

## Fellows Selection Process

Background Information. AAPS has a strong commitment to the recognition of select AAPS members through their designation as FELLOW. The primary criterion for election to FELLOW status is professional excellence in the fields relevant to the mission of AAPS. Election to FELLOW status thus will be based on the individual's documented **sustained** level of superior and distinguished professional achievement and contributions in a relevant field.

Since pharmaceutical scientists practice in diverse basic and applied areas, the measurement of their contributions and impact on a field requires a careful consideration of many factors. Accordingly, each nomination must be supported by a carefully prepared *Portfolio* that clearly provides detailed documentation of the candidate's accomplishments and contributions and the impact in a particular field. The term "portfolio" literally means "a collection of representative works," and its use here implies a document that is not limited to such traditional academic forms of evidence as refereed publications and successful grantsmanship. In fact, for scientists working in non-academic environments, significant evidence of scientific contribution other than traditional refereed publications may have a major role. The portfolio thus provides the opportunity for all members to be recognized for their accomplishments, regardless of the setting in which they function, but requires careful preparation in order that the **sustained scientific contributions of the nominee are documented concisely and unambiguously.**

The Nomination Process. There is a clearly defined process for the selection of Fellows. The process starts with an individual AAPS member (the Nominator) who wishes to nominate another AAPS member (the Nominee) for consideration for Fellow status. The Nominator and Nominee work together to develop a nomination package according to the process outlined below. The package is then submitted prior to the annually specified deadline to AAPS headquarters. The nomination package is then considered by the Fellows Selection Committee of the primary AAPS section of the nominee. Successful section nominees are then forwarded to the AAPS Fellows Committee for review. Successful nominees are then forwarded to AAPS Executive Council for final approval. Nominators are notified of the outcome of the selections process (whether successful or not) either by the AAPS President or by the AAPS Fellows Committee Chair. The successful Fellows nominees are recognized at the AAPS Annual Meeting and Exposition.

## **AAPS FELLOW REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES FOR NOMINATION**

### **Responsibility and Requirements of the Nominator\***

**THE NOMINATOR MUST BE A CURRENT MEMBER OF AAPS.** The nominator is responsible for assembling and submitting the **completed** Nomination Package which must include: (a) Nomination Form, (b) the Nominator's Assessment, (c) the Curriculum Vitae, (d) no more than 3 Letters of Recommendation, and (e) the Portfolio of Accomplishments. The Nominator's Assessment is to be an accurate and concise evaluation of the contributions and impact of the nominee in the pharmaceutical sciences. It is anticipated and recommended that the nominator will actively work with the nominee, wherever possible, in the collection of information, including the solicitation of letters of recommendation. ***The original materials and three collated copies must be received in the AAPS Office by Friday, April 14, 2006.*** If three complete collated copies are not sent, the forms will be returned and not considered for nomination.

### **Responsibility and Requirements of the Nominee**

**THE NOMINEE MUST BE A CURRENT MEMBER OF AAPS AT THE TIME OF NOMINATION.** The nomination process is an open one. The nominee prepares, in collaboration with the nominator, the Curriculum Vitae and the Portfolio of Accomplishments, and recommends sources of supporting letters of recommendation.

\*AAPS strongly suggests the nominator consider the length of time that a candidate has been active in his/her scientific area and suggests 10 years as a minimum.

Such letters might necessarily represent academic colleagues, peers and technical management. Since all Fellows are “AAPS Fellows,” the nomination package will be sent to the “Section Fellows Selection Committee(s)” representing the nominee’s expertise. If the nominee has demonstrated sustained achievement in areas represented by more than one section, the nomination package may be sent by the nominator to each relevant section for its evaluation.

### **The Nomination Package**

In order to assure that only persons of the highest qualifications and distinction be elected to FELLOW status, there must be focus and rigor in the nominating process. To that end, the following format for the content and presentation of the Nomination Package are presented and must be followed.

The nomination package must contain items A through D as follows:

#### **A. Nominator's Assessment**

This component of the proposal will be prepared by the nominator and should clearly identify the currently active sustained achievements of the candidate. This assessment must be supported with appropriate relevant examples. Often, the nominee will present additional qualities and dimensions that obviously serve to enhance the nomination; however, the identification and validation of a candidate's sustained excellence in one (or perhaps two) specific field(s) is of primary importance. Clearly establish for the reviewing committees the answers to the following questions: “What makes the nominee an acknowledged leader in, and an outstanding contributor to, the pharmaceutical sciences?” “What are the nominee's most important scientific research accomplishments?” “What is the demonstrated impact of the contributions?”

#### **B. Letters of Recommendation (no more than 3)**

Each letter is to be specific and include how long the individual has known the candidate and in what capacity. It is strongly recommended that the letters include sources outside the place of employment or education or training of the nominee. Letters are to specifically describe the candidate’s contributions to the pharmaceutical sciences. Explain what makes the nominee “an acknowledged leader in, and an outstanding contributor to, the pharmaceutical sciences.” Letters **must be** included in the submitted package to be considered for nomination.

#### **C. Complete Curriculum Vitae (summary of candidate's background and qualifications)**

This section is to include: Current Position and Affiliations, Fields and Areas of Specialization, Education (degrees, institutions, years, majors, minors), Previous Positions Held, Professional Licensure (if appropriate), Honors, Awards, Promotions, and Recognitions (with dates). A complete list of publications, presentations, abstracts, etc., must be included. Publications should be divided by peer review and non-peer review. Un-refereed articles should be listed separately.

#### **D. Portfolio of Accomplishments**

It is essential to the nomination that this section be clear, focused and convincing. The following is a partial list of categories of documentation that may be used to support the nomination of a candidate for Fellow. This list is intended only as a guideline and is not meant to limit the types of information that may be submitted or that could be considered. The key to this section is to identify and document via the most appropriate mechanism(s) for an individual nominee, what are his/her most important scientific contributions and the impact on the pharmaceutical sciences? Cite and discuss key publications (no more than 6) representing major contributions, giving a brief explanation why each should be regarded as a key contribution. One good measure that helps assess the impact of publications is the frequency at which they are cited, and serious consideration should be given to providing such information in this section. It is important to note that the **impact and sustained nature of the activity**, rather than the number of publications, is key. Additionally, in the case of multiple authorships, it is essential that the principal or corresponding author be denoted with an asterisk and that all authors be included in the order in which they were listed in the actual publication.

Refereed publications should be listed separately from other publications, such as books, chapters, etc. One measure that helps assess the impact of publications is the frequency at which they are cited, and serious consideration should be given to providing such data in this section. Include citations for each of the key publications.

**2. Patents** (explain importance and potential impact)

What is the value and number of patents held by the candidate? Value can be assessed, for example, by the number of patents which lead to products and the success with which the patent(s) has dominated the field.

**3. Presentations**

- (a) Invited Presentations
- (b) Submitted Presentations

Presentations must be cited chronologically, indicating full authorship, the title of the presentation, and to whom and where the presentation was given. For invited presentations, the size and importance of the audience will be factors in judging peer esteem. Do the presentations reflect expertise and innovation on the part of the candidate? In certain cases, contributed presentations may be refereed, and this fact also should be noted. In the case of multiple authorship, the principal author should be denoted.

**4. Service as Editor, Associate Editor, Editorial Advisory Board Member, and Referee for Learned Journals in the Pharmaceutical or Related Sciences.**

This information shall be indicative of the recognition of the nominee.

**5. Organization of Symposia**

Successful efforts in organizing national and international symposia are valuable for establishing the level of recognition of the nominee in the area of his/her expertise.

**6. Mentoring of Graduate Students, Subordinates and Colleagues**

This category includes the traditional thesis/dissertation advisors and co-advisors as well as mentors for summer interns in academic or non-academic research/development laboratories. For Ph.D. and Master's students, the student's name and the title of the thesis/dissertation should be included. The research under the direction of mentors ordinarily will be published and/or presented. An additional, though more indirect, measure of the impact of the mentor may be taken from the success of his/her students upon leaving the program. This category may also include mentoring and development of coworkers in positions outside academia.

**7. Service to AAPS or Other Professional/Scientific Organizations**

While service is not the major contributing factor to election of Fellow status, it is a criterion which can have favorable impact. Accordingly, significant service (not university or company committees) should be provided and documented. For example, chairing committees or task forces, or holding elected offices, etc., is supportive, particularly when that service has had impact in a field.

## **8. Adjunct Faculty Positions in Universities**

As an adjunct faculty member, it must be clearly demonstrated what the contributions have been. Mere listing as adjunct faculty is insufficient.

## **9. IND's, NDA's and Related Contributions**

If the candidate functions in a drug development environment, it is important to determine what are the product approvals or introductions associated with the person's career. Can the candidate make a documented argument that she/he was pivotal in the product success through some unique contribution? Such contributions might include a new formulation technique or process, a new analytical procedure, the development of a novel *in vitro* procedure that provided *in vivo* correlation for a dosage form that would otherwise be "unapprovable," a novel pharmacokinetic statistical method for data analysis, or a unique contribution to a clinical/clinical pharmacology program critical to an NDA, etc. In using this approach, it is important that a strong case be made by experts other than a nominee's supervisor or subordinates. **The impact and sustained nature of these activities must be documented.**

## **10. Level and Scope of Technical and/or Managerial Responsibility**

A record of increasing responsibility is usually an indicator of the regard that the organization holds for the individual. Responsibility here does not necessarily mean managing large staffs, but also includes responsibility for start-up departments or management responsibility for complex projects.

## **11. Special Internal Awards, Recognition, etc., for Research and Development Related Achievements**

These may include major recognition awards from the employers or national or international achievement and recognition awards. Awards routinely given in recognition of a job well done, as a part of normal employment, shall not be provided.

## **12. Sustained Recognition and Solicitation for Expertise and Technical Leadership**

The above format (A-D) must be followed. Incomplete or incorrectly formatted nomination packages will be returned without consideration. Poorly prepared and/or insufficiently documented nominations will place the nominee at a disadvantage in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the nominator to ensure a complete and representative Nomination Package.

### **DO NOT**

- **submit nominations in binders;**
- **use plastic sheet protectors;**
- **use index tabs; or**
- **use special binding of any kind.**

**Submissions received in any of these formats will be subject to return without consideration.**