



Atmospheric Sciences Program

APPLICANT EVALUATION FORM

Name of Applicant: _____
Last
First
Middle

To the Applicant: Under the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, students who are accepted and who matriculate into the school or college program for which they applied are given the right to inspect their records, including their letters of recommendation, unless they have waived their right of review. You have the option of (1) signing the following waiver; or (2) declining to do so.

I expressly waive any rights of access I might have to this letter of recommendation under the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, and grant permission for it to be held confidential.

Date: _____ Signature: _____

I do not waive my right of access to this form. It shall be made available to me for inspection upon written request.

Date: _____ Signature: _____

1. I know the applicant: very well moderately well only slightly
2. Contact with applicant: student in lecture class student in laboratory academic advisor
 other: _____
3. Would rate among recent graduates as:

	1. Excellent	2. Above Average	3. Average	4. Below Average
A. Intellectual ability or capacity				
B. Initiative and drive				
C. Personality and cooperativeness				

4. From the following list of phrases, please check as many as you are able to apply to the applicant. Feel free to modify any phrase by additions or deletions.

- Definitely Ph.D. material
- Should work towards an M.S. and then re-examine potential
- Applicant's potential is better than suggested by transcript
- Pretty much an average student
- Cannot in good faith recommend this person for graduate work
- Superb analytical mind; able to analyze problems quickly and clearly
- Open-minded and discriminating judgement
- Can work through difficult problem with some minor assistance
- Lacks judgement; tends to get stuck on minor aspects of a problem
- Has good overall grasp of basic physics, chemistry and mathematics
- Has good oral and written communication skills
- A truly brilliant mind
- Imaginative and creative; a real innovator
- Applicant is brilliant but irritating; a tendency toward intellectual arrogance
- Smart but lazy
- Conventional in performance, lacks imagination
- A good technician but less able to handle theoretical concepts
- A good theoretician but somewhat inept in the laboratory
- Equally adept as an experimentalist or theoretician
- Applicant works well independently
- Performs well under supervision
- Very enthusiastic but sometimes gets carried away and spreads self too thin
- Tends to plunge into things without thinking
- Very organized approach to work
- Applicant is sloppy and careless in work habits
- Works well with others
- Emotionally and psychologically stable; self-confident
- Easily discouraged; emotional unstable

5. Applicant's strongest points:

6. Applicant's weakest points:

7. Would you recommend this student as a potential Ph.D. candidate for your own department?

8. Among applicant's current peers, I would rate this applicant in overall ability as:

- Upper 5% Upper 10% Upper 20% Upper 50% Lower 50%

9. Please add any qualifying remarks or comments not covered in the above. We are particularly interested in short anecdotes of your personal experiences with this applicant.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Please return to: **Admissions Coordinator**
 Atmospheric Sciences Program,
 PO Box 75-7320, Geophysical Institute
 University of Alaska Fairbanks
 Fairbanks, AK 99775-7320