

Applicant: _____

Nominee: _____

SEC Reviewer: _____

<p>Pre-Screening: Viability (Proposals below “good” will not be considered further)</p>	<p>Nominee expressed interest and availability; proposed schedule shows evidence of thought (mentions activities, explains why activity is relevant to the speaker and department interests)</p>	<p>Nominee is interested but has not confirmed travel; schedule shows some evidence of thought, with some details missing</p>	<p>Did not contact nominee; schedule shows no evidence of thought or preparation</p>
<p>Round Two Evaluation</p>	<p>Excellent (5)</p>	<p>Good (3)</p>	<p>Not Competitive (1)</p>
<p>Intellectual Significance (50%)</p>	<p>Cutting edge research that engages colleagues in multiple areas; novel methods can inspire future work; content and approach expand existing strengths and offer new directions for SIP and UVA.</p>	<p>Research makes a solid contribution to the field in an established area. The methods are field-appropriate, but not generalizable. Content and approach contribute to existing strengths within SIP and UVA.</p>	<p>Research is outdated and/or so specialized that it is not relevant or accessible to scholars outside of the area. Content and approach offer a marginal contribution to SIP and UVA initiatives.</p>
<p>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Community Partnerships (25%)</p>	<p>Research area and/or approach diversify the field with new kinds of materials, frameworks, and/or methods; the speaker is an underrepresented scholar in the field; research returns knowledge to communities and/or is public facing.</p>	<p>Meets 1-2 of the 3 areas: research area and/or methods diversify the field; scholarly presence promotes inclusive research; findings address inequity by returning knowledge and/or empowering communities with public humanities scholarship.</p>	<p>Research focuses on a dominant culture with the Hispanophone, Lusophone, and/or Italian-speaking world, focusing on historically (over)represented voices, delivered by a scholar who is not URM and only for the ivory tower.</p>
<p>Collaboration (25%)</p>	<p>Research area and/or methods engage multiple fields; proposal shows evidence of collaboration across research areas and professional ranks (e.g., Latin American & Italian; grad students & TT faculty; grad students & AGF)</p>	<p>Research area and/or methods are primarily aligned with one field; proposal is co- or multi-authored but by colleagues in the same area (Latin America) and/or rank (2 grad students; 3 AGF; 4 TT)</p>	<p>Research area and/or methods do not cross fields or disciplines; proposal is single authored</p>

<p>Score and Ranking:</p>	<p>Excellent</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Not Competitive</p>
----------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

Score and Comments:

--	--	--	--