



Distinguished University Scholar (DUS) Reviewer Guidelines

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the Distinguished University Scholar (DUS) 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 demonstrate that their research has had significant impact on the ongoing research/scholarship and/or graduate student training in their respective units?

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 University Scholar Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding. Reviewers will not need to review the following items:

• **Eligibility**

- Is the nominee's job code listed among the eligible job codes for this award?
- Does the nominee already hold the title of Distinguished University Scholar?

• **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 (if not self-nominated)?
- Have no more than three **External Letters** been submitted, and written within 24 months prior to the date of the Call of 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 direct knowledge or a 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 or accomplishments in the field of expertise, publications, exhibitions and performances including dates, locations, page numbers, co-authorship, and publication status?
- 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?