University of Pittsburgh Travel Award for IEP Instructors

CRITERIA	RATING 1	RATING 2	RATING 3	RATING 4	RATING 5
Reason(s) Applicant Wishes to Attend Convention	Nominee does not demonstrate compelling reasons for wanting to attend the convention.	Nominee demonstrates very little interest and commitment to the convention.	Nominee demonstrates some interest and commitment to convention participation and sharing of best practices.	Nominee demonstrates interest and commitment to participation and sharing best practices.	Nominee demonstrates strong interest and commitment to convention participation and sharing of best practices.
Past and Current Contributions to ESL/EFL Teaching	Little to no evidence found of contributions to ESL/EFL teaching in an IEP context.	Minimal contributions to ESL/EFL teaching in an IEP context.	Developing contributions to ESL/EFL teaching in an IEP context.	Accomplished contributions to ESL/EFL teaching in an IEP context.	Exemplary and significant contributions to ESL/EFL teaching in an IEP context.
Explanation of Financial Aid Opportunities	Nominee has full financial support from employer or other source to attend convention.	Nominee has minimal financial burden to attend the conference.	Nominee has some financial support from employer or other source to attend convention and distance to convention is not significant.	Nominee has one source of financial support from employer or other source but the distance of travel to the convention is significant and support will not be able to cover a large portion of expenses.	Nominee has no financial support from employer or other source to attend convention.
Attendance at Previous TESOL Convention	Nominee has annually attended TESOL International Convention.	Nominee has attended the TESOL International Convention more than once in the past five years.	Nominee has attended the TESOL International Convention once in the past five years.	Nominee has not recently attended a TESOL International Convention.	Nominee has never attended a TESOL International Convention.

Letter of Recommendation #1	Reference letter is missing, is not from the applicant's direct supervisor, or does not support award application.	Reference letter is weak and does not state why candidate should receive the award. Referee is the applicant's direct supervisor.	Reference letter somewhat supports award application. Referee is the applicant's direct supervisor.	Reference letter supports award application. Referee is the applicant's direct supervisor. Referee knows the candidate and supports the candidate for the award.	Reference letter significantly supports award application. Referee is the applicant's direct supervisor. Referee knows the candidate and the letter strongly support why the candidate is the best choice for the award.
Letter of Recommendation #2	Reference letter is missing or fails to support award application.	Reference letter is weak and does not state why candidate should receive the award.	Reference letter somewhat supports award application.	Reference letter supports award application. Referee knows the candidate and supports the candidate for the award.	Reference letter significantly supports award application. Referee knows the candidate and the letter strongly supports why the candidate is the best choice for the award.