

Summary Awards Committee Report April 2009. Revised May 4, 2009.

1. Award eligibility for Research Fellowship (RF) and Clinical Scholar (CS) Awards.
Conclusion: All Associate members should be eligible. Those with career plans in North America favored.
2. Academic potential is favored by vast majority.
 - Conclusion: additional wording will be added to RF & CS application forms to state that, "Review criteria will include significance of the research project, the investigator, the mentor, and the research and training environment."
3. Advise differentiating RF and CS instructions and changing instructions for Mentor and Sponsor slightly to ask them to respectively address 'research potential' and 'career plan' rather than asking both to comment on "potential for a research career".
4. With increased number of applicants, should we change our review system for RF and CS Awards?
 - The current system of review by Awards Committee members is at the breaking point, particularly if the number of applications increases any more. It also does not provide expert review for many applications. Furthermore, it does not provide a mechanism for feedback to applicants (see #5).
 - Conclusion: Initial ("outside") written expert review with earlier submission deadlines, followed by Awards Committee review as a whole
 - a. Deadlines: December 8 for RF (evaluation of potential), December 15 for CS (productivity).
 - b. Two consultant expert reviewers will be chosen (from Committee, Board, or our membership) for each proposal to review the grant and provide an NIH score and a 1-page written summary with strengths and weaknesses of science, applicant, mentor, and environment. The summary will include a section suitable for transmission to candidate and another confidential to the Board.
 - Appointments of these experts will be coordinated by the Chair after apportioning applications to members of the entire Awards Committee for their recommendations.
 - Database information on scientific and clinical expertise of Active Members would facilitate this
 - c. These reviews will be made available to the entire Awards Committee, which would then rank the top several.
5. The Awards committee will develop a mechanism to provide feedback to the (RF and CS) applicants who were not chosen for awards.
 - See #4 above, which provides a mechanism to provide written critiques to applicants.
6. Reviewing applications for courses (Summer School, Karolinska, etc).
 - Conclusion: Criteria for LWPES applicants should include (at least) relatively senior fellowship position and academic potential; preference will be given to applicants who have not previously attended a similar course.
7. General concerns
 - Repeatedly belated communication by ESPE/Karolinska/sponsors regarding availability of courses and funding.