



# Dean of Science Distinguished Scholar Medal 2023

---

## Nomination Deadlines

**February 15, 2023**      The **notice of intent letter** with **contact information of at least three referees** must be submitted electronically to the Dean of Science Office by the nomination coordinator.

**March 8, 2023**      The **full nomination package** must be submitted electronically to the Dean of Science Office by the nominee.

The Dean of Science Distinguished Scholar Medal, with an accompanying citation and a research grant of \$1,000, is presented by the Dean of Science each year to a faculty member who has made scholarly contributions of outstanding quality to both teaching and research in the Faculty of Science.

The award reflects the spirit of the following excerpt from the mission statements in Memorial University's 1993 Strategic Plan, *Launch Forth*:

"Memorial University is committed to excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service to the general public."

This award recognizes outstanding and sustained contributions in both the teaching and research areas of a faculty member's responsibility. Nominations that demonstrate outstanding performance by the nominee in one of these activities accompanied by very strong performance in the other can also be considered.

## Nomination Process

Each nomination must be supported by at least three individuals who will normally be academic staff members within the Faculty of Science; however, one of these individuals may be a former student (undergraduate or graduate) of the nominee. Self-nominations will not be considered.

All documents must be submitted as **electronic pdf files** to the Dean of Science office, [melanief@mun.ca](mailto:melanief@mun.ca), on or before the submission deadlines. Please use the subject line "Distinguished Scholar Medal".

### **Notice of Intent (submitted by nominator)**

1. A **Notice of intent letter**, addressed to the Dean of Science, including the name of the nominee and a brief statement of their suitability. **This letter must be signed by at least three supporters** (see p. 1).
2. The names, addresses, and email addresses of at least three people external to the university from whom the Dean of Science can request references. *The references should satisfy the same criteria as those used for Tenure and Promotion letters as outlined in the collective agreement (Associate Professors or equivalent; recognized national and/or international scholars in their field; no collaboration with the nominee in the last 5 years).*

### **Full Nomination Package (submitted by nominee)**

1. A brief (max 1 page) citation outlining the nominee's contributions to teaching and research,
2. A *curriculum vitae*,  
In addition, nominations *may* include the following, although if the information is adequately covered in the CV and citation these documents are not necessary:
3. A brief statement (max 2 pages), similar to a recent NSERC form 100, characterizing the significance of the nominee's research contributions
4. A brief statement (max 2 pages), similar to a recent NSERC "Past Contributions to the Training of Highly Qualified Personnel" section on mentoring contributions.
5. A brief statement (max 2 pages), outlining contributions to curriculum development, instructional approaches, integration of research into teaching, and professional development of teaching. This follows the guidelines for the "Dean of Science Distinguished Teacher" award, but a shorter description is expected.

The selection committee will assign the most weight to concrete evidence supporting the quality (rather than quantity) of contributions to all areas. Examples of evidence that can be considered are provided below.

The submitted *curriculum vitae* should document academic background, employment history, awards, teaching experience, contributions to the training of highly qualified personnel, research support and contributions to research and scholarly activity. Evidence of national and international impact should be evident and may include invited lectures, contributions to the profession or discipline including editorships, membership on peer-review panels, boards, selection committees, etc., and other professional, university, or community service.

## **Adjudication of the Award:**

The Selection Committee shall be the Faculty of Science Awards Committee. The committee will evaluate candidates with the help of the method outlined below. The committee can recommend that no award be made in a given year if, in its majority opinion, none of the files examined present a sufficiently compelling case. In this event, nomination packages can be revised and reconsidered in the next competition. The committee can also recommend that the award be given to multiple nominees.

## **Evaluation of Research and Teaching:**

The Canadian Tri-Council scores of “Exceptional, Outstanding, Very Strong, Strong, Moderate, Insufficient” will be used to help assess how the nominee meets the required criteria. Points are awarded as Exceptional (5), Outstanding (4), Very Strong (3), Strong (2), Moderate (1), Insufficient (0).

## **RESEARCH**

Research will be assessed using the NSERC rubric for “Excellence of the Researcher” available here: [https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/\\_doc/Professors-Professeurs/DG\\_Merit\\_Indicators\\_eng.pdf](https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/Professors-Professeurs/DG_Merit_Indicators_eng.pdf)

## **TEACHING**

Teaching evaluation will follow the Dean of Science Distinguished Teacher Award, as below.

### **Curriculum Development:**

Exceptional: Developed new curriculum tools used at a national or international level.

Outstanding: Developed new curriculum for multiple courses at different levels (e.g. first year and fourth year) and/or across the entire departmental curriculum.

Very Strong: Developed new curriculum for a single course.

Strong: Incorporating tools from other faculty into coursework.

Moderate: Teaching existing courses, incorporating standard updates as material evolves.

Insufficient: Not addressed

### **Instructional Approaches:**

Exceptional: Developed new teaching practices and applied them to their courses, assessing their effectiveness quantitatively

Outstanding: Adapted cutting-edge teaching practices to their field/courses, assessing their effectiveness quantitatively and/or developed and applied new teaching practices

Very Strong: Adapted and incorporated new methods into main-stream courses

Strong: Used existing techniques with skill and adaptation

Moderate: Used existing techniques

Insufficient: Not addressed

**Integration of Research: (Note this can be either science or pedagogical research)**

Exceptional: Published research with student co-authors based on work done with students in courses.

Outstanding: Incorporated research projects into coursework, with opportunities for students to present their work outside the course.

Very Strong: Invited in a diverse group of guest-speakers to present research results relevant to coursework.

Strong: Presented one's own research in the course, directly or through grad-student speakers.

Moderate: Incorporated reading assignments from the primary literature (e.g. journal articles).

Insufficient: Not addressed

**Professional Development:**

Exceptional: Leadership at the national or international level

Outstanding: Consistent participation at the national or international level, and/or leadership at the university level

Very Strong: Consistent participation at the university level and/or leadership at the school, faculty or department level

Strong: Consistent participation at the faculty, school or department level

Moderate: Occasional or rare participation at any level

Insufficient: Not addressed

**MENTORSHIP**

Nominees are encouraged to elaborate on their mentorship and supervision activities to clearly specify how they exemplify their excellence under each of the main criteria (research and/or teaching).

### **Examples of evidence and criteria that can be considered in the assessment of nominees for the Dean of Science Distinguished Scholar Medal**

Examples of evidence which may be considered for evaluating research and scholarly contributions include, but are not limited to:

- **publication of work in peer-reviewed scientific journals;**
- **publication of books and monographs;**
- **the securing of research grants and/or research contracts;**
- **contributions to the practical application of knowledge such as patents, technical reports arising out of contract research, the development of computer software or hardware which advance the state of the art, etc.;**
- **activities as a reviewer of grant applications and journal transcripts;**
- **contributions and invited presentations at conferences, seminars, or workshops;**
- **other research and professional activities that advance the discipline.**

Examples of evidence which may be considered for inclusion in the specific documentation of the nominee's scholarly teaching-related contributions and/or effectiveness as a teacher, whether in the form of a brief teaching dossier or other format include, but are not limited to:

- **a sustained record of teaching over a range of courses and levels;**
- **a record of graduate or undergraduate thesis supervision;**
- **student evaluations (either CEQ or a valid, reliable and departmentally-accepted instrument administered by a third party);**
- **direct evidence of classroom/lecture performance;**
- **examples of teaching material developed by the nominee (lecture notes, course outlines, examinations, laboratory manuals, course handouts, etc.;**
- **descriptions or examples of innovative teaching methods or technologies used or developed by the nominee, including initiatives that support equity, diversity and accessibility;**
- **the securing of grants for pedagogical research and/or publication of teaching-related methods;**
- **the publication of teaching-related materials such as textbooks or study guides;**
- **other teaching-related professional activities that advance the discipline.**

Evaluation of the individual's contribution to his or her discipline may take into consideration:

- **the quality of published work as judged by the nominee's peers;**
- **the impact of the nominee's contribution to refereed literature as judged by the reputation of the journals in which it appears, consistency of the individual's publication record, and the contribution that the nominee has made to multi-authored papers;**
- **the nominee's degree of success in the securing of research support obtained through peer review and/or competition;**
- **the quality of ratings on student evaluations of teaching contributions and the nature of information contained in letters from former students;**
- **the "success" of former students;**
- **reviews and adoption of published textbooks and other teaching-related materials, including computer software and hardware;**
- **other indicators of the nominee's impact on the nominee's discipline such as his or her record of:**
  - **membership on peer-review panels;**
  - **editorial service;**
  - **membership on committees, boards, or policy-making bodies;**
  - **invitations to speak or present prestigious lectures;**
  - **awards;**
  - **contributions to public awareness of science**

(Revised January 2023)