

ASB Fellow Nomination Review Criteria

Original Author: Wendy Murray
Last edited: 7/13/2021 by Michelle Sabick

USING THE SCORING RUBRIC:

Specific scores awarded in each category are based on the judgement of the individual committee member. This document is intended to help guide the individual reviewers to assign appropriate scores, as well as to support nominators in crafting nomination letters that are relevant and useful to the reviewers in making their determinations.

Criteria outlined in the following guidelines are used to assist in the process of determining if the ASB Fellow nominee is considered to be a senior ASB member (evidence: at least 10 years post PhD, sustained contribution to ASB, and significant and sustained contributions to professional service AND research).

Nominees from different sub-disciplines will likely contribute to service and research in different ways. As such, the relative weighting between service and research contributions and general professional stature is expected to be different between individuals. Nominees with a distribution somewhere between a 30-70% split and a 70-30% split between service and research would likely be considered for Fellow status. Nominees with a total score of ≥ 12 out of a maximum score of 16 are considered to be senior members with significant and sustained research contributions and service to ASB and profession.

BASIC CRITERIA (confirmed by ASB Secretary):

Name of Nominee for ASB Fellow in 20XX	YES	NO
<i>Became a Regular ASB member more than ten years ago.</i>		
<i>Has a consistent and significant record of service to the ASB and profession during career.</i>		
<i>Not currently a member of the ASB Executive Board</i>		
<i>Has two letters of strong support from current ASB Fellows*</i>		

*A letter from an established research scientist of senior rank (comparable to an ASB Fellow in the nominee’s sub-discipline) may also be considered (*requires pre-approval by Past President*).

Rationale for Basic Criteria:

Membership: Annual membership records begin in January 1, 2008. Prior to that, our database only includes the year that members joined ASB.

Annual Meeting Participation: Conference programs since the late 1990s are archived on the ASB webpage. Conference attendance cannot be verified. ASB Secretary can search meeting archives by author to confirm that nominee has a consistent record of participation in the ASB.

SERVICE CRITERIA:

	Score 0-4
<i>Service to ASB during career.</i>	
<i>Service to profession during career.</i>	

Reviewers should provide two scores ranging from 0 to 4, one for service specifically to ASB and one for service to the profession of biomechanics. Scores of 0-1 should indicate no or minimal demonstrated service in each category, and Scores of 3-4 should be reserved for sustained and substantial involvement in each category, as described below.

Guidelines to consider when evaluating significance of service to ASB:

- *minimal* involvement in ASB (e.g. attended regional or national conferences)
- *some* involvement in ASB (e.g. presented ASB tutorial, served as an ASB mentor, membership on ASB committee, appointed position on ASB executive board, etc.)
- *sustained* involvement (e.g. elected to a position on ASB executive board, consistent minor involvement over a period of several years, etc.)
- *extensive* involvement (e.g. elected to multiple positions on ASB executive board, demonstrated leadership of Society activities over several years, etc.)

Guidelines to consider when evaluating significance of service to the biomechanics profession:

- *minimal* involvement in professional service (e.g. occasionally reviewing grant proposals or journal manuscripts)
- *some* involvement (e.g. multiple memberships on pertinent committees, ad-hoc member of grant or journal review panels, occasional participation in outreach activities, etc.)
- *sustained* involvement (e.g. standing member of a review panel, journal associate reviewer), programmatic leadership and implementation, organization of broad-reaching outreach activities, etc.)
- *extensive* involvement, (e.g. journal editorship, elected leadership in other professional societies, regular member of grant review panel, appointed academic or research leadership (Head, Chair, Dean, Research Center Director, significant and sustained organization of impactful outreach activities, etc.)

RESEARCH CRITERIA:

	Score 0-4
<i>Significance of Publications</i>	
<i>Societal Impact of Research</i>	

Reviewers should provide two scores ranging from 0 to 4, one for publications and one for impact. Scores of 0-1 should indicate no or minimal demonstrated excellence in each category, and Scores of 3-4 should be reserved for sustained and substantial excellence in each category, as described below.

Consideration should be given to the research area and the professional role of the individual when making these determinations. For example, the number and scope of publications for individuals who work in industry or at educational institutions with high teaching loads should not be the same as for someone at a research-intensive institution with relatively light teaching expectations. In addition, research regarding biomechanics education or biomechanics outreach should be fully considered in the same way that technical research is assessed.

Publications as first author, invited review papers, book chapters, publications as senior author, and publications in very prominent journals are important factors to consider when rating significance of publications. Guidelines to consider when evaluating significance of publications specific to the individual's sub-discipline and professional role include:

- *minimal* significance of publications (e.g. only a few publications with some significance or a reasonable number of publications with relatively low significance)
- *some* significance of publications (e.g. a reasonable number of publications with some significance or a significant number of publications with relatively low significance)
- *substantial* significance of publications (e.g. several publications with very high significance or a high number of publications with moderate significance)
- *extensive* significance of publications (e.g. many highly impactful publications or an extensive body of work including high-impact publications)

Guidelines to consider when evaluating the societal impact of an individual's body of work to their subdiscipline may include magnitude of grant or industrial funding garnered, effects on clinical practice or patient care, development a new area of research or useful technique, awards for papers describing research results, advancement of trainees, invitations to organize research symposia at national meetings, patents, significant translation of biomechanics research into policies and standards, major career awards and invited presentations, national and international presence, advancing biomechanics through outreach and other efforts to expand opportunities and participation in biomechanics, etc.

- *minimal* societal impact of research (e.g. only a few activities with some impact or a reasonable number of activities with relatively low impact)
 - *some* societal impact of research (e.g. a reasonable number of activities with some impact or a significant number of activities with relatively low impact)
 - *substantial* societal impact of research (e.g. several activities with very high impact or a high number of activities with moderate impact)
- extensive* societal impact of research (e.g. many highly impactful activities or an extensive body of work including some high-impact activities)