



# Distinguished Research Professor (DRP)

## Reviewer Guidelines

### **COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA**

Below are the criteria each member of the Distinguished Research Professor (DRP) Review Committee will use to assist them in (a) critiquing the nomination and (b) determining an overall score for the nomination binder.

- Does the candidate show evidence of outstanding scholarly productivity and/or creative activity?
- Does the candidate show evidence of national and international visibility in endeavors that emphasize research and/or creative activity?
- Does the candidate show evidence of recognition and honors related to research and/or creative activity?
- Does the candidate indicate how his/her research informs his/her teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels?

### **SCORING SCALE**

Reviewers should provide a numeric score and comments for each nomination, identifying minor/moderate/major weaknesses specifically to correlate with the chart below.

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance or Strengths/Weaknesses
1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Very Good	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Good	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
4	Satisfactory	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Average	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Fair	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Marginal	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8	Poor	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Unacceptable	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

- Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact
- Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact
- Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

### **PROGRAM STAFF CRITERIA**

Below are the criteria the CRC Program Staff will use to review each nomination binder. If any of these criteria are not met, the nomination binder will not be reviewed by the Distinguished Research Professor Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding. Reviewers will not need to review the following items:

#### **• Eligibility**

- Is the nominee a full-time, full Professor who, as of August 2024, has completed at least 5 years in the rank of Professor at FSU?
- Does the nominee already hold an endowed chair, the Robert O. Lawton Award, the Daisy Parker Flory Award, or the Distinguished Research Professor award titles?

#### **• Nomination Submission**

- Has the nominator/nominee correctly completed all the required forms?
  - Has a **Letter of Nomination** from a FSU faculty member, administrator, or self-nominating letter been properly submitted? Does it include a 2-page CV of the letter writer?
  - Have no more than three **External Letters** been submitted written within 24 months prior to the date of the Call for Nominations? Do they include a 2-page CV for each letter writer? Is a statement of qualifications paragraph included with each letter? Do at least one of these individuals have a direct knowledge or relationship to the nominee?
  - Have letters from the nominee's **Department Chair/Director and Dean** been submitted?
  - Has a **Curriculum Vita** been provided? Is it current, concise, and does it provide full documentation of grants, awards, publications, exhibitions, and performances including dates, locations, page numbers, co-authorship, and publication status?
  - Has a list of present and former **Graduate Student Advisees** been provided?
  - Has a list of **Contract and Grant Awards** (with dates and amounts) been provided?

- Has a list of **Invited Talks** been provided?
- Did the nominator submit the nomination binder in time to meet the submission deadline? Did the Chair(s) and Dean(s) approve the nomination by their approval deadline?