**Evaluation form for the Carl Douglas Award for Outstanding Postdoc**

**Name of Nominee**:

**Overall Rubric:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Candidate Score (max 6)** |
| 1. Originality and Productivity of Research | **50%** |  |
| 1. Teaching and Mentoring | **20%** |  |
| 1. Personal Statement (leadership, initiative, etc) | **20%** |  |
| 1. Reference letter | **10%** |  |

**Detailed Criteria Descriptions:**

1. *Originality and Productivity of Research:* The candidate has published research articles in mainstream journals and has delivered conference presentations (oral/poster) or invited seminars in national and/or international venues. The candidate has an influential publication record (both total number of publications and first-author publications) with pioneering research questions and highly novel findings during PhD and postdoctoral research, which conceptually advance the field. Make sure to consider the years of postdoc experience and other scholarly output including review articles, book chapters, books and even non-peer-reviewed publications (e.g. popular science and science communication work). Other research indicators also include the quality/stature of PDF fellowships and involvement in various grants as PI or co-PI.
2. *Teaching and Mentoring:* The candidate has demonstrated evidence of mentoring undergraduate, MSc and/or PhD students. Participating authorships of BSc, MSc and PhD student's research articles and conference abstracts are strong evidence. Make sure to consider teaching responsibilities (e.g. teaching full courses, guest-lecturing and TAing). Personal statement and reference letter may further support this.
3. *Personal Statement (leadership, initiative, etc):* The candidate has taken a leadership role(s) in research (peer-reviewing activities, EDI initiatives in research, etc.) and/or in the plant biology/science community (plant society involvement, volunteering (science fairs, etc.), outreach (promote diversity in plant biology field, promote knowledge of plants and their importance to public, undergrads), etc. and strong motivation for research. Make sure to consider justifications of original and high-risk research that may not necessarily lead to a high quantity of publications but constitute paradigm-shifting discoveries.

1. *Reference Letter:* The letter provides more detailed information about the applicant, not revealed in their CV and/or personal statement.

**Detailed Criteria Rubric:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Weight** | **6 points** | **5 points** | **4 points** | **3 points** | **2 points** | **1 point** |
| ***Originality and productivity of research*** | 50% | Exceptional; In the Top 1% of postdocs. The candidate will be a leader in terms of research accomplishments and excellence. The applicant will become a successful independent researcher. Using the *Elife\** scale, their research provides “landmark: findings with profound implications that are expected to have widespread influence.” | Outstanding; In the Top 5% of postdocs. The candidate conducts highly original research, with multiple (2-3) high-impacting publications. The applicant is highly likely to become a successful independent researcher. Using the *Elife\** scale, their research provides “fundamental findings that substantially advance our understanding of major research questions.” | Very Strong; In the Top 10% of postdocs. The candidate has at least 1 high-impacting paper and consistent publications and/or presentations. The applicant has a good chance to become a successful independent researcher. Using the *Elife\** scale, their research provides “important: findings that have theoretical or practical implications beyond a single subfield.” | Good; In the Top 25% of postdocs. The accomplishments and research excellence of the candidate is good and above-average for a postdoc at this stage. Using the *Elife\** scale, their research provides “valuable findings that have theoretical or practical implications for a subfield.” | Average; In the Top 50% of postdocs. The accomplishments and research excellence of the candidate is reasonable and moderate for a postdoc at this stage. Using the *Elife\** scale, their research provides “useful findings that have focused importance and scope.” | Below average; In the Bottom 50%. The accomplishments and research excellence of the candidate is below the expected level of a postdoc at this stage. Using the *Elife\** scale, their research provides “inadequate findings with limited importance and narrow scope.” |
| ***Teaching & Mentoring*** | 20% | Exceptional; In the Top 1% of postdocs. The candidate exhibit leadership and extensive experience in teaching, pedagogy and research mentorship at the highest level. | Outstanding; In the Top 5% of postdocs. The candidate has demonstrated experience in teaching, pedagogy and research mentorship that are far superior to other applicants. | Very Strong; In the Top 10% of postdocs. The candidate ha demonstrated experience in teaching, pedagogy and research mentorship at the highest level that are relatively superior to other applicants. | Good; In the Top 25% of postdocs. The teaching accomplishments and excellence of the candidate are good and above-average. | Average; In the Top 50% of postdocs. The teaching accomplishments and excellence of the candidate are reasonable and moderate. | Below average; In the Bottom 50%. The teaching accomplishments and excellence of the candidate are below the expected level of a postdoc at this stage. |
| ***Personal Statement*** | 20% | Exceptional and extensive initiative and leadership supported by personal statement and/or reference letter. | Very strong initiative and leadership supported by personal statement and/or reference letter. | Strong initiative and leadership supported by personal statement and/or reference letter. | Above-average initiative and leadership supported by personal statement and/or reference letter. | Expected initiative and leadership as indicated by personal statement and/or reference letter. | Below-average initiative and leadership as indicated by personal statement and/or reference letter. |
| ***Reference Letter*** | 10% | Exceptional strengths and qualities of the candidate are clearly defined and clearly described by the referee (with specific and detailed examples). | Very strong qualities of the candidate are clearly defined and described by the referee (with specific examples). | Strong qualities of the candidate are generally defined and described by the referee (with some examples). | Above-average qualities of the candidate are defined and described by the referee (with some examples). | Qualities of the candidate are partially defined and described by the referee. | Qualities of the candidate are not described or defined by the referee. |

*\*Elife’s New Model: What is an eLife assessment? (*[*https://elifesciences.org/inside-elife/db24dd46/elife-s-new-model-what-is-an-elife-assessment*](https://elifesciences.org/inside-elife/db24dd46/elife-s-new-model-what-is-an-elife-assessment)*)*