FSU
COUNCIL ON RESEARCH & CREATIVITY
DIVISION OF RESEARCH

Criteria for Reviewing
Developing Scholar Award (DSA) Nomination Binders

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the Developing Scholar Award (DSA) 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 superior teaching and research/creative activity that has begun to earn the nominee external recognition, reflecting a strong, cumulative record of achievements?
    - Examples:
        - Positions on editorial boards of leading academic journals
        - Selection for review panels of funding agencies
        - Ability to attract federal and foundation support for research/creative activity
        - Ability to attract graduate students at FSU
        - Publications in leading journals by high-quality book presses of museum catalogs, or critical reviews from important venues
        - Artistic performance in leading locations
        - Strong letters of recommendation by clearly distinguished scholars, referees, or art critics.

- Does the candidate have established publications or performances during the preceding 5-6 years, coupled with a clear line of forthcoming and anticipated future accomplishments in their area?

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 Developing Scholar Award 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, tenured Associate Professor who has achieved that rank no earlier than August 2023?

- Nomination Submission
    - Has the nominator/nominee correctly completed all of 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?
        - Has a Description of Teaching and Research/Creative Activity been submitted?
        - Has a description of **Future Direction, Goals, and Anticipated Accomplishments** been submitted?
        - Have no more than three **External Letters** been submitted, each 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 single-paragraph statement of qualifications included with each letter?
        - Have letters from the nominee's **Department Chair/Director and Dean** been submitted?
        - Has a **Curriculum Vita** been provided for the candidate? 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?

    - Did the nominator submit the nomination binder in time to meet the submission deadline? Did the Chair and Dean approve the nomination by their approval deadline?