



Mid-Career Researcher Award

Purpose: The Mid-Career Researcher Award is intended to recognize outstanding research accomplishments and significant recognition of an individual at the mid-career stage.

Eligibility Criteria: Nominee must be a current NAPCRG member.

The nominee may be defined as mid-career by the following evidence:

- Ten to twenty years since completion of terminal degree (e.g. MD, PhD, MSW)
- Rank of either Assistant or Associate Professor (or equivalent)
- Other evidence of mid-career status (i.e. please describe why the nominee qualifies as mid-career, if not explicitly by one of the criteria above)
 - Evidence would include major grants funding or publications as co- or principal investigator, demonstration of mentorship, significant collaboration

Personal Achievements	Scoring Range/Definitions (1 is the lowest score and 5 is top score)	Score	Comments
Did they meet the eligibility criteria?	Yes or No (If no, this is a disqualification)		
Did they follow instructions and submit the correct materials?	0-2 0 – Did not follow instructions 1 – One lapse (eg: CV too long) 2 – Followed all instructions		
Research Experience	1-5 1 – Limited expertise, has few leadership roles in research, mainly supportive functionally. 2 – Acts only in co-investigator role on projects, small but productive research portfolio including academic writing. No dissemination. 3 – Leads projects as investigator. Modest portfolio, limited but some diversity of collaboration. Demonstrates some patient engagement. 4 – Leads projects as investigator or project lead. Innovative ideas in research. Moderate number of publications. Demonstrates patient engagement. Moderate grant funding 5 – Expert in their field with principal investigator roles, innovative and impactful research portfolio. Demonstrates patient engagement. Developed grant funding, many “touches” with academics . Includes teaching activities and community engagement. Collaborative across disciplines.		
Contribution to and participation in NAPCRG	1-3 1 – Few presentations or low attendance at annual meetings, ICPF, or PBRN. 2 – Regular investment in NAPCRG community through meeting attendance and internal dissemination.		

	3 – Regular investment in NAPCRG community, early leadership roles, committee membership.		
Personal statement and Letters of Support: Do they accurately describe philosophy and career?	<p style="text-align: center;">1-3</p> 1 - Vague description of research portfolio. No narrative built to support longevity in PC research. 2- Discusses career achievement but does not explore next steps. 3 – Clearly articulated PC research philosophy and narrative around research body. Anticipates future research needs.		
Rate the nominee based on their submission packet.	<p style="text-align: center;">1-3</p> 1 – Moderate strength applicant that has provided some research without breadth and limited depth. Lacks NAPCRG involvement. 2 – Strong applicant that has diverse mentees, aligns with values of primary care research and NAPCRG, and promotes professionalism and interdisciplinary collaboration. 3 – Best possible applicant with wide breadth of meaningful research, promotes patient and community involvement, active NAPCRG member, strong dissemination efforts.		
	Total Overall Score (Average of the rated metrics)		/ 16