NAME OF REVIEWER: PLACE YOUR NAME HERE

| NAME OF REVIEWER             | PLACE YOUR NAME HER          | KE.                             |                      |                      |                |          |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------|
|                              | 2022 RITA SCHAFFE            | R YOUNG INVESTIGATO             | R LECTURE AV         | VARD EVALUATORS      | FORM           |          |
| Nominee's Name               | University                   | Member Type                     | <b>Good Standing</b> | Department Chair Ltr | Support Letter | Comments |
|                              |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
|                              |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
|                              |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
|                              |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
|                              |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
|                              |                              | GUIDELINES & GRA                |                      |                      |                |          |
| <b>Evaluation Rubric (NI</b> | H Scoring of 1-10, with 1 as | high/best, 5 being average, and | d 10 as low/poor)    |                      |                |          |
| SCALE                        |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 1= Exceptional               |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 2= Outstanding               |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 3= Excellent                 |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 4= Very Good                 |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 5= Good                      |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 6= Satisfactory              |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 7= Fair                      |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 8= Marginal                  |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 9= Poor                      |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |
| 10= Extremely Poor           |                              |                                 |                      |                      |                |          |

| AREAS OF EVALUATION & SCORING   |                      | NOMINEE SCORES |           |           |           |  |
|---|----------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
|   | Nominee 1            | Nominee 2      | Nominee 3 | Nominee 4 | Nominee 5 |  |
| BIOSKETCH   | L <mark>0%</mark> 0% | 0%             | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |  |
| Biosketch clearly demonstrates independence as a senior investigator  |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| Scale 1 to 10:  |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 1- many examples of independence  |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 10- no examples of independence   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
|   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
|   | L <mark>0%</mark>    | 0%             | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |  |
| Letter clearly highlights the quality of the PI's work and how the work by the PI is noteworthy.                              |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| Scale 1 to 10   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 1-enthusiastically supportive of the work, and states its importance in the field   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 10-no clear support of the work   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| LETTER OF SUPPORT/ DEPARTMENT HEAD  | 10%                  | 0%             | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |  |
| Letter clearly highlights the ability the applicant has to develop an independent research program.                           |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| Scale 1 to 10   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 1-many examples of developing an independent research program   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 10-no examples of developing an independent research program  |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| RESEARCH STATEMENT BY PI  | 5 <mark>0%</mark> 0% | 0%             | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |  |
| The research statement describes examples that demonstrate their ability to becaome a successful, independent PI and          |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| highlight up to 3 research manuscripts that the applicant has published (or is in press) as an independent PI.                |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| Scale 1 to 10, of each paper evaluated on a scale of 1 to 10  |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 1-paper has high impact (high impact journal) and the applicant clearly describes the significance of the manuscript in their |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 10- paper has low impact (not as impactful journal) and/or the applicant poorly describes the significance of the manuscript  |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| PARTICIPATION IN BMES   | 10%                  | 0%             | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |  |
| Scale 1 to 10   |                      |                |           |           | 070       |  |
| 1- The applicant is a member in good standing and has particpated actively (2 situations) within the Society.                 |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| 10- The applicant is a member in good standing, however has not participated within the Society.                              |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,   |                      |                |           |           |           |  |
| TOTAL SCORE 1   | 0%                   | 0%             | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |  |