**Candidate Name** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Materials provided: Research Statement, CV, Research Productivity Considerations (optional), Diversity and Inclusion Statement, & Letter of Support

**Reference the Research Statement for Questions 1-5**

1. **Description of research question and how it fills a gap that is understandable by a universal audience and contains relevant information 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | Vague, unclear, or rambling description. Too much jargon or assumptions of reader knowledge to understand the description. May provide many irrelevant details. May be difficult to follow. |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Acceptable description. May be lacking a few important details or include some jargon/assumptions of knowledge, but the reader is still able to follow. |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Clear and detailed description that is easy to follow. Provides the reader with the necessary information. |

1. **Research Approach discussed appropriately 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | Little information on the approach used to get to this point or what will be done. Too much jargon may make it difficult for the reviewer to follow. |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Provides information on approach but may be lacking enough detail for the reviewer to completely understand what the applicant did. May contain a small amount of jargon. |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Description of approach is clear and detailed enough that the reviewer can understand what the applicant did. No jargon. |

1. **Interpretation and implications of the research are clearly stated**  **1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | Interpretation/implications is poor |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Interpretation and implications are stated but difficult to follow, missing important details, or the interpretation is not clearly based on the results |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Interpretation and implications are accurately presented, easy to follow, and clear |

1. **The innovative nature of the presented work, and its impact on the field, is briefly described 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | Description of innovation is vague. Applicant does not make a strong argument for how the research contributes any new findings to the field or that the approaches used are novel. |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Description of innovation is acceptable. May be missing some important details or could make a stronger argument for innovation. |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Description of innovation is strong. Based on the description, it is clear to the reviewer that this research approach is innovative and will contribute to new findings in the field. |

1. **Incorporation of behavior 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | Behavior is not included, relevance of using a given behavior is absent, or it is not stated how the research increases our understanding of behavior. |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Behavior is included, but not well described, or the behaviors assessed are not well suited to address the research question. It is unclear how the research increases our understanding of behavior. |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Behavior is a key component of the study. The description of the behavior task is accurately presented, easy to follow, and clear. The behavioral manipulation is relevant to broader research question. It is clearly explained how the presented research increases our understanding of behavior.  |

**Reference the CV and Research Productivity Considerations if provided for Question 6**

1. **Evidence of success early career stage 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | There is not much evidence of research productivity  |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Research that is serving as the foundation of the applicant’s independent lab has been published  |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Data collected in the applicant’s independent lab have been submitted for publication |

**Reference the Diversity and Inclusion Statement for Question 7**

1. **The applicant should describe the ways in which they have made efforts or plan make future efforts to promote diversity and inclusion, with regards to culture, ethnicity, gender identity or expression, national origin, physical or mental difference, politics, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, and/or subculture, as described in** [**IBNS’ Diversity Statement**](https://www.ibnsconnect.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=176:commitment-to-diversity&catid=20:site-content&Itemid=177)**. 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | The applicant does not describe efforts they have done or plan to do in the future relevant to promoting diversity and inclusion within the field of behavioral neuroscience. |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | The applicant provides a clear but generic example of efforts they have done or plan to do in the future to promote diversity and inclusion within the field of behavioral neuroscience. |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | The applicant provides specific examples (e.g. partnering organizations, collaborators, and/or applicant led- initiatives/programs) of things they have done or plan to do in the future and clearly explain how these examples promote diversity and inclusion within the field of behavioral neuroscience. |

**Reference the Letter of Support for Question 8**

1. **Letter of support 1 2 3 4 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = Poor | Letter shows low or moderate level of support |
| 2 = Good |  |
| 3 = Very good | Letter shows clear support, indicating the role applicant will conduct in the Department and how they fit into the Department’s goals |
| 4 = Excellent |  |
| 5 = Outstanding | Letter from Chair shows strong support, indicating (1) eligibility, (2) relation research to Department’s goals, (3) progress toward seniority, and (4) potential success nationally and internationally |

 **TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**