SOCIETY FOR BIOMATERIALS
AWARD NOMINATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Pursuant to the SFB Bylaws, the Awards, Ceremonies and Nominations Committee follows the procedure below when evaluating nominations for Awards.

Solicitation and compilation of nominations

1. An open call for nominations is distributed to all members for all award categories via email and postings on the SFB website. Details on the awards and required materials are posted on the SFB website.
2. Nominations are submitted to headquarters staff for compilation.
3. Staff compiles nomination packages and shares via secure cloud link with the Committee.
4. In the event that there are not sufficient nominees for each award, the committee will solicit additional nominees as needed.

Selection of nominees for voting slate

4. ACN members will submit preliminary scores to staff using the rubric as well as an overall 'impact score.' The impact scores will be averaged to prioritize discussion of nominees.
   • ACN members should refrain from nominating or providing letters for any candidate. If candidate package is a roll over from prior year and has letter from ACN member, then the ACN member will not vote on that award category.
   • ACN members will not vote on nominations for their mentors or trainees as well as colleagues from the same institution.
5. The Committee's feedback is compiled, blinded, and shared with all Committee members.
6. A meeting is held to discuss the nominees. The compiled preliminary results are used as a guide in prioritizing the nominations for discussion. Individual committee members can request for particular nominees to be discussed regardless of the preliminary rankings.
7. The Committee discusses and votes on all candidates for each award category, one category at a time.
8. The Committee's recommendations are forwarded to SFB's governing Council for final approval.
9. If a recommendation from the Committee is not approved by Council, the Committee reconvenes to address Council's concerns until a suitable recipient for each award has been identified.
10. Notifications are made to all award recipients, and to the nominators of all unsuccessful nominations. *(Notifications of unsuccessful nominations are only made to the nominator, not to the nominee.)*
11. Awards are announced to the SFB Members, and to the public.

FOUNDERS AWARD

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)
RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional 2 = Outstanding 3 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 5 = Good 6 = Satisfactory 7 = Fair 8 = Marginal 9 = Poor 10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION
1. Landmark contributions to the field of biomaterial Identification and description of the impact and outcomes of candidate's contributions to the field of biomaterials research
2. Significant contributions to SFB, Leadership in SFB Clear descriptions of active volunteerism and contributions in the Society
3. Sustained impact to field and SFB Description of effort continuity with quantifiable or non-quantifiable metrics of long-term impact on the society or the field of biomaterials

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION (DEI) AWARD

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Significant and demonstrable impact of service/program/initiative on groups who have been historically excluded based on race, ethnicity, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, dis/ability, socioeconomic class, language, culture, and national identity.

Identification of the population served clearly describes the impact and outcomes of their efforts on the identified population. When available, measurable outcomes are welcome, but not required, including enrollment/retention numbers, shifts in demographics, or survey data. Other examples include demonstration that the work has clear impacts beyond individuals.

2. Strong demonstration of programmatic sustainability or plans to continue work in diversity, equity, and inclusion

Clear plans for effort continuity beyond the nominee's leadership, including long-term goals of the program/effort with self-described quantifiable or non-quantifiable metrics. Description of how the program/effort may be viable long-term, financially or otherwise, and how the effort will continually impact under-served populations.

3. Specific examples of contributions to diversity in the biomaterials community

Measurable/non-measurable impact of underserved populations within the biomaterials community. Description of how the programmatic goal aligns with constituents of the biomaterials field, shows an understanding of the dimensions of diversity within the biomaterials community, and how their efforts/program advance equity within the community.

3. Strong demonstration of work in diversity is innovative and different from existing programs

C. WILLIAM HALL AWARD

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Significant contributions to SFB

Clear identification and description of the impact and outcomes of candidate's efforts within the Society

2. Leadership in biomaterials industrial or government sectors

Description of leadership roles in industry and governmental roles that align with SFB objectives and goals

3. Record in promoting SFB objectives and goals

Identification and description of examples of active volunteerism within the community, examples of establishing, developing, maintaining, and promoting the objectives and goals of the Society

SFB AWARD FOR SERVICE

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)
RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional 2 = Outstanding 3 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 5 = Good 6 = Satisfactory 7 = Fair 8 = Marginal 9 = Poor 10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Impactful service contributions to establish and promote SFB objectives and goals

Identification and description of the impact and outcomes of their efforts within the Society

2. Sustained involvement with SFB

Clear description of candidate's long-standing involvement and engagement with the Society

3. Leadership in SFB

Identification of leadership roles and description of long-term impact of the contributions from these roles on the society

CLEMSON AWARD – APPLIED RESEARCH

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)
RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional 2 = Outstanding 3 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 5 = Good 6 = Satisfactory 7 = Fair 8 = Marginal 9 = Poor 10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Distinguished research and development to address critical areas in the field of biomaterials

Identification and description of the impact and outcomes of their efforts within the Society including contributions to the literature, broad adoption of methodology, material or knowledge, or device/therapeutic development

2. Translational aspects of research and development efforts

Examples of successful translation of a medical device or therapeutic, number of patents, licensing of patents, new business ventures

3.. Significant contributions to SFB, Leadership in SFB

Identification of leadership roles or active volunteerism in the Society with description of impact of the contributions from these roles on the society

CLEMSON AWARD – BASIC SCIENCE

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE

1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Significant contribution that shaped basic knowledge and understanding

Clear demonstration of expanding the basic science research knowledge in biomaterials to keep pace with ever-expanding biomedical knowledge and application.

2. Impact of contribution to the biomaterials field

Identification and description of how the contribution is widely adopted and/or created new research directions in the field

3. Significant contributions to SFB, Leadership in SFB

Identification of leadership roles or active volunteerism in the Society with description of impact of the contributions from these roles on the society

CLEMSON AWARD – CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LITERATURE

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Significant literature contributions in the field of biomaterials

Substantial contributions to the literature as indicated by numerous examples of high-quality publications that have contributed significantly to the field as evidenced by being widely cited, examples of textbook and other major works that are widely adopted/referenced, examples of reviews/perspectives that are widely adopted/referenced

2. Impact of contribution to the biomaterials literature

Identification and description of how the contribution filled a salient gap in the biomaterials-related literature, moved the biomaterials field forward over the years

3. Significant contributions to SFB, Leadership in SFB

Identification of leadership roles or active volunteerism in the Society with description of impact of the contributions from these roles on the society

TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION & DEVELOPMENT AWARD

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)
RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional 2 = Outstanding 3 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 5 = Good 6 = Satisfactory 7 = Fair 8 = Marginal 9 = Poor 10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Technical development and translational activities

Identification and description of how the development of the medical product or technology has introduced a new technology

2. Biomaterial innovation

Identification and description of how biomaterials played a key role in the device/product success and describes how the medical product or technology they developed is innovative

3. Improvement over state-of-the-art and potential or realized impact on patient care

Identification and description of how the medical product or technology has improved/advanced the state-of-the-art. Specific examples of prior technologies and/or the technological gap addressed with their medical product/technology should be included with estimated number of patients impacted.

MID-CAREER AWARD

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Outstanding research and development accomplishments in the field of biomaterials

Identification and description of the impact and outcomes of their research with clear evidence of being an authority in the biomaterials field with invited seminar and conference presentations, impactful publications in the field of biomaterials post-tenure, and a rising career trajectory post-tenure.

2. Innovation within the field of biomaterials

Clear evidence of candidate's role in creating, moving, or reshaping specific area within biomaterials with examples including patents, new knowledge, methodology, or materials

3. Significant contributions to SFB, Leadership in SFB

Identification of leadership roles or active volunteerism in the Society with description of impact of the contributions from these roles on the society, contributions should be significant in terms of service, such as SIG representations, symposium/session organization, workshops, community building, or committee services, etc.

YOUNG INVESTIGATOR AWARD

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE
1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Outstanding research and development accomplishments in the field of biomaterials

Identification and description of the impact and outcomes of their research with impactful publications in the field of biomaterials and a rising career trajectory

2. Innovation within the field of biomaterials

Clear evidence of creating, moving, or reshaping specific area within biomaterials with examples including patents, new knowledge, methodology, or materials

3. Significant contributions to SFB

Identification of leadership roles or active volunteerism in the Society with description of impact of the contributions from these roles on the society, contributions should be significant in terms of service, such as SIG representations, symposium/session organization, workshops, community building, or committee services, etc.

STUDENT AWARDS FOR OUTSTANDING RESEARCH

GUIDELINES AND RATING CRITERIA
Evaluation Rubric (Rating from 1-10: 1 as high/best, 5 as average, 10 as low/poor)

RATING SCALE

1 = Exceptional
2 = Outstanding
3 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
5 = Good
6 = Satisfactory
7 = Fair
8 = Marginal
9 = Poor
10 = Deficient

AREAS OF EVALUATION

1. Track record of contributions to the field of biomaterials

Clear description of research productivity and contributions at this stage of career

2. Impact and quality of submitted manuscript

Quality of the submitted manuscript in terms of scientific rigor, innovation, potential impact, and technical writing

3. Involvement and Contributions to SFB

Description of engagement in SFB with regards to abstract submission and meeting attendance either at the regional Biomaterials Day or national meeting; active volunteerism and contributions in the Society in terms of student chapter involvement/leadership