

Faculty Award for Excellence in Research Reviewer Instructions and Rubric Overview

Updated 2023

Overview: Recognizing Excellence in Research, Scholarly, or Creative Work

Committee Chair: Most recent award winner

Committee Reviewers: Members of the [Research Faculty Advisory Board](#)

Eligibility Criteria Met?

1. Be a faculty with rank of Assistant Professor or above
2. Be in at least their third year at UCCS
3. Have not previously received this award

Application Complete?

1. A nomination letter.
2. A narrative (double spaced, 1000 word maximum) of the candidate's research, scholarly, or creative activities and goals (written by the candidate)
3. CV
4. Supporting Letter(s) (maximum of 5 letters). Letters should address the originality of the candidate's work, and the impact of the work both within and outside the field. At least one letter must be external to UCCS.
5. Examples of research, scholarly, or creative work (e.g., publications, videos of exhibits, citations, etc).

If yes to all these items, continue to score:

Instructions to Reviewers: Getting Oriented*

Thank you for taking the time to review the nominations for this award. Your work in evaluating the submissions and selecting colleagues for recognition is important and familiar work for faculty. You may be less familiar with the research on peer reviewing, which has shown there are some common pitfalls in the process that lead to unintentional bias in the outcomes. Briefly, those pitfalls have to do with taking procedural shortcuts in peer review that lead reviewers to rely on intellectual shortcuts (e.g., biases) in our thinking.

Keep in mind: biases may appear in the very materials that you are asked to review as part of the nomination package. From the content of the letters to the types of metrics used to determine excellence (e.g., citation counts) there are several ways that bias may unintentionally get baked in. To overcome this, give yourself enough time to review. Research consistently shows that biases are most likely to occur when we are rushed. After you read the nominations consider going back over all the packets and reflect on the group as a whole. Just like grading papers, sometimes our criteria can shift as we see what is submitted. Make sure you go back and ask yourself if you were too hard on or too easy on nominees.

Nomination Scoring

We are modeling the NIH reviewer system in which we will use a 9-point rating scale (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor) in whole numbers (no decimals) to determine the **Overall Research Impact** and **Three Criterion** scores for all applications. Scores of 1 or 9 should be used less frequently than the other scores. 5 is for a good medium-impact application and considered an average score.

Overall Research Impact or Criterion Strength	Score	Descriptor
High	1	Exceptional
	2	Outstanding
	3	Excellent
Medium	4	Very Good
	5	Good
	6	Satisfactory
Low	7	Fair
	8	Marginal
	9	Poor

You will score an application as presented in its entirety and may not modify your scores based on personal knowledge of the nominee. **Please notify the Vice Provost of Research of any possible conflicts of interest *prior* to your review.**

Consider the **Three Criterion Strengths** *considering the number of years as a faculty member*:

- Originality of the research or creative work
- Impact/contribution of the research
- Quality of the letters of support

Holistic Impression: You should give equal weight to the above criteria in assessing the comprehensive strength of the nomination package to derive an overall holistic score of the nominee. Your score should reflect the number of years a faculty member has served in academia – for example, using a proportion of contributions per year and not an overall count of contributions (which would disproportionately disadvantage early career faculty).

You will also be asked to provide a very brief (~ 50 words) summary in support of your overall score.

Your scoring will take place online, via the Qualtrics Review Portal.

You will input the nominee's name in your review and repeat the reviewer form for each nominee.

Final Selection: The scores are summed across reviewers for all nominees. The lowest score is selected as the winner. In the event of a numerical tie, the reviewer summary comments will be considered by the Vice Provost of Research, who will make the final selection in consultation with the review committee.

* *Modified from [UMass ADVANCE](#) template for peer review*