CLEAN ENERGY INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

CEI Graduate Fellowship Scoring Instructions to Panelists

We are looking to recognize applications with outstanding potential for research and leadership. You are asked to score applications (short responses, CV, and letters of reference) from 5 (highest) to 1 (lowest) across 3 scoring categories:

(a) research potential; (b) leadership and commitment to inclusion and diversity in STEM; (c) relevance to CEI's state-mandated core research mission areas of solar energy, renewable energy storage, and smart grid systems.

To help you assign scores, please see the rubric below, in particular for those that are new, student leadership potential and commitment to inclusion in STEM (especially through proven examples while at UW) is an important criterion that needs to be weighed.

Special Cases:

(1) current NSF, NDSEG, DOE, etc. fellowship holders are NOT eligible to receive additional CEI funding, *BUT they may be designated as CEI Fellows*. **Please indicate any such students who are applying.**

(2) Students must have begun their graduate study between June 1, 2018 and September 31, 2020 and should not be planning to graduate before June 15, 2022. Incoming 1st year students are not eligible. Please flag any students who we missed during pre-screening.

(3) Students who were interested in being considered for the DIRECT program as well have submitted additional responses. CEI Faculty Advisory Board reviewers should feel free to make notes on their suitability for that program if applicable, but applicants will be considered separately for both programs.

Scoring Rubric

Research

5 **Exceptional:** Application shows evidence of significant research products such as publication(s), patent(s), refereed proceeding(s), published code repositories, or other noteworthy research achievement(s) as appropriate for an applicant's field and career stage *in graduate school.* Applications will include evidence of student initiative and competitiveness such as applications for NSF, international, and similar fellowships. You would argue to fund this application in front of the group based on their research achievements.

4 **Very good:** This application is significantly stronger compared to the UW graduate cohort, has demonstrated evidence of achievements (as noted above) at UW that distinguishes them. You would agree with a group recommendation to fund this application based on the evidence of research achievements.

3 **Above average:** This application is above average compared to the UW graduate cohort, but may not yet show strong evidence of exceptional research achievements (as noted above). You would not advocate for this application to be funded but would not speak out in objection.

2 **Average:** This application appears to be average compared to the UW graduate cohort but has evidence of promise for future research achievements (as noted above).

1 **Below Average:** This application appears to be below average compared to the UW graduate cohort, their CV or reference letters specifically raise red flags. You would object to funding this application.

Leadership

5 **Exceptional**. Application indicates high level of participation and leadership (while at UW) in service and extracurricular activities; application clearly shows how experiences motivate and prepare applicant to achieve CEI outreach goals of engaging, increasing, and supporting the persistence and inclusion of diverse people in STEM.

4 **Very good**: This application is significantly stronger compared to the UW graduate cohort, has demonstrated leadership achievements at UW that motivate and prepare the applicant to achieve CEI outreach goals of engaging, increasing, and supporting the persistence and inclusion of diverse people in STEM that distinguishes them. You would agree with a group recommendation to fund this student based on strong evidence of their leadership achievements.

3 **Above average**: This application is above average compared to the UW graduate cohort in service when compared, but may not yet have strong evidence of being exceptional in leadership achievements.

2 **Average**: This application appears to be average compared to the UW graduate cohort but has evidence of promise for future success in leadership achievements.

1 **Below Average**: This application appears to be below average compared to the UW graduate cohort, their CV or reference letters specifically raise red flags. You would object to funding this student.

Research Fit

Note: we want to be inclusive when possible. Nevertheless, some research just doesn't fit. There may be borderline cases where research fit may become the tie-breaker, but research-fit is not generally used to exclude students except in severe cases.

5 The application shows evidence of research that has clear implications for solar energy, renewable energy storage, energy systems, or advanced energy materials. This may include basic science applications, from algorithm development to the study of new semiconductors or physical processes with future applications to energy as well as energy equity or policy in the context of CEI's major research thrusts.

4 The application shows evidence of research that is relevant to CEI, but may be somewhat tangential.

3 The application shows evidence of research that is relevant to CEI, but you have concerns about how this program might one day benefit solar energy, energy storage, energy systems, or energy equity or policy.

1-2 The application shows evidence of research that is relevant to energy, but maybe not CEI. Wind power, tidal power, sewage biofuels, and similar projects would generally fall into the range of 1-2 or below.

1 The application shows evidence of research that is not related to CEI. You would object to funding this project because it does not appear relevant to solar energy, energy storage, energy systems, or energy equity or policy.