

FOCUS Award for the Advancement of Women in Medicine Scoring Rubric

Notes to reviewers

- Goal of the award: The FOCUS Award for the Advancement of Women in Medicine recognizes a faculty member (of any gender identity) at the associate or full professor ranks who has shown role model-level excellence in paving the way for women *across the continuum* in academic medicine at the PSOM or beyond in areas including **any or all** of the following aspects: advocacy, structural change, mentorship, sponsorship, education, science, clinical care and administration.
- Mitigating bias: In efforts to mitigate the influence of personal experience with or feelings towards any one nominee, please evaluate each nominee based solely on the materials in their nomination packet.
- Confidentiality: Nomination packet materials and deliberations are confidential and should not be shared with individuals outside of the FOCUS Awards and Opportunities Committee.
- Reporting conflicts of interest: There may be nominees whom the committee members know socially, have worked with, published with etc. FOCUS does NOT request that committee members recuse themselves on all such cases. If you feel that you cannot comment objectively on a nominee, we assume that you will recuse yourself from evaluating that nominee.
- Completing the rubric: For each of the two domains, please rate the accumulative level of impact from 1 to 5 total (1 = *lowest impact*, 5 = *highest impact*) and note examples of this impact drawn from the nomination packet (*this is required*).
- Creating a list of top nominees: Once you have reviewed the nomination packets and completed the scoring rubrics for each nominee, please make a list of your **3 top nominees**. Your top nominees do not need to be positioned in any particular order. Please send your list of top 3 nominees to Sue Primavera at sprimave@pennmedicine.upenn.edu who will share an anonymized aggregation of top nominees to share at the assembled deliberation.

FOCUS Award for the Advancement of Women in Academic Medicine Scoring Rubric

A note to reviewers: Nominees will have made contributions in different aspects of the two domains below based on their role within the PSOM. Every aspect is valued which is why we have condensed them into two domain categories in the scoring rubric. A nominee does not need to excel in all aspects of either domain to have a high impact score (i.e., a nominee on the Tenure track may not focus on clinical care but their nomination packet may detail exemplary improvements for women via their science and administrative work). Examples of how one may evaluate the level of impact are presented on page 3. Please give one impact score per domain.

Nominee’s Name: _____

Total Impact Score: _____

Domains	Level of Impact Score (1-5) 1 = lowest 5 = highest	Rationale for impact score (examples from the nomination packet are required)
Paves the way for women in academic medicine through advocacy, structural changes, mentorship and/or sponsorship		
Generates improvements for women through education, science, clinical care and/or administration		

Domains	Examples	Impact Score 1	Impact Score 5
<p>Paves the way for women in academic medicine through advocacy, structural changes, mentorship and/or sponsorship</p>	<p>Creation of career development/leadership programs, networking/mentoring opportunities, number of mentees/protégés</p> <p>Policy changes / changes in systems that enhance the work environment and culture for women as a result of advocacy, at the division, department, school, regional, national levels</p> <p>Promotion of women colleagues to achieve awards, opportunities, special recognition, promotions, leadership positions</p> <p>Roles in mentorship/sponsorship structures (formal or informal) for trainees</p>	<p>Minimal evidence of positive impact on mentees, protégés, patients, peers, colleagues, or environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters/CV provide few examples/outcomes 	<p>Substantial evidence of positive impact on mentees, protégés, patients, peers, colleagues, or environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters/CV provide specific examples of change in outcomes as a direct result of applicant's efforts Internal or external recognition of accomplishments in these domains by professional societies or other such organizations
<p>Generates improvements for women through education, science, clinical care and/or administration</p>	<p>Creation of, or leadership in, educational programs that help the advancement of women in science and medicine</p> <p>Creation of, or leadership in, clinical programs specific to women's health</p> <p>Creation of, or leadership in, research that impacts the health and wellbeing of women</p> <p>Creation of, or leadership in, administrative changes supporting women in academic medicine/scholarship focused on women in the workforce</p>	<p>Minimal evidence of positive impact on mentees, protégés, patients, peers, colleagues, or environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters/CV provide few examples/outcomes 	<p>Substantial evidence of positive impact on mentees, protégés, patients, peers, colleagues, or environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters/CV provide specific examples of change in outcomes as a direct result of applicant's efforts Internal or external recognition of accomplishments in these domains by professional societies or other such organizations Regional / national recognition as a scholar in these domains