

Nominee:

PI:

REU or RET:

2019 REU/RET Nomination Package
PI Letter of Recommendation Rubric

	Rating			
Category	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
Site Participation Does the letter explain the role that the nominee played at the REU/RET and outline their duration of work and responsibilities onsite?	Clearly and sufficiently addresses nominee's role at REU/RET site, duration of participation, and responsibilities on site	Addresses all of these points sufficiently, but lacks clarity or necessary details	Marginally addresses some of these points	Does not mention role, duration, or responsibilities
Conference Benefit Does the letter explain how this nominee will benefit from the EEC Grantees Conference (e.g. networking, present a poster, help with a session)	Clearly and sufficiently addresses how nominee will benefit from participating in the EEC Grantees Conference, offering thoughtful explanation	Addresses expected conference benefit but lacks detail or explanation	Marginally address conference benefit	Does not mention conference benefit
Commitment Does the letter explain the nominee's commitment to REU/RET (e.g. skills or qualities displayed during work, work ethic, specific ways nominee has contributed to research)?	Content offers significant information about the nominee. Examples (cited accomplishments, contributions, talents, qualities, etc.) are clearly supported	Content offers information about the nominee, including one or two examples; examples may or may not be supported	Marginally addresses nominee commitment, but content is weak and specific examples of commitment are not shared	Does not address nominee commitment to REU/RET
Individuality Does the letter effectively distinguish the nominee from other applicants? Is the nominee memorable and remarkable for the right reasons?	Letter distinguishes nominee from other applicants (e.g. experience, background, activities, growth during research)	Letter offers distinguishing details but nominee may lack necessary individuality or remarkability	Letter indicates that nominee appears acceptable, but is not really distinguishable from other nominees	Letter does not leave a dominant impression because the information is dull, vague, or otherwise lacking