



HPAC 2026 Evaluation Rubric

Updated 12/23/2025

Rubric Use and Scoring Guidance

This rubric provides guidance for committee review of Health Professions Advisory Committee (HPAC) applicants. Applicants are expected to follow all instructions, including eligibility requirements and deadlines, as outlined on the HPAC website and in associated materials. All application materials must represent the applicant's own original work and accurately reflect their experiences and perspectives.

Applicants to Veterinary Medicine, Optometry, and Podiatry programs, which are not explicitly outlined in this rubric, will be evaluated using appropriate adjustments aligned with the priorities of GW undergraduate education and with current trends, expectations, and policies of those professional schools and their governing associations.

The committee expects all applicants to conduct themselves in a professional manner throughout the HPAC process. Concerns related to professionalism may be reflected in scoring and, in rare cases, may affect an applicant's eligibility.

Final scores are determined at the discretion of the committee.

Definitions

BCPM / Science GPA: The BCPM, BCP, or Science GPA as calculated by the centralized application service for the applicant's health professional schools. See HPAC Application guidance for details.

Clinical Experience: Includes both paid work and unpaid volunteer positions in healthcare that involve direct patient interaction and/or care, such as hospital volunteer, medical scribe, EMT, CNA, medical assistant, or similar positions in which the applicant is an active contributor in the clinical setting. Applicants must be able to meaningfully reflect on how these experiences informed their understanding of working in healthcare. Shadowing is not included unless otherwise specified.

Community Service: Non-clinical, unpaid, volunteer activities that directly contribute to the well-being of others or the broader community.

Activities should align with the applicant's interests, professional goals, and competencies, such as leadership and service orientation.

Research Experience: Participation in the scientific process through inquiry, investigation, or scholarly work that contributes to scientific, clinical, or practical advancement. Research may be conducted for credit or not for credit and may be paid or unpaid. Applicants must be able to clearly articulate their role and the purpose of the research. Does not include assignments as part of a regular science course or lab, ie. CHEM 2153 Organic Chemistry Laboratory I, BISC 2337 Introductory Microbiology Laboratory.

Written Application: Includes the personal statement, work and activities descriptions, and three short essays (practice secondaries).

Interview: Applicants will participate in short, structured, one-on-one interviews over Zoom. Interviews are recorded and evaluated by the entire committee.

Section	Exceeds expectations (4)	Meets expectations (3)	Needs improvement (2)	Unacceptable (1)	No Credit Given (0)	Considerations	Score
Academics (Cumulative & BCPM / Science GPA)	Cumulative: 3.8-4.0 BCPM/Science: 3.7-4.0	Cumulative: 3.5-3.79 BCPM/Science: 3.4-3.69	Cumulative: 3.2-3.49 BCPM/Science: 3.1-3.39	Cumulative: 3.0-3.19 BCPM/Science: 3.0-3.09	Cumulative: less than 3.0 BCPM/Science: less than 3.0	If applicant falls in (2) or (3) and meets one or more of the following conditions, add 1 point. (Only 1 additional point may be awarded.) -Demonstrates strong upward trajectory -Took rigorous STEM coursework -Has significant extenuating circumstances associated with W or grades below C -Is pre-dental	Max. 4 pts
Clinical Experience	Applicant has about 1000+ hours of clinical experiences (usually 2+ years continuous engagement) For pre-dental applicants: applicant has about 150+ hours of shadowing in a dentist office and/or working as a dental assistant	Applicant has about 500 to 1000 hours of clinical experiences (usually 1 to 2 years of continuous engagement) For pre-dental applicants: applicant has about 100 to 150 hours of shadowing and/or working in a dentist's office	Applicant has about 200 to 500 hours of clinical experiences (usually 6 to 12 months of continuous engagement) For pre-dental applicants: applicant has about 50 to 100 hours of shadowing and/or working in a dentist's office	Applicant has clinical experiences totaling less than about 200 hours (usually less than 6 months or only intermittent engagement) For pre-dental applicants: applicant has experiences shadowing and/or working in a dentist's office totaling less than about 50 hours	Applicant has no clinical experience For pre-dental applicants: applicant has no experience shadowing and/or working in a dentist office	Scoring may be adjusted for depth, relevance, continuity, and breadth of each experience. If applicant falls into categories (2) or (3) but has a valid reason for extended periods of inactivity such as illness, death of family member or other extenuating circumstances, add 1 point If applicant in any category cannot meaningfully comment on their clinical experience, subtract 1 point	Max. 4 pts

Community Service	Applicant has about 1000+ hours of community service (usually 2+ years of continuous engagement)	Applicant has about 500 to 1000 hours of community service (usually 1 to 2 years of continuous engagement)	Applicant has about 200 to 500 hours of community service (usually 6 to 12 months of continuous engagement)	Applicant has community service totaling less than about 200 hours (usually less than 6 months or only intermittent engagement)	Applicant has no engagement in community service	<p>Scoring may be adjusted for depth, relevance, continuity, and breadth of each experience.</p> <p>If applicant in any category has worked with diverse or underserved populations and is able to articulate meaning behind experiences, add 1 point</p> <p>If applicant in any category cannot meaningfully comment on their community service, subtract 1 point</p>	<p>Max. 4 pts</p> <p>+ 1 bonus pt.</p>
Research Experience	Applicant has about 500+ hours of research experience (usually 2+ semesters)	Applicant has about 250 to 500 hours of research experience (usually 1 to 2 semesters)	Applicant has about 100 to 250 hours of research experience (usually 1 semester)	Applicant has research experience totaling less than about 100 hours (usually less than 1 semester)	Applicant has no research experience	<p>Scoring may be adjusted for depth, relevance, continuity, and breadth of each experience.</p> <p>If applicant in any category has participated in research events (posters, presentations, publications) and/or has been awarded a research fellowship, then add 1 point</p> <p>If applicant in any category cannot meaningfully comment on their research, subtract 1 point</p>	<p>Max. 4 pts</p> <p>+1 bonus pt</p>

<p>Written Application</p>	<p>The written application clearly, genuinely, and passionately articulates the applicant’s motivations, competencies, and goals relevant to their chosen health profession. Reflection demonstrates intentional choice of career path and active pursuit of academic and extracurricular experiences that support professional development. Purpose is well supported through thoughtful, relevant, in-depth examples. Writing is unified and cohesive and demonstrates professional tone, mechanics, and style.</p>	<p>The written application articulates the applicant’s motivations and goals, showing good connections between academic and extracurricular experiences and the intended health profession. Reflection is present and supported by examples, though they may be less detailed or not fully integrated. Writing is clear and organized, with minor issues in tone, mechanics, or style, but overall demonstrates care and attention to composition.</p>	<p>The written application communicates goals or motivations in a general or vague manner. Connections between academic record, experiences, and intended health profession are limited or unclear. Reflection is minimal, and examples may be superficial or only loosely relevant. Writing may lack cohesion, clarity, or proper mechanics, reducing readability and professional polish.</p>	<p>The written application is present, but reflects limited depth, effort, or development. Goals, motivations, or relevance to the chosen health profession are vague or unclear. Reflection and supporting examples are limited or superficial. Writing contains numerous issues in organization, clarity, or mechanics, but some content is still interpretable.</p>	<p>The written application is missing, incomplete, or irrelevant. The composition contains significant issues, making it difficult to understand or evaluate.</p>		<p>Max. 4 pts</p>
-----------------------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	--------------------------

Interview	<p>The applicant was punctual and fully engaged. Communication demonstrated confidence, professionalism, and authenticity. Responses were clear, organized, relevant, and thorough, supported with illustrative examples and explanations. The applicant effectively demonstrated motivation, knowledge, competencies, and critical thinking relevant to their chosen health profession. Overall, the applicant presented as mature, thoughtful, and highly prepared for a healthcare career .</p>	<p>The applicant was punctual and professional, and engaged throughout the interview. Responses were generally clear, organized, and relevant, with some examples or reflection provided. Motivation for pursuing the health profession was evident, and the applicant demonstrated basic knowledge, competencies, and critical thinking, though some responses lacked depth or specificity. Overall, the applicant presented as competent and prepared.</p>	<p>The applicant was on time but demonstrated inconsistent engagement or professionalism. Responses were vague, general, or partially relevant, with minimal examples or reflection. Motivation for pursuing the health profession was unclear or inconsistently supported. The applicant showed limited demonstration of knowledge, competencies, or critical thinking. Overall, the applicant appeared underprepared or less confident.</p>	<p>The applicant was late, unprofessional, or disengaged. Responses were unclear, unrelated, or superficial, and lacked supporting examples. Motivation for pursuing the health profession was not evident. The applicant demonstrated minimal understanding of healthcare issues, competencies, or critical thinking. Overall, the applicant appeared unprepared, disinterested, or inappropriate for the healthcare field.</p>	<p>The applicant did not attend the interview, canceled without sufficient notice, or demonstrated unprofessional or disengaged behavior throughout. Responses were unrelated or incomprehensible, and motivation for the health profession was entirely absent.</p>		Max. 4 pts
Total Score	Exceeds expectations: 20+	Meets expectations: 14-19	Needs improvement: 8-13	Unacceptable: 7 or lower			Max. 24 (+ 2)

<p>Total Score Narrative Summary</p>	<p>Exceeds Expectations: The applicant demonstrates exceptional readiness for their chosen health professional program, with excellent academic performance and the ability to meaningfully connect coursework to the healthcare field. Engagement across clinical, community service, and research experiences is sustained and purposeful, with clear reflection on their impact. Motivation is well articulated, and maturity, professionalism, and enthusiasm for learning are evident throughout. The committee strongly recommends the applicant.</p>	<p>Meets Expectations: The applicant demonstrates solid readiness for their chosen health professional program, with appropriate academic performance and engagement across required areas. The applicant can connect academic and experiential learning to the healthcare field and articulates meaningful takeaways from clinical, community service, and research experiences. While some areas may be less developed, the overall record supports readiness. The committee recommends the applicant.</p>	<p>Needs Improvement: The applicant demonstrates emerging readiness for their chosen health professional program, but shows limited depth, continuity, or reflection in one or more areas. Connections between experiences and preparation for a healthcare career may be superficial or inconsistently articulated. Additional time and development would strengthen readiness for application. The committee does not recommend the applicant at this time, but recommends further preparation prior to application.</p>	<p>Unacceptable: The applicant does not meet expectations for application due to significant gaps in academic preparation, experiential engagement, reflection, and/or professionalism. The committee does not recommend the applicant for application at this time.</p>	<p>No Credit Given: Requirements were not met. All or part of the application was missing, incomplete, or submitted after the deadline, and/or the applicant did not complete the interview process. Required communication was not conducted in a timely or professional manner.</p>		
---	---	--	--	--	---	--	--