

## **Guidelines for Scoring:**

### **Extracurricular Activities**

**10 points maximum**

Extracurricular activities may include academic, service, cultural, athletic, religious, as well as paid and unpaid work. Participation may be as an individual or as part of a group.

#### **(9-10 points):**

- Wide range of varied extracurricular activities – inside and outside of school
- Serious consistent effort and commitment
- Shows initiative and specific involvement/participations/results
- Demonstrated consistent leadership responsibility in activities

#### **(7-8 points):**

- Moderate range of varied extracurricular activities – inside and outside of school
- Generally consistent effort and commitment
- Some initiative and indication of specific involvement/participations/results
- Some leadership responsibility in activities

#### **(5-6 points):**

- Limited range of variety of extracurricular activities – inside and outside of school
- Inconsistent effort and commitment
- Little initiative and indication of specific involvement/participations/results
- Minimum leadership responsibility in activities

#### **(1-4 points):**

- Narrow range and little variety of extracurricular activities – inside and outside of school
- Little consistency in effort and commitment
- No initiative and minimal indication of specific involvement/participations/results
- No leadership responsibility in activities

## **Guidelines for Scoring:**

### **Service** **10 points maximum**

Service includes voluntary, unpaid, and paid efforts in school, civic, church, community, or business settings. Service can be done individually or as part of a group. Descriptions should detail the student's individual responsibilities and what they learned/gained by doing each.

#### **(9-10 points):**

- Wide range and variety of voluntary and paid service
- Serious consistent effort and commitment toward service
- Shows initiative and specific participation and results in service
- Evidence of personal growth and values

#### **(7-8 points):**

- Moderate range and variety of voluntary and paid service
- Generally consistent effort and commitment toward service
- Some initiative and specific participation and results in service
- Sense of personal growth and enrichment

#### **(5-6 points):**

- Limited range and variety of voluntary and paid service
- Some consistent effort and commitment toward service
- Little initiative and specific participation and results in service
- Little sense of personal benefits of service

#### **(1-4 points):**

- Small range and variety of voluntary and paid service
- Token/minimal effort and commitment toward service
- No initiative and elaboration of specific participation and results in service
- No sense of benefits of service

## **Guidelines for Scoring:**

### **Honors/Awards** **10 points maximum**

Honors/Awards can be school related or outside of school. They may be given for individual achievement or related to the achievement of a group in which the individual participated. Consistency of effort and recognition, as well as selectivity and competitiveness of honor/award may be considered.

#### **(9-10 points):**

- Recognition is given for a wide range and variety of achievement
- Achievement is achieved at numerous levels including local, district/regional, state and national
- Specific description of achievement/ability recognized

#### **(7-8 points):**

- Recognition is given for a moderate range and variety of achievement
- Achievement is achieved at several levels including local, district/regional, state
- General description of achievement/ability recognized

#### **(5-6 points):**

- Recognition is given for a limited range and variety of achievement
- Achievement is achieved at local, district/regional levels
- Limited description of achievement/ability recognized

#### **(1-4 points):**

- Recognition for small range and variety of achievement
- Achievement is limited to recognition at the local level
- No description of achievement/ability recognized

# Governor's Scholars Program Writing Entry Scoring Guidelines

<b><u>Formatting...</u></b>	2.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Writing Entry</u> is double-spaced</li></ul>	
<b><u>Purpose/Audience...</u></b>	0.0 – 3.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Limited awareness</u> of audience and/or purpose</li><li>• <u>Some evidence</u> of communicating with an audience for a specific purpose; some lapses in focus</li><li>• Focused on a purpose; communicates with an audience; evidence of <u>appropriate voice</u> and/or suitable tone</li><li>• Establishes a purpose; maintains <u>clear focus and strong awareness</u> of audience; appropriate tone</li><li>• Establishes a purpose; maintains clear focus throughout; evidence of <u>distinctive voice</u> appropriate to audience</li></ul>	
<b><u>Idea Development/Support...</u></b>	0.0 – 3.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Minimal</u> idea development; limited and/or unrelated details</li><li>• <u>Unelaborated</u> idea development; minimal and/or repetitious details</li><li>• <u>Depth</u> of idea development supported by relevant details</li><li>• Depth and <u>complexity</u> of ideas supported by <u>rich, engaging, pertinent</u> details</li><li>• Depth and complexity of ideas supported by rich, engaging, pertinent details; evidence of <u>analysis, reflection, insight</u></li></ul>	
<b><u>Organization...</u></b>	0.0 – 3.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Random</u> and/or weak organization</li><li>• <u>Lapses</u> in organization and/or coherence</li><li>• <u>Logical, coherent</u> organization</li><li>• <u>Well-crafted, skillful</u> organization</li></ul>	
<b><u>Sentences...</u></b>	0.0 – 3.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Incorrect</u> and/or ineffective sentence structure</li><li>• <u>Simplistic</u> and/or <u>awkward</u> sentence structure</li><li>• <u>Controlled</u> sentence structure</li><li>• <u>Varied</u> sentence structure</li><li>• <u>Advanced</u> sentence variety, structure, and length that enhances writing</li></ul>	
<b><u>Language...</u></b>	0.0 – 3.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Incorrect</u> or <u>ineffective</u> language</li><li>• <u>Imprecise</u> and/or <u>simplistic</u> language</li><li>• <u>Acceptable, effective</u> language</li><li>• <u>Precise</u> and/or <u>rich</u> language</li></ul>	
<b><u>Correctness...</u></b>	0.0 – 3.0 possible points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Frequent errors</u> in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</li><li>• <u>Some errors</u> in spelling, punctuation, and/or capitalization that do not interfere with meaning and emphasis</li><li>• <u>Very few errors</u> in spelling, punctuation, and/or capitalization relative to length and complexity</li><li>• <u>Skillful control</u> of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</li></ul>	

## **Guidelines for Scoring:**

### **Teacher Recommendation**

**10 points maximum**

Scores for this section will be a comprehensive evaluation of the numerical rankings the comments, as well as the consistency between the two of these.

#### **(9-10 points):**

**5's (8-12)**

**4's (0-4)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (0)**

- Numerical scores are consistent with written recommendation
- Direct knowledge of working with student, citing specific examples of student effort, qualifications, values, and/or regards for others in a school/classroom setting.
- Minimum amount of "vitae material"
- Well written, no/few distractors, and no repetition in answers
- Obvious recommender knows student
- Addresses questions regarding applicant directly

#### **(7-8 points):**

**5's (6+)**

**4's (4-5)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (1-2)**

- Numerical scores essentially consistent with written recommendation
- Knowledge of working with student without specific examples of student effort, qualifications, values, and/or regards for others in a school/classroom setting.
- "Vitae material" liberally used in answers
- Generally well written, minimum distractors, and minimum repetition in answers
- Recommender is fairly well acquainted with student
- Addresses questions regarding applicant directly

#### **(5-6 points):**

**5's (3-5)**

**4's (5-7)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (3-4)**

- Numerical scores are generally consistent with written recommendation
- Little indication of direct working with student
- Repetition in answers
- Heavily dependent on "vitae material"
- Questions regarding applicant only partially addressed

#### **(1-4 points):**

**5's (0-2)**

**4's (3-4)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (5-6)**

- Numerical scores are inconsistent with written recommendation
- No indication of working with or interacting with student
- Almost exclusively "vitae material"
- Poorly written – distractors common and/or answers are repetitive
- Questions regarding applicant minimally or not addressed

## **Guidelines for Scoring:**

### **Community Recommendation**

**10 points maximum**

Scores for this section will be a comprehensive evaluation of the numerical rankings the comments, as well as the consistency between the two of these.

#### **(9-10 points):**

**5's (7-10)**

**4's (3-4)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (0)**

- Numerical scores are consistent with written recommendation
- Direct knowledge of working with applicant, citing specific examples of applicant community involvement, effort, values, and/or regards for others outside of a school/classroom setting.
- Minimum amount of "vitae material"
- Well written, no/few distractors, and no repetition in answers
- Obvious recommender knows applicant
- Addresses questions regarding applicant directly

#### **(7-8 points):**

**5's (5+)**

**4's (5-9)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (1-2)**

- Numerical scores essentially consistent with written recommendation
- Knowledge of working with applicant but without specific examples of applicant community involvement, effort, values, and/or regards for others outside of a school/classroom setting.
- "Vitae material" liberally used in answers
- Generally well written, minimum distractors, and minimum repetition in answers
- Recommender is fairly well acquainted with applicant
- Addresses questions regarding applicant directly

#### **(5-6 points):**

**5's (3-4)**

**4's (3-5)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (2-3)**

- Numerical scores are generally consistent with written recommendation
- Little indication of direct working with applicant or examples that are given are from a school/classroom setting
- Repetition in answers
- Heavily dependent on "vitae material"
- Questions regarding applicant only partially addressed

#### **(1-4 points):**

**5's (1-2)**

**4's (2-4)**

**1's, 2's, 3's (3-5)**

- Numerical scores are inconsistent with written recommendation
- No indication of working with or interacting with applicant
- Almost exclusively "vitae material"
- Poorly written – distractors common and/or answers are repetitive
- Questions regarding applicant minimally or not addressed