

Travel Award Scoring Guidelines

Overall, a total score should be assigned to each applicant as outlined:

- 1: Exceptional: In the top 10% of applicants overall. Overall outstanding; with no weaknesses.
- 2: Very Good – Good: Top 25% of applicants overall. Strengths outweigh weaknesses.
- 3: Satisfactory/Average: Top 50% of applicants overall. Balance of strengths and weaknesses.
- 4: Fair: Weaknesses outweigh strengths.
- 5: Marginal: An application with serious weaknesses and limited strengths.

It is advisable to assign a preliminary score and then go back after reviewing ALL applicants and revise as necessary. A reviewer should look for: Evidence of quality to date in all categories should be present, and a trajectory of future excellence should be apparent in each category.

Junior Applicants: Those individuals who are at a level which is less than an assistant professor, also including psychiatric residents, interns, and post-doctoral fellows.

Scientific Productivity Category:

1. Publications in peer-reviewed journals:
 - a. Total number of publications.
 - b. Number of first-author publications.
 - c. Quality and impact of publications (e.g., impact of journals where published).
2. Funding (K Award or small R Grant greater than foundation grant, greater than no funding). *Recipients at this level had anywhere from 1 – 12 grants listed, but the average was 4 foundation-level grants. 10 junior level recipients had received a K or R award.

*Recipients at this level for 2011 had anywhere from 2 – 11 papers in which they were first author, but most had an average of 7 papers for which they were first author on. Range of total publications was 5 – 24, with the average being 12.

Distinctions & Organizations Category:

1. Awards, honors, and recognition.
2. Roles in national and international research organizations.

*Recipients at this level for 2011 had anywhere from 4 – 25 honors and awards listed, most had an average of 8 awards or honors listed.

Relationship to ACNP Category:

1. Strength of nomination letters attesting to the present and future value of the candidate to ACNP.
2. Past record of ACNP participation (panels, posters, attendance)

Scientific Quality Category:

1. Quality of science and coherence of science in alignment with career track.

Some consideration should also be given to enhanced diversity to ACNP, with a reflection to ethnic or racial status of the applicant, or to the nature of the applicant's institution.

Senior Applicants: Applicants are defined as those individuals who are at the assistant professor level, and who have not received an RO1.

Scientific Productivity Category:

1. Publications in peer-reviewed journals:
 - a. Total number of publications.
 - b. Number of first-author publications.
 - c. Quality and impact of publications (e.g., impact of journals where published).
2. Funding (K Award or small R Grant greater than foundation grant, greater than no funding).). *Recipients at this level had anywhere from 2 – 21 grants listed, but the average was 7 foundation-level grants. 10 senior level recipients had received a K or R award.

*Recipients at this level for 2011 had anywhere from 6 – 25 papers in which they were first author, but most had an average of 15 papers for which they were first author on. Range of total publications was 19-67, but the average was 34.

Distinctions & Organizations Category:

1. Awards, honors, and recognition.
2. Roles in national and international research organizations.
3. Experience with editorial boards and/or grant reviews.

*Recipients at this level for 2011 had anywhere from 3 – 15 honors and awards listed, most had an average of 13 awards or honors listed.

Relationship to ACNP Category:

1. Strength of nomination letters attesting to the present and future value of the candidate to ACNP.
2. Past record of ACNP participation (panels, posters, attendance)

Scientific Quality Category:

1. Quality of science and coherence of science in alignment with career track.

Some consideration should also be given to enhanced diversity to ACNP, with a reflection to ethnic or racial status of the applicant, or to the nature of the applicant's institution.

Pre-doctoral awards should have the same guidelines, but with a lower threshold. Also, funding may not be relevant at this level, as this is the first year for these candidates, we will have a better idea as to what the criteria should be once we are able to examine the applicants in this category.