2024 Provost's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program:
Supporting Researchers from Underrepresented Groups

PPFP Scoring System

Using a holistic approach, committee members assign a score for each nomination package they review, using the following as a guide.

Descriptor	Range	Definition
Outstanding	4.5 – 4.9	The application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal. If an application is innovative, fills an important critical gap in knowledge, has very few flaws, and the applicant (with support of supervisor/team) is well poised to perform the research and have a very productive track record.
Excellent	4.0 – 4.4	The application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible. If an application is very interesting, makes important advances, the applicant (with support of supervisor/team) is excellent, but there are some minor limitations that need to be addressed or a clear description of impact is missing.
Good	3.5 – 3.9	The application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary. If an application is compelling, but has limited scope or impact, and/or raised some concerns about the feasibility of the applicant and/or team; or in other words, the grant has strengths, but needs work.
Fair	3.0 – 3.4	The application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required. If an application has merits but also has many limitations. *Will not be funded.*
Poor	0.0 – 2.9	The application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps. If an application has significant flaws and is not ready to be funded. *Will not be funded.*