

Explanation for Evaluation of Scholar-Chessplayer Awards

The following briefly explains the Scholastic Council's philosophy and priorities for the 2001 Awards. The first three criteria are very objective and do not require much thought. The others are more subjective and necessitate some direction.

- **RATING** – A student with a higher rating deserves a higher ranking.
- **SAT/ACT** – A student with a higher score deserves a higher ranking. Conversion scale is listed below.
- **CLASS RANK** – We believe that scholar-chessplayers will be in the top 5% among all students.
- **GPA** – If a school does not provide a percentage grade, you may have to interpolate, e.g. on a 4.0 scale, $90\% \times 4.0 = 3.6$; therefore, 3.6 would = 90%. The following table provides **EQUIVALENT** scores between percentage grades and 5.0 and 4.0 grading scales.

% GRADE	5.0 SCALE	4.0 SCALE	% GRADE	5.0 SCALE	4.0 SCALE
99% =	4.95	3.96	94% =	4.70	3.76
98% =	4.90	3.92	93% =	4.65	3.72
97% =	4.85	3.88	92% =	4.60	3.68
96% =	4.80	3.84	91% =	4.55	3.64
95% =	4.75	3.80	90% =	4.50	3.60

- **CHESS ACHIEVEMENTS** – Placement in national events is our primary consideration, state events are secondary with local and regional events having a lower priority.
- **LEADERSHIP** – In what activities other than chess has this student demonstrated a leadership role? Has s/he started a new club at school? Has this student earned any leadership awards? Has s/he served as a class officer or held an office in a club or student government.
- **ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS** – Subject area awards, honor roll, class officer, office in a club or student government, membership in the National Honor Society, leadership awards, scholarships, and other significant activities are examples of the type of achievements for which we are searching.
- **CHESS SERVICE** – The student who demonstrates leadership by organizing a chess club or event, helping as a chess coach or tournament director, or writing a regular chess column will most likely have a greater impact on the world of chess than one who only plays chess.
- **ESSAY** – We are looking for scholars. Scholars must be able to communicate by organizing their thoughts logically on paper and make a convincing argument or a memorable point.
- **REFERENCES** – We are searching for candidates whose references mention key qualities, such as integrity, dedication, strong work ethic, motivation, etc. I personally favor using a form that asks the evaluator to rank the individual on these qualities rather than asking for a general letter of reference. A form is more objective and the student will not be penalized as he/she would be by a letter when the reference does a poor job communicating.

The last column is weighted to reflect the Scholastic Council’s priorities for the current year. Please write the score you give for each of the criteria in the first blank, and then multiply the score by the weighted factor to determine the score for each criterion. The Council recognizes that those evaluating the candidates are undertaking a challenging task, and we wish to express our appreciation to all who take the time to help.

SAT I-ACT™ Score Comparisons

SAT I to ACT:

Recentred SAT I Score Verbal+Math	ACT Composite Score
1600	36
1560-1590	35
1510-1550	34
1460-1500	33
1410-1450	32
1360-1400	31
1320-1350	30
1280-1310	29
1240-1270	28
1210-1230	27
1170-1200	26
1130-1160	25
1090-1120	24
1060-1080	23
1020-1050	22
980-1010	21
940-970	20
900-930	19
860-890	18
810-850	17
760-800	16
710-750	15
660-700	14
590-650	13
520-580	12
500-510	11