/Research Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• specialized experience</td>
<td>• cognitive skills</td>
<td>• passions</td>
<td>• third-party endorsement</td>
<td>• practical application of classroom concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• academic ability</td>
<td>• graduate-level readiness</td>
<td>• personality</td>
<td>• attributes</td>
<td>• specialized experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• growth over time</td>
<td>• objective benchmark</td>
<td>• potential</td>
<td>• ability to succeed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• challenging coursework</td>
<td>• equal opportunity</td>
<td>• humanizes objective, quantifiable info</td>
<td>• authentic perceptions of achievements, potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• passion for subject</td>
<td>• research-based</td>
<td>• unique experiences, backgrounds, POVs</td>
<td>• concrete examples of subjective traits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• well-roundedness</td>
<td>• fairness reviews</td>
<td>• intent and suitability</td>
<td>• skills and dispositions to contribute to the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cross-discipline interests</td>
<td>• professional standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>• proof of practical skills that can be advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Board of grad deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose
- Passions
- Personality
- Potential

### Benefits
- Objective benchmark
- Equal opportunity
- Research-based
- Fairness reviews
- Professional standards
- Board of grad deans
- Humanizes objective, quantifiable info
- Unique experiences, backgrounds, POVs
- Intent and suitability

### Drawbacks
- Perceptions dependent on reviewer factors
- Subject to explicitness of instructions
- Positive bias
- Courtesy vs. sincerity
- Some student authored
- Reviewer bias
- Influenced by socioeconomic factors
- Can be incomplete due to relevancy questions

### Mitigation
- Gather input on application directions
- Have multiple reviewers
- Articulate dispositions
- Provide a standard form
- Pay special attention to language, examples
- Understand impact of privilege
- Use explicit directions
- Use consistent format

### Letters
- Third-party endorsement
- Attributes
- Ability to succeed
- Authentic perceptions of achievements, potential
- Concrete examples of subjective traits
- Skills and dispositions to contribute to the field
- Proof of practical skills that can be advanced

### Résumé/Research Exp.
- Practical application of classroom concepts
- Specialized experience
- Use explicit directions
- Use consistent format
Reviewing Applicant Files

Adopt a truly holistic review process.

Consider multiple criteria.

Explore alternate processes.

“"A holistic process inclusive of both objective and subjective measures is inherently fairer and more respectful to applicants, while also helping programs better meet their needs.”

Michael Cunningham
Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research and Professor of Psychology and Africana Studies at Tulane University, and Chair of the GRE Board Services Committee
Reviewing: Explore Alternate Processes

✓ Determine alternate review processes to avoid the framing bias.

✓ Consider withholding information about UGPA and GRE scores until personal statements are reviewed or interviews are conducted.

✓ Ensure all participants review application materials in the same order and completely independently.
"Making admissions decisions is an art and a science. Information about personal attributes and passions, found in personal statements and recommendations, serves as the art. Information about applicants’ critical thinking skills, provided through GRE scores, serves as the science. Both are important."

JoAnn Canales
Dean in Residence at Branch Alliance for Educator Diversity, Former Dean, College of Graduate Studies, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, and GRE Board member

Selecting Applicants
Balance quantitative and qualitative measures.
Consider composition of the class as a whole.
Use a scorecard or rubric for consistency.
Selecting: Use a Scorecard or Rubric

✓ Use tools to help ensure that reviewers evaluate applicants consistently and in alignment with program goals.

✓ Give more points to information the program values more and fewer points to less important information.

✓ Recommend actions based on total score ranges.

Scorecard Example
A sample scorecard with links to more examples

Download here.
## Selecting: Use a Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component &amp; Max Points</th>
<th>Points values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3 – 1 yr UG + work/ internship research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – 1 year of UG research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0–1 – less than a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–2 extra for publications, posters, awards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Recommendation</td>
<td>3 – very strong letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – moderately strong letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – below average letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 – red flag in letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work exp./CV</td>
<td>2 – 2+ years related work exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max = 3</td>
<td>1 – 1–2 years related work exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 extra for volunteer work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG curriculum</td>
<td>1 – extensive science coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max – 2</td>
<td>1 extra for high UG challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGPA</td>
<td>4 – 3.7 to 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max = 4</td>
<td>3 – 3.4 to 3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – 3.2 to 3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – 3.0 to 3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample rubric for illustrative purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component &amp; Max Points</th>
<th>Points values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal statement</td>
<td>2 – suggests strong fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max = 3</td>
<td>1 – suggests good fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – unclear fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 – poor fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 extra for hardship, disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>2 – 164–170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max = 2</td>
<td>1 – 160–163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 – less than 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE Analytical Writing</td>
<td>2 – 5.0–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max = 2</td>
<td>1 – 4.0–4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 – less than 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE Verbal Reasoning</td>
<td>1 – 150–170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max = 1</td>
<td>0 – &lt;150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score:</td>
<td>20–25 – Strong admit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17–19 – Admit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14–16 – Probable admit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10–13 – Probable deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0–9 – Deny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Find several more examples [here](#).
Evaluating the Admissions Process

Evaluate outcomes data against inputs.

Reflect on past students to gain insight.

Understand typical reasons for dropping out.

“Be careful about placing blame for low completion rates on inputs considered during admissions. Completion is more often caused by what happens after enrollment, and programs and institutions can often influence outcomes by developing strong mentorship programs and a culture of inclusion.”

Carlos Grijalva
Emeritus Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience and Former Graduate Associate Dean at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Graduate Education Advisor with ETS
Evaluating: Measure Outcomes

- Evaluate outcomes against admissions data to ensure desired goals are achieved.
- Look for patterns that can help refine admissions practices in subsequent cycles.
- If goals haven’t been met, review your strategies for recruiting and nurturing relationships.
- Consider doing a regression analysis using an appropriate sample size. This can help determine how well the various components can predict student success, however your program defines success.

A Model for Holistic Review in Graduate Admissions That Decouples the GRE® from Race, Ethnicity, and Gender

Read here.
✓ Exercise care when comparing outcomes with inputs as many factors contribute toward whether a student is successful in a particular program.

✓ Conduct exit surveys and/or interviews to consider changes the program or institution can make to avoid dissatisfaction.

✓ Note that while GRE® scores cannot predict which students will drop out due to life circumstances, they are helpful in determining who has the reasoning, critical thinking and analytical writing skills needed for graduate-level study, and who is likely to struggle.
Holistic Admissions Best Practices In a Nutshell

Preparing for the Admissions Process
Set goals and guiding principles. Structure processes to achieve your goals. Consider committee composition and training.

Download: Discussion Guide

Collecting Applicant Information
Determine evidence needed to evaluate applicants. Ensure application explicitly requests desired information. Collect comparable information from all applicants.

Download: Benefits and Drawbacks of Application Components

Evaluating the Admissions Process
Evaluate outcomes data against admissions inputs. Reflect on past students to gain insight. Understand typical reasons for dropping out.

Download: Understanding and Improving Retention Rates

Selecting Applicants
Balance quantitative and qualitative measures. Consider composition of the class as a whole. Use a scorecard or rubric for consistency.

Download: Sample Holistic Admissions Scorecard/Rubric

Reviewing Applicant Files
Adopt a holistic review process. Consider multiple criteria and explore alternate processes. Ensure applications are evaluated consistently.

Download: Getting the Greatest Value Out of Test Scores

Access this infographic here.
This robust resource provides research-based guidance, examples from programs, and **downloadable content** that can be emailed, printed and shared. The entire guide is also available as a PDF and a PowerPoint deck.

**Resource:** Navigating Holistic Admissions Digital Guide
GRE® Scores: Benefits and Limitations
Poll #4

How is your program currently using the GRE® General Test?

A. Required
B. Optional
C. Temporarily optional due to COVID
D. Not accepted
The Verbal Reasoning Measure

The Verbal Reasoning assessment measures an individual’s ability to comprehend and synthesize written material, including the ability to:

✓ Analyze and draw conclusions from discourse; reason from incomplete data
✓ Identify the author’s assumptions and/or perspective
✓ Summarize text and distinguish major from minor points
✓ Comprehend literal and figurative meanings
✓ Understand the meaning of words, sentences and entire texts
✓ Understand relationships among words and concepts
The Quantitative Reasoning Measure

The Quantitative Reasoning assessment measures a candidate’s ability to reason quantitatively, including the ability to:

✓ Understand, interpret and analyze quantitative information
✓ Model and solve problems with quantitative methods
✓ Apply the basic concepts of:
  - Arithmetic
  - Algebra
  - Geometry
  - Data analysis
The Analytical Writing Measure

Analytical writing skills are critical for success in almost every graduate discipline.

The Analytical Writing assessment consists of two separately timed tasks:

1) Take a position on an issue and develop an evidence-based argument supporting that position;

2) Evaluate the logical soundness of someone else’s argument.
The Analytical Writing Measure (continued)

The tasks assess the candidate’s ability to:

✓ Articulate and support complex ideas with relevant reasons and examples
✓ Examine claims and accompanying evidence
✓ Construct and evaluate arguments
✓ Sustain a well-focused, coherent discussion
✓ Control the elements of standard written English
What are the benefits of using GRE® scores?

✓ Helps identify which applicants are graduate-ready
✓ Enables applicants from different backgrounds to be compared fairly
✓ Balances out more subjective information
✓ Levels the playing field for applicants who aren’t as well resourced as their peers

“GRE Analytical Writing scores provide information about applicants’ ability to construct and evaluate arguments and articulate complex ideas. Programs can access applicants’ actual essay responses through ETS Data Manager. These responses are more authentic than personal statements, which are often coached and refined before submitting as part of the application.”

Steve Matson
Professor of Biology and Former Dean of the Graduate School, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Graduate Education Advisor with ETS

See: Four Facts about the GRE® General Test.
What are the limitations of using GRE® scores?

✓ Test scores can’t offer insight about all qualities or factors that may predict academic or career success

✓ No single measure can represent a person's potential, yet many programs use GRE scores as cutoff scores, thus disadvantaging some students

✓ On average, members of different groups perform differently on the test, which can be addressed through holistic review

“GRE scores are complex measures that are frequently used inappropriately. It is important for review committees to obtain training to better unlock the value of GRE scores.”

Bill Andrefsky
Edward R. Meyer Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Former Graduate Dean, Washington State University, and former graduate education advisor with ETS

See: www.holisticadmissions.org/be-informed/
Misconceptions about Group Differences in Average Test Scores

Posted: November 22, 2019

The recent request to the Regents of the University of California to stop using college admissions test scores pointed out the troubling reality that there are large score differences across racial/ethnic groups on college admissions tests. However, the letter reinforced two misconceptions about tests that need to be corrected. First, the letter claimed that differences across racial/ethnic groups in test performance signify test bias. Second, the letter claimed that the typical finding that students from high-income families obtain higher test scores, on average, than students from low-income families constitutes proof of test bias. These erroneous claims confuse correlation with causality. Differences in socioeconomic status and quality of education exist across racial/ethnic groups in this country. Criticizing test results for reflecting these inequities is like blaming a thermometer for global warming.

For this reason, the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education, 2014) explicitly point out that test fairness does not require equality of outcomes. As the Standards state “…group differences in testing outcomes should trigger heightened scrutiny for possible sources of test bias … However, group differences in outcomes do not in themselves indicate that a testing application is biased or unfair” (p. 54). Some examples of factors that may contribute to average score differences across racial/ethnic groups are disparities in school and community resources, teacher quality, course offerings, and access to cultural activities. The National Council on Measurement in Education is troubled by these inequities and would like to see educational assessments be part of the solution in resolving them. However, we note the disparities in test performance are caused by disparities in educational opportunities, and that group differences in college admissions tests do not equate to test bias. Rather than limiting the types of information college admissions officers can use, we encourage proper use and interpretation of all data associated with college readiness, and we acknowledge the importance of the information provided by college admissions test scores.

See NCME Statements
All components of the application have imperfections ...

Educational opportunities and life circumstances can have a substantial influence on all components of an application.

- Letters of recommendation
- Reputation of the undergraduate institution
- Personal statements
- Undergraduate GPA
New research provides a blueprint for holistic review using *GRE®* scores

A 2019 study at The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center UTHealth Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences concluded that:

1. It is the practice of using cut scores, not the GRE test itself, that disproportionately affects doctoral applicants from underrepresented groups

2. An admissions committee can mitigate GRE score variances between demographic groups

3. A multi-tiered holistic applicant review process can increase the diversity of the applicant pool without increasing the workload of the admissions committee

The report also provides a blueprint for institutions that want to implement a data-driven approach to assess applicants in a manner that uses GRE scores as part of the process.

See [A Model for Holistic Review in Graduate Admissions That Decouples the GRE from Race, Ethnicity, and Gender](#)
Your Questions Answered

+ Are the GRE tests valid and reliable?

+ Why do some people say the tests are biased?

+ How can an admissions committee mitigate GRE score variances between demographic groups?

+ Will dropping use of the tests help remove barriers for people from underrepresented groups?

+ Can dropping the tests help increase student diversity?

+ What would help increase campus diversity?

+ What exactly is holistic admissions?

+ Can using GRE scores as part of a holistic process help increase diversity?

Discover more at www.holisticadmissions.org/be-informed
The Validity of the GRE® Tests
Predictive Validity of the GRE® Tests

A meta-analysis* of 82,659 students by University of Minnesota found that, across master’s and doctoral programs, the GRE® General Test ...

Is a valid predictor of:
- ✓ Overall graduate GPA
- ✓ Comprehensive exam scores
- ✓ Publication counts
- ✓ Faculty ratings

Correlates positively with:
- ✓ Degree attainment
- ✓ Research productivity

Has stronger predictive validity than undergraduate GPA and letters of recommendation

GRE Analytical Writing scores are the best or 2nd-best predictors of future GPA, across master’s and doctoral programs

Research also shows:

- The value of the test in identifying students likely to struggle
- Correlates positively with:
  - ✓ Degree attainment
  - ✓ Research productivity

* This same meta-analysis found that GRE Subject Test scores are better predictors of graduate school success than GRE® General Test scores or undergraduate GPA.
Four cautions about evaluating recent studies

1. **Insufficient sample sizes can lead to incorrect conclusions.**

   - Most of the research unfavorable toward the **GRE®** tests rely upon small sample sizes, leading to incorrect conclusions.
   - The University of Minnesota meta-analysis referenced earlier used a sample size of more than 82,000 students. The quality of research always matters. And when analyzing the value of standardized testing, quantity matters as well.
Four cautions about evaluating recent studies (continued)

2. Restricted range and failure to account for it can skew the results.

• Recently published research has based conclusions on GRE® test takers who have already gotten in, but not accounted for that range restriction in the analysis. As a result, the samples used in these studies are skewed toward individuals who scored high on the GRE test.

• Good research accounts for range restriction so that if the entire population is not available, at least that weakness has been factored into the analysis.
### Reasons for Leaving Graduate School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in family status</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job or military conflict</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program dissatisfaction</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed to work</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal problems</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial reasons</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking time off</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other career interests</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling issues</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment not suitable</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *The Path Through Graduate School: A Longitudinal Examination 10 Years After Bachelor’s Degree*
Lacking a true “control” in the study can lead to incorrect conclusions.

- Some programs that drop the GRE® test requirement do so while they are making other changes, such as offering more financial support or beginning a mentoring program.

- Making several changes at once and then drawing the conclusion that dropping the GRE test requirement is what produced an increase in program completion may not be accurate.
The TOEFL® test is composed of four parts:
- Reading
- Listening
- Speaking
- Writing

Using TOEFL scores in admission decisions
- Use all score information not just the total score. Section scores can distinguish one applicant from another and provide a more complete picture.
- Review section scores routinely, and consider setting minimum section score requirements for the skills that are most important to success in your program.
Practical Experiences from UNC Chapel Hill
## UNC – A Tale of Two Programs

**Overarching Goal: Program Completion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Biological and Biomedical (BBSP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>• Increase diversity&lt;br&gt;• Retain quality</td>
<td>• Increase diversity&lt;br&gt;• Predict productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Waive GRE scores as a way to reduce barriers</td>
<td>• Study whether any admissions factors predict research productivity&lt;br&gt;• Adopt holistic admissions, conduct bias training and GRE/GPA-blind interviews&lt;br&gt;• Focused on supporting enrolled students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>• Short-term application volume increase&lt;br&gt;• Slightly higher UGPA&lt;br&gt;• No noticeable increase in applicant diversity</td>
<td>• Admission of underrepresented students rose from 20% to 26% and now at 30%&lt;br&gt;• Completion of underrepresented students is identical with majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations for File Review

✓ Do not assign undue predictive power to UGPA, GRE scores or any other measure
✓ Consider relevant experience, especially when coupled with enthusiastic support letters
✓ Define criteria for admissions in advance
✓ Train committees on implicit bias
✓ Consider ways to assess noncognitive qualifications, such as perseverance and adaptability
✓ Read every application and the entire application — it can be done at scale
Next Steps
Next Steps

Share the slides/recording

Talk with faculty members about admissions practices

Consider developing and/or sharing your admissions rubric

Connect with ETS to discuss your program’s particular pain points and objectives.
Poll #6

Would you be interested in any of the following ETS® Services? (Select all that apply.)

A. Free training on holistic admissions and/or implementation
B. Piloting alternative assessments (i.e. behavioral, research, etc.)
C. Participating in research around admissions methodologies
D. Recruitment and engagement tools
E. Other (please put in the chat)
To Get More Information

• **GRE® Tests and Services**
  – Visit [www.ets.org/gre/institutions](http://www.ets.org/gre/institutions)

• **Holistic Admissions Strategies**
  – Visit [www.holisticadmissions.org](http://www.holisticadmissions.org)

• **If you have questions:**
  – Steve Matson, ETS Graduate Education Advisor: smatson@holisticadmissions.org
  – Chad Muse, Academic Partnerships: cmuse@ets.org
  – Matt Bashi-Kadlubowski, Academic Support Services: mbashikadlubowski@ets.org
  – GRE Help Line: grehelpline@ets.org
Questions?
APPENDIX
Increasing Access and Equity for Applicants
Reducing barriers for applicants

The GRE® Program works to increase access, affordability and equity through these offerings:

- GRE® General Test at home
- Excellent free test prep
- GRE® Fee Reduction Program
- Industry-leading accommodations
- Feedback on test performance
Stay on Course with the GRE® General Test at Home

The GRE General Test at home is offered 24/7. It’s identical to the usual testing experience in:

- Content
- Format
- On-screen experience
- Cost

And offers dozens of accommodations for people with disabilities and health-related needs

“Students want to submit their GRE® scores in a timely manner to graduate programs seeking this source of objective and reliable information. The GRE General Test at home meets their needs.”

Fred Oswald
Professor and Herbert S. Autrey Chair in Social Sciences, Rice University, and Ad Hoc Member, GRE Board Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Learn more here.
3 ways applicants pay less — or nothing — to take a GRE® test

1. **Apply**
   for a 50% GRE® fee reduction voucher, which is available for individuals who can demonstrate financial need and for those who are unemployed and receiving unemployment compensation

2. **Receive**
   a 50% GRE® fee reduction voucher, which ETS gifts to a dozen programs that serve students from underrepresented groups, first-generation college students, and students with financial need

3. **Receive**
   a full or partial pre-paid voucher from any sponsoring program, organization or individual

See [GRE® Fee Reduction Program](#) and [GRE® Prepaid Voucher Service](#)
**GRE® Fee Reduction Program**

- Program began in 1971. In the past six years, 31,000+ GRE® Fee Reduction Vouchers were used.
- Year-over-year usage has increased as ETS has made vouchers available to more programs.
- Those who qualify also get free access to additional test prep ($100 value).

**Programs that receive fee reduction vouchers annually from ETS**

- EducationUSA Opportunity Fund Program
- Gates Millennium Scholars Program
- Institute for Recruitment of Teachers (IRT)
- Management Leaders of Tomorrow
- Maximizing Access to Research Careers (MARC) Undergraduate Student Training in Academic Research (U-STAR) Program
- National Consortium for Graduate Degrees for Minorities in Engineering and Science Program (GEM)
- NSF Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP) Program
- Postbaccalaureate Research Education Program (PREP)
- Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement (RISE) Program
- Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)
- TheDream.US
- TRIO Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program
- TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) Program

See [www.ets.org/gre/grefeereduction](http://www.ets.org/gre/grefeereduction)
Excellent, free test prep

POWERPREP® Online simulates the GRE® General Test. Two practice tests help test takers understand what's being tested, gain familiarity with question types and test functionality, and practice taking the test under timed conditions.

All Skills

• **Math Review** – 100-page refresher, including definitions, properties, examples and exercises with answers.
• **Khan Academy®** – For each Math Review topic, find links to instructional videos at Khan Academy.
• **Math Conventions** – Notations, symbols, terminology and guidelines.

Extra Math

Writing

The entire pool of GRE Analytical Writing tasks are available on ets.org/gre. The website also includes sample questions, scored sample essay responses, rater commentary, tips and more.

Subject Test practice books contain a complete test and answer key, plus test-taking strategies.
Advanced Accessibility

• The GRE® Program offers the most advanced accessibility features and support of any testing program worldwide.

• ETS staff participate in the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) initiative that sets accessibility standards for use by the international community.

• The GRE® General Test includes accessibility features that enable test takers to use JAWS® and refreshable braille.

• Accommodations are also available for the GRE General Test at home and POWERPREP Online practice tests.

“When you’re blind, it’s like taking a test while looking through a pinhole... We needed to build an infrastructure that allows [test takers] to quickly understand what is on screen, and easily navigate between parts of a test question. When a blind test taker can come out of a room and say this was the best test experience they’ve ever had, that means we’ve accomplished something.”

Cary Supalo
Research Developer, Accessibility Standards & Inclusive Technology, ETS

Learn more
Test Performance Feedback – GRE® Diagnostic Service

Insight into the test taker’s performance on the test questions in the Verbal Reasoning and Quantitative Reasoning sections of the GRE® General Test, whether taken at a test center or at home.

The service is free and includes:

• a description of the types of questions the test taker answered right and wrong
• the difficulty level of each question
• the time spent on each question

See GRE Diagnostic Service
Additional Resources
Find your future students with the GRE® Search Service

- **A cost-effective way to reach qualified, diverse in individuals** who want to pursue an advanced degree and have opted in to hear from programs like yours
- A database of 400,000+ test takers, who can be filtered by 30 criteria — including demographic details, academic performance and intended graduate major
- Option to receive newest names weekly or monthly
- Pay only for the names you need — there is no annual participation fee

Learn more.
Toolkit of resources to help educators advise students

• GRE Advisor Kit gives advisors and educators information to help students understand everything they need to know about:

  − test registration
  − preparation
  − sending scores

• Includes how-to videos, a student presentation with script, printable flyers, helpful links and more.

Learn more
Advisors and educators who conduct workshops with students can access free GRE® test preparation modules to complement their test prep activities. The modules contain video presentations and additional resources.

**Module A**
Gives a general overview of the GRE General Test in less than an hour

**Module B**
Offers five different sessions with much more extensive test prep instruction on the GRE General Test

**Module C**
Provides information about the GRE General Test at home option
Links to help increase understanding and promote appropriate use of GRE® scores

• Planning for the Admissions Process
  – Information and resources you can use to evaluate and enrich your admissions practices.

• Using GRE® Scores
  – The GRE Guidelines for Using Scores and other information to assist you in using scores appropriately in graduate admissions decision making.

• GRE Score Interpretation Resources
  – Interpretive data and resources for the GRE® tests to assist you in using scores.

Resource: GRE Snapshot report
Reviewing: Consider Multiple Criteria

Familiarize yourself with the six guidelines for using GRE® scores.

1. Use multiple sources of information when making decisions.

2. Consider Verbal Reasoning, Quantitative Reasoning and Analytical Writing scores as separate and independent measures (don’t add scores to create a composite score).

3. Consider scores carefully because, like all tests, they are not exact measures.

Considering Score Use
Learn about six guidelines for using GRE scores.

Download here.
Reviewing: Consider Multiple Criteria (continued)

Familiarize yourself with the six guidelines for using GRE® scores.

4. Understand what score difference are meaningful when evaluating applicants.

5. Use the appropriate percentile ranks when comparing candidates.

6. Subject test scores and percentile ranks should only be compared with other scores and percentile ranks on the same subject test.
About ETS and Its Commitment to Diversity
About ETS’ nonprofit status

As a nonprofit educational research organization, ETS must continuously prove that it operates for the advantage of public, rather than commercial, interests. It does so in several ways:

• **Research investment:** ETS invests over $100 million dollars annually on research that addresses educational challenges in order to improve teaching and learning, expand opportunities for individual learners, and inform education policy and assessment.
  – ETS’s Research & Development Division, including the new Fairness & Equity Research Methodologies Institute
  – The ETS Policy & Evaluation Research Center
  – The ETS Center for Research on Human Capital and Education

• **Public information:** Anyone can search the ETS ReSEARChER database of 10,000+ ETS-authored or published works.

• **ETS Center for Advocacy & Philanthropy:** A center of ETS focused on advocating for important educational issues and managing ETS’s philanthropic activities — including grants and scholarships — that support education and local communities.
The 9 big education challenges that ETS aims to help solve

1. Increase sustainable access to a diverse, high-quality teaching pool
2. Improve science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics pathways
3. Raise U.S. literacy levels
4. Support U.S. English learners’ development of language proficiency
5. Raise global English-language proficiency
6. Increase the diversity and quality of admissions to higher education
7. Promote assessment & development of critical competencies in a global context
8. Increase workplace preparedness and success
9. Support underserved learners and those who teach them

Resource: ETS Research Website
New Fairness and Equity Institute

ETS has launched a new research methodologies institute to investigate issues that affect inequality in educational outcomes, including:

- poverty
- structural stigma
- inequities in educational resources

This work will help to inform the educational community in developing strategies making education equitable for all.

**Resource:** ETS Launches Institute Focused on Fairness and Equity in Education

“This Institute will serve to highlight and reinforce the historical focus on fairness and equity in education that continues to be at the core of ETS’s mission.”

– Michael Walker, Director of the Fairness and Equity Research Methodologies Institute, ETS
ETS Center for Research on Human Capital and Education

Also part of R&D, this team manages global assessments on behalf of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and produces policy reports related to access, skills and opportunity. Recent reports:

 ✓ Too Big To Fail: Millennials on the Margins
 ✓ Skills and Earnings in the Full-Time Labor Market
 ✓ Choosing Our Future: A Story of Opportunity in America

Resource: Center for Research on Human Capital and Education
ETS Policy Evaluation and Research Center (PERC)

✓ Conducts and disseminates research on educational issues related to public policy that spans a continuum from childhood through graduate education and early career.

✓ Focuses on improving the quality of instruction in schools, closing achievements gaps for underrepresented populations and investigating factors that adversely affect student progress at all levels.

Resource: Policy Evaluation and Research Center
ETS Center for Advocacy & Philanthropy (CAAP)

The mission of CAAP is to:

✓ Act as an educational advocate by helping to raise awareness on those issues in education that impact disadvantaged groups
✓ Advance education goals in local communities through identifying, supporting and helping to replicate programs that achieve results
✓ Provide philanthropic support to organizations whose goals and missions align with ETS’s mission

Merit-based ETS Presidential Scholarships for HBCU students are awarded annually.

✓ Applicants are eligible to apply for their junior or senior year of undergraduate study
✓ Eight HBCU Students (chosen from four public and four private HBCUs) are awarded full-tuition scholarships

Resource: CAAP Website
Additional Resources
Resources from
Fisk-Vanderbilt Master’s to Ph.D. Bridge Program

https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit

• Toolkit for Practitioners

• The Fisk-Vanderbilt Masters-to-PhD Bridge Program was developed with the hope that the lessons learned, strategies, and tools we have developed would inspire and provide concrete guidance to other practitioners in the field seeking to develop similar programs. To access these resources and help us assess their utility, please fill out the form below.

• Please contact us if you have trouble accessing the resources or with any questions regarding the use of these tools as well as just to let us know that you are using them.

• We would love to hear from you!
## Resources from the Fisk-Vanderbilt Master’s to Ph.D. Bridge Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-Concept</td>
<td>Expresses confidence they can complete challenging goals, makes positive statements about abilities</td>
<td>Shows confidence and independence but may be unsure about adequacy or skills</td>
<td>Is unsure they can complete the program, exhibits low self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Self-Appraisal</td>
<td>Can clearly and realistically delineate strengths and weaknesses, works on self development</td>
<td>Has trouble identifying strengths and weakness but appreciates/seeks both positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>Over or understates abilities, does little to no self-assessment, does not appear to have learned from experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for Long vs. Short Term Goals</td>
<td>Clearly communicates long-range goals beyond the PhD</td>
<td>Primary goal is PhD completion</td>
<td>Is vague about long-term goals, or goals are short term such as coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Person Availability</td>
<td>Can define a professional support network including mentors</td>
<td>Expresses support from one individual, or family or community</td>
<td>Expresses little or no support from family or institution for goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Community Involvement</td>
<td>Demonstrates involvement and leadership ability in either academics, family, community, religious group, or athletics</td>
<td>Demonstrates involvement in groups in academia or extramural but has not shown leadership</td>
<td>Not involved in institutional or community group, no demonstrated leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in a Field/Non-Traditional Learning</td>
<td>Has engaged in, and learned from, experiences outside the classroom, i.e. performed independent research, extramural activities, self-taught skills</td>
<td>Shows some evidence of non-traditional learning experience</td>
<td>Has not engaged in or indicated learning from experiences outside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>Can describe a time they failed or encountered an obstacle and successfully coped.</td>
<td>Can identify a time they hit an obstacle but has trouble defining how they overcame the challenge.</td>
<td>Has little experience with failure/obstacles. Cannot provide an example or describe response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit](https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit)
Resources from Fisk-Vanderbilt Master’s to Ph.D. Bridge Program

https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit
# Letter of Recommendation

**To be completed by applicant:**

Name ____________________________

Last ____________________________ First ____________________________ Middle ____________________________

Department to which you are applying ____________________________

I agree that the recommendation I am requesting shall be held in confidence by Fisk University and hereby waive my rights of access to this recommendation.  

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Signature ____________________________ Date ______________

**To be completed by the recommender:**

Please rate the applicant relative to other students or employees who have undertaken graduate study in recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 2%</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>Top 25%</th>
<th>Top 50%</th>
<th>Lower 50%</th>
<th>No basis for judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and Diligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University would appreciate a statement from you about this applicant. How long and in what capacity have you known the applicant? What is your assessment of the applicant’s strengths and weaknesses? What is your opinion of the applicant’s ability to carry on study and research at the Master’s level? Please include any additional information that would be helpful to the University in evaluating the applicant. Use an additional sheet if necessary.

Source: [https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit](https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit)
# Candidate Evaluation Worksheet

**Candidate Name**

**Interview Date**

**Interviewer**

**Interviewee**

## Candidate Assessment (Rate on scale of 1-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Preparation</th>
<th>Perseverance/Fire-in-the-Belly</th>
<th>Relevant Research Exp.</th>
<th>Leadership/Outreach Activities</th>
<th>Communication Skills/Presence</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**EXPLANATION:**

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

**Probe Further**

**Topics/Areas Probed** | **Additional Notes**

---

Source: [https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit](https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit)
### Did they have questions for us? Curiosity/Preparedness

**Strengths**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weaknesses**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire in the Belly Work Ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Address Reviewer Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit
Interview Short Form
Tell us about your research? Should be able to succinctly present basic question.

What did you learn from that experience? Non-traditional learning/Self-reflection

Tell us something you are proud of in academics or personal life? Positive Self Concept

Give an example of a time you hit a serious obstacle or failure and how you handled it?

What motivates you to get the PhD and what do you want to do with it? Goals

Who do you go to for support or mentorship? Support Person Availability

What extracurricular activities are you engaged in and have you had a chance to lead?
Leadership/Community Involvement/Non-Traditional Learning

Why do you want to be in the Bridge Program? Goals, Preparedness

What worries you when you think about starting grad school? Realistic Self-Appraisal

What do you do when you get over your head? Perseverance/Engagement with Resources

Source: https://www.fisk-vanderbilt-bridge.org/toolkit
Resources from
Cornell University Graduate School
https://gradschool.cornell.edu/

• https://gradschool.cornell.edu/resources/

• https://gradschool.cornell.edu/diversity-inclusion/recruitment-2/prospective-students/writing-your-statement-of-purpose/

• https://gradschool.cornell.edu/academic-progress/faculty-guide-to-advising-research-degree-students/
## Admissions Interview Rubric - Part I

### Admission Interview Scoring Rubric

**Candidate Name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaboration:**
- Candidate’s responses do not reflect an ability to collaborate, problem-solve, and/or build capacity with others instructionally in a teacher leader role.
- Candidate’s responses indicate a limited level of experiences in making contributions to teaching & learning issues.
- Candidate’s responses indicate experience in or concrete examples of contributions which demonstrate collaboration, problem-solving, and/or building capacity with others in his/her classroom work.
- Candidate’s responses indicate many examples of leadership, consistent examples of contributions at the school or district level and support collaboration, problem-solving, and building capacity with others.

## Admissions Interview Rubric – Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching &amp; Learning Issues</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate did not provide examples of their role in improving teaching &amp; learning issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provided an example that supported limited activities and/or contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provided multiple examples of supporting school-wide leadership and/or contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provided supporting evidence that demonstrates capacity building or improved achievement results at the school level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Viability</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the candidate’s responses and/or demeanor in the interview, do not wish to become a principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the candidate’s responses and/or demeanor in the interview, it is not clear if they wish to become a principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the candidate’s responses and/or demeanor in the interview, with further growth and development, it appears likely he/she would be interested in the principalship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the candidate’s responses and/or demeanor in the interview, it appears likely he/she would be a strong candidate for the principalship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviewer Comments:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Form</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address qualifications and ambition</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed/Well Done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of candidate for Master’s program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>General in Nature</td>
<td>Directly address qualifications for program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Objective Statement</td>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>Some objectives</td>
<td>Objectives w/ some depth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Multiple instances of Poor Grammar</td>
<td>Some Errors A challenge to read and understand due to the errors</td>
<td>Few Errors</td>
<td>Well written and Engaging Grammar and diction are consistent with strong writing ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with Program Objectives</td>
<td>No alignment</td>
<td>Minimal alignment</td>
<td>Good alignment</td>
<td>Strong alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in terms of both quality and quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.iue.edu/education/programs/mose/documents/MasterofScienceinEducationAdmissionRubric-revised.docx](https://www.iue.edu/education/programs/mose/documents/MasterofScienceinEducationAdmissionRubric-revised.docx)
## Example of a “Completed Rubric”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Documentation</strong></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>None or some with little relevance to teaching abilities</td>
<td>Minimal and/or Weak Connections to Teaching Ability</td>
<td>Shows Potential as related to NBPTS</td>
<td>Strong NBPTS level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Random Not Engaging</td>
<td>Some organization Somewhat engaging</td>
<td>Organized and Engaging</td>
<td>Of superior quality Reflects high level of motivation and competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with Program Objectives</td>
<td>No alignment</td>
<td>Minimal alignment</td>
<td>Good alignment</td>
<td>Strong alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resume/C.V.</strong></td>
<td>Shows experience as an educator highlighting development as a professional</td>
<td>Little relevance to teaching experience</td>
<td>Some teaching experience</td>
<td>Shows development as a professional</td>
<td>Strong background and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transcripts</strong></td>
<td>GPA: Minimum of Bachelor’s Degree from Accredited Institution</td>
<td>2.79 or below</td>
<td>2.8-2.99</td>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>Above 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Some weak areas in terms of applicable content</td>
<td>Content reflects adequate breadth and depth</td>
<td>Content reflects the breadth and depth of a Master Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Score</strong></td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Below 2</td>
<td>2.0-2.99</td>
<td>3.0-3.49</td>
<td>3.5-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Score</strong></td>
<td>Add Total and divide by 12</td>
<td>None or some with little relevance to teaching abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.iue.edu/education/programs/mose/documents/MasterofScienceinEducationAdmissionRubric-revised.docx](https://www.iue.edu/education/programs/mose/documents/MasterofScienceinEducationAdmissionRubric-revised.docx)