

## RUBRICS FOR FELLOW NOMINATIONS

### 1. Honors and Awards (5 points)

*Rubric:*

0	1	2	3	4	5
No honors or award.	All honors or awards are at the state or local level.	Awards or honors are mostly local, with one regional, nothing on a national scale.	Several are regional, and some are national.	Although there are still regional awards or honors, most are national.	A substantial number of honors and awards, of which most are national or international.

**2. Career Roles (50 points total):** Nominator allocates points among the five categories, in increments of 10 (including zero). For example, if the nominator writes something in all 5 areas they can simply allocate 10 points to each area, to total 50. If they supply information for only 3 areas, they could allocate points as 20, 20 and 10, respectively, or any other combination they wish. Assigning a score of zero to one or more areas will not weaken the nomination (categories without information should have zero points).

Category 1: Rubric for **Outreach/Extension/Industrial Education**: From 0 to a possible 50 points.

Zero to few points awarded	Moderate points awarded	High to Maximum Points
Outreach/Extension/Industrial Education is documented with examples of education or other outreach events. There is little evidence that the programs have been adopted on a larger scale, or by large numbers of clientele. No documentation is provided as to the number of people impacted by the outreach activities.	The nominee has secured some funding related to Outreach/Extension/Industrial education, and the application clearly shows the impact of that work. The nominee is recognized by clients, stakeholders and peers as an effective educator. The nominee has influenced attitudes or stakeholder behaviors, and this is documented through examples such as the adoption of new practices.	Outreach/Extension/Industrial Education is documented by significant publications and/or other educational material for clientele. There is evidence that the nominee performs outreach/extension education in novel and innovation ways. The nominee is recognized as an excellent mentor/teacher/trainer. The candidate's regional, national or international expertise is known and rewarded through speaking engagements, advancement of their students/staff or upward movement in their careers. If the candidate's specialty has a strong regional focus their nomination materials clearly demonstrate the importance of their program to their clients, and a wide range of adoption by their clientele.

Category 2: Rubric for **Teaching/Mentoring/Training**: from 0 to a possible 50 points.

Zero to few points awarded	Moderate points awarded	High to Maximum Points
Teaching/Mentoring/Training is documented by undergraduate and/or graduate teaching, including course/curriculum development, student advising, formal or informal	The nominee has attracted some funding to support undergraduate or graduate students, or to support curriculum development. The nominee is recognized by students and peers as an effective educator. The nominee has developed curriculum or training	There is ample evidence that the nominee uses effective teaching methods, and they engage students in a wide variety of instructional techniques. Results from teaching or mentoring activities have been published

mentoring by consulting scientists. Mentoring or training of their own students may be mentioned.	materials that contribute to student learning and student career development. There is evidence of pedagogy, with books, presentations or articles written on student learning and/or engagement. Mentoring and/or training extends beyond their own students, and may include items such as work with underrepresented or underserved groups.	or rewarded. The nominee is recognized as an excellent mentor/teacher/trainer, and they have long service on committees or groups that study teaching/mentoring/training. The nominee's teaching/mentoring/training activities have had impacts that extend beyond their home organization, and have regional, national or international scope.
---	--	---

Category 3: Rubric for **Investigative Competency**: from 0 to a possible 50 points.

Zero to few points awarded	Moderate points awarded	High to Maximum Points
Investigative competency documented is within the existing framework of current knowledge, but findings are of limited scope. There are only a few primary authored peer-reviewed articles. Investigative endeavors tend to use current methods, and there is little evidence of scientific curiosity.	Investigative competency is documented with evidence of rigorous research marked with originality. Published research findings or patents have value in the field. The nominee is recognized by the scientific community (e.g., selection to serve on technical or profession panels; invited speaking engagements, consulted by others in the field, trained numerous graduate students and/or Post-docs). Other measures of success may include successful acquisition of grants.	Investigative competency is documented with evidence of rigorous research marked with originality such that their work has moved the science forward. The nominee is considered a leader in their field. The nominee's contributions in the field (e.g., inventions, designs, models, theories etc.) have provided major advancement or solved a significant problem. The nominee is sought out or consulted on topics beyond their own narrow field, and their investigative competency has some depth and breadth. The nominee's international or national expertise is known and rewarded through speaking engagements, advancement of their students/staff or upward movement in their careers. If the nominee's specialty has a strong regional focus their materials clearly demonstrate the importance of their program to their clients.

Category 4: Rubric for **Service/Advocacy**: from 0 to a possible 50 points.

Zero to few points awarded	Moderate points awarded	High to Maximum Points
Service/advocacy has largely been internal service, and includes service to the nominee's industry, university, foundation or other organization for which the nominee is employed. The nominee has not held leadership positions, nor has their	The nominee's service has positively impacted their home organization. Specific examples of developed programs or outcomes for the university, business or organization are provided. There is some evidence of extension of that service or advocacy to an outside entity such as a state or regional	The nominee's service has had broad reaching impact, with documented results extending out from the home organization to other state, regional, national or international groups. The nominee's guidance and expertise impacted a large number of individuals, with those impacts changing livelihoods or providing significant cultural change. The nominee's guidance has modified policy or public perception of science.

service/advocacy been shown to have significant impact.	commodity group, non-profit or other service organization.	The nominee's service has had national/or international impact, with a demonstrated effect on policy or people's livelihoods. Specific programs or number of affected people are provided.
---	--	--

Category 5: Rubric for **Leadership/Administrative**: from 0 to a possible 50 points.

Zero to few points awarded	Moderate points awarded	High to Maximum Points
The nominee has served as a leader/administrator for their organization or business for a fairly short period of time. Documentation of change or impact under their leadership is missing.	The nominee's leadership has positively impacted their home organization, and is quantified by examples such as program development, staff hiring, or development of new programs for education, research or outreach. The nominee's leadership has provided impact beyond their own organization. Another organization has benefited from the nominee's leadership and expertise, and their examples of this leadership and its' outcomes.	The nominee's administrative leadership has led to a major change in management or policy at their home organization. These significant advancements are documented by examples of new projects or programs that have led to changes in the workplace. Such changes could include staff hires in novel new areas, new buildings/construction or programs, or development of significant and new educational programs or curricula. Awards of substantial funding for the nominee's faculty, staff or colleagues is also documented.

### 3. Professional Output (15 points)

*Rubric:*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Publications are in non-refereed or in journals with little evidence of publication impact, as shown by number of citations, downloads or site visits. Books are self-published and not in general use. Extension documents have only narrow applicability or have become dated material. Web-based materials or other documents (newsletters, etc.) with impressively high user numbers are not present. There is little evidence of created educational or training content or working with a wide range of clientele.					Publications are in significant refereed journals, but none are in tri-society publications. Books are published by a quality press, but may have less of an impact. Extension documents may fail to reach the intended clientele. Web-based materials, columns, twitter feeds or other documents may be present, but are not widely used and lack presence. There does not appear to be an effort to maintain updated and relevant communication to the nominee's audience.					Publications are in significant refereed journals, and are in the journals for the society for which the person has applied for Fellow. Books are widely used and acknowledged. Extension documents are in widespread use and considered as key documents in their area. If the nominee has a regional focus (due to a crop specialty or service territory, for example) their output is considered an important source of information for their clientele. Web-based materials or newsletters/monthly columns are documents with impressively high user numbers.				

### 4. Service to Societies (20 points)

*Rubric:*

1			20
No service to the society for which the candidate has been nominated. There is some service to one of the other tri-societies, or another scientific society. Service includes moderating meetings, or reviewing for journals.	There is some service to the society for which the candidate has been nominated, but it is minor, such as one term as an Associate Editor for a journal, or service on some committees. There may be more extensive service for another one of the tri-society organizations, or to another scientific society.	There is extensive service to the society for which the candidate has been nominated. The candidate has served as an Associated Editor for multiple terms or for more than one society journals. They have served as a Division or other Chair. The candidate has served as a Technical Editor or has long-term consistent service as an AE. Significant and impactful committee and society service, including organization of symposia, mentorship in diversity, organization of tours, or leadership on committees exists.	

## 5. Summary (5 points)

*Rubric:*

1		5
<i>Rubric:</i> Summary merely repeats information that has already been provided. It is merely a list, and does not attempt to provide justification for why the candidate should be awarded Fellow. The document may have spelling or grammar issues.	The summary provides an exacting and compelling rationale for why this person should be a Fellow of the selected Society. It neatly summarizes the nominations, and clearly outlines the candidate's strengths. There are no spelling or grammar issues.	

## 6. Reference Letters (5 points)

*Rubric:*

1		5
Letters do not contain details or information that clearly shows the letter writer knows the candidate. Letters are not written by a Fellow, nor has the letter writer obtained their maximum academic rank or title. The letters merely repeat materials already in the nomination, without a meaningful evaluation of the nomination.	Letters are, compelling, and clearly demonstrate that the letter writer is familiar with the candidate. The letter writer is operating at the top of their academic or professional rank, and is a Fellow. The letter clearly communicates why the candidate should be a Fellow.	