

	1	2	3	4
<b>Conventions/Narrative Progression</b>	Innumerable spelling and typographical errors are present. The candidate's narrative is erratic and fragmented. The significance of the references is lost upon the reader and in no way speaks to the mission of the fellowship.	Spelling and typographical errors are present. The candidate's narrative has many inconsistencies that create problems for the reader. The most salient references are confusing and do not speak to the mission of the fellowship.	Very few spelling or typographical errors present. The candidate's narrative has little to no inconsistencies that impede the reader's ability to follow. References are, generally, easy to follow with respect to their relevance to the mission of the fellowship.	No spelling or typographical errors present. Candidate has a pace and cadence in their narrative development that is engaging for the reader. References are relevant to the work and mission of the fellowship.
<b>Craftsmanship</b>	Wild and unorganized. There are no coherent transitions to assist with the flow of the writing sample. There is no clearly defined introduction, argument/theme, or conclusion. The references, if any, are confusing and lack appropriate messaging.	Structurally mediocre. There are spotty transitional moments throughout the piece. It is, on occasion, difficult to discern between the introduction, the argument/theme development and conclusion. The references are not easily intelligible.	The physical structure of the writing sample is strong. There are little to no transitional issues that impede the introduction, argument/theme development, or conclusion. The plot or anecdotal reference is generally intelligible.	Physical structure of the writing sample is thoughtful and elegant. There is a clearly defined introduction, argument/theme development, and conclusion. The reader can easily surmise the plot or anecdotal reference through the organization.
<b>Voice</b>	There is no voice present that is the candidate's own or authentic in general. There are no references to community relations or affiliations. Moreover, there are no references to the Kansas City community or the ways in which the candidate aspires to make a difference as a Green Fellow.	While present, the voice of the candidate has no authenticity and is forced. There is little reference to community involvement either in their native city or their plans for involvement in Kansas City. His/her strengths do not show confidence in terms of their ability to leave a lasting impact as a Green Fellow.	The candidate's voice is present, but is questionable in authenticity at times. The candidate alludes to how he/she will engage the community in several ways, but nothing of specificity. His/her strengths are alluded to throughout, but it is generally left up to the reader to infer how these will be leveraged in a meaningful way as Green Fellow.	The candidate's voice is authentic and present in the writing sample. The candidate clearly states how he/she hopes to engage the community both in and outside of the classroom. The candidate references to his/her strengths and specific ways in which these strengths will be leveraged to be an effective Green Fellow.

Your narrative should focus on your life trajectory, the motivation in applying for the Green Fellowship, and the particular strengths you possess that will allow you to be an effective fellow. Include specific ways in which you hope to engage the urban core of Kansas City as well as the professional and personal goals you hope to achieve through this experience.