

## 2024 Distinguished Scholar-Teacher Selection Committee Procedures

### **REVIEW CRITERIA:**

The award description is “The DST award honors senior tenured members of the faculty who combine outstanding scholarly accomplishment with excellence in teaching and personify our image of the professoriate. The purpose of this program is to recognize successful scholar-teachers and to enable them to share their achievements and expertise with the university at large.”

This means that candidates must show evidence of each of the three items below:

- “Outstanding scholarly accomplishment” (appropriate to field, remembering to take into consideration interdisciplinary and emerging fields).
- “Excellence in teaching” (broadly defined: in or out of classroom, undergrad or grad students, curricular or pedagogical efforts, teaching or mentoring).
- Integration – Relationship/interplay between research and teaching.

### **REVIEW PROCESS:**

While each committee can consider changing the process, the following has worked in the past:

1. Each committee member will **review the materials of all nominees**. The nominees and materials are available on a secure website at: <https://faculty.umd.edu/apa>. After logging in, choose “Review Nominations” from the Awards menu. Then click on “Completed Documents” to review the nomination packet for each nominee.
2. In addition to reviewing all of the candidates, **each committee member will be assigned the task of leading the discussion on particular files**. Committee members should thus read these assigned files with particular care and attention.
3. **Committee members will review each nominee’s materials** (click on the blue button labeled “Completed Documents”) **and rate each candidate for his/her teaching, research, and integration from 1-5: 1 - Not Ready for Award; 2 - Qualified for Award; 3 - Good; 4 - Very Good; or 5 - Superlative** (click on the gold button labeled “Enter your ranking”). Please note that these ratings are preliminary and will inevitably change in discussion. Evaluating is difficult because all of the candidates tend to be excellent and many will be out of your field, so committees generally think of these rankings as a starting point.
4. Committee should submit their ratings **one week prior to the second meeting date**.
5. At the second meeting, nominees will be considered in the order of the preliminary ratings, with brief introductions by the committee members to whom those files have been assigned. The committee recommends nominees to the Provost, who makes the final decision.
6. In addition, the committee will compose a paragraph on each nominee to forward to the Provost.

## **Important Reminder**

As with other evaluation processes, please **evaluate the files as submitted and do not bring in additional information**. Doing so will add bias to the process. For example, if the applicant does not include an H-index (or some other common indicator in your field), do not look it up and especially do not share it. Information that is not in the application may not be important in the candidate's field. In and before the evaluation meeting, do not share anecdotes about the candidate (for example, information gleaned from department APT meetings or students you know who have taken their classes or any other personal information, etc.). Please refer to the submitted promotion criteria when trying to understand the candidate's accomplishments in their own area, which may be very different from your own.