

## Research Excellence Award Scoring Rubric

### Award Description / Purpose

The Research Excellence Award recognizes outstanding contributions to research and innovation, honoring individuals who have demonstrated exceptional dedication, originality, impact in their respective fields, and uphold the highest standards of transparency, reproducibility, and professional conduct. This award celebrates groundbreaking discoveries, influential research, and contributions that benefit society.

#### Instructions for Reviewers:

Review each nomination using the criteria below, scoring each area on a scale of 1–5 (1 = Does not meet expectations, 5 = Exceeds expectations). Use the comment sections to support your scores. Total possible points: 35. For team awards, apply the criteria to the team's collective achievements.

#### Section 1: Research Impact (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Significant contributions to advance knowledge, pioneer new approaches, or challenge existing paradigms.
  - Development of new models, theories, or frameworks that influence the field.
  - Research leading to intellectual property protection, commercialization, or real-world applications.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Section 2: Collaboration (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Fostering research partnerships across disciplines, institutions, or industries.
  - Exemplary mentorship of emerging scholars, students, or early-career researchers.
  - Recognition through appointments to prestigious academies, leadership roles in professional organizations, or major awards.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 3: Productivity (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Strong track record of peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, patents, licensing agreements or startup ventures.
  - Strong record of extramural funding and other significant scholarly achievements.
  - Evidence of research visibility and impact, such as high citation rates, policy influence, or industry adoption.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 4: Supporting Evidence (5 points)

- Criteria: Quality and relevance of supporting documents (CV, letters of support, etc.).

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 5: Advancement of Institutional Mission (5 points)

- Criteria: How the nominee's work supports and advances the mission/values of the institution.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 6: Overall Excellence and Distinction (5 points)**

- Criteria: Overall impression of nominee’s excellence and distinction in their field or role.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 7: Clarity and Quality of Nomination Letter (5 points)**

- Criteria: Clarity, thoroughness, and persuasiveness of the nomination letter.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 35**