FULBRIGHT Scholar Program

U. S. SCHOLAR PEER REVIEW

INSTRUCTIONS AND POLICY: 2021-2022 APPLICATIONS

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for serving as a Peer Reviewer for the Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program. Each peer reviewer serves on a Peer Review Committee and evaluates applications submitted to the U.S. component of the Fulbright Scholar Program.

Reviewers are academics and professionals with relevant discipline expertise who represent the diversity of the program, including the wide range of disciplines, regional experience, demographics, and institutional affiliations. Reviewers are typically Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program alumni.

As a reviewer, you are asked to examine and evaluate each applicant's academic or professional training, experience, and achievements, as well as the merit of the candidate's proposed activity.

Reviewers carefully evaluate applications and submit their comments and ratings electronically through the program's online review system. (All reviewers review all applications assigned to the committee.)

The committee subsequently meets virtually via videoconference, hosted by the Institute of International Education/Council for International Exchange of Scholars' (IIE/CIES). Committees discuss the individual evaluations and to reach consensus on which applications to recommend for the next round of review.

Before you start the review process

Before you get started, carefully review the guidelines and Review Criteria outlined in this document. Every application should be reviewed against these criteria.

Please note there are no quotas for how many candidates you can recommend, and you are not evaluating applicants against each other, rather against the review criteria.

Review deadline

Please refer to guidance for your specific committee regarding the date by which you must submit your final ratings and comments online.

Reviewers are encouraged to begin their review early to allow for sufficient time to read and evaluate the applications.

Who will see your evaluation? How will your evaluation be used?

Your evaluative comments and ratings serve to inform the peer review process and guide the outcome of the meeting discussion. Your comments and the criterion ratings can only be accessed by you and Fulbright program staff at IIE/CIES. These are for your reference during the meeting.

Your overall rating of each applicant will be viewable by your peers in the peer review meeting, and these ratings will serve as a starting point for the meeting discussion.

They may also help IIE/CIES to provide the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Embassy and/or Fulbright Commission with an overview of the panel and the competition. Your ratings and comments will not be shared with any other entities, including applicants.

What happens after the Peer Review Committee meeting?

Following the peer review committee meetings, IIE/CIES staff sends the panel of recommended candidates to the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, the U.S. embassy or Fulbright Commission in the host country, and the U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for further consideration.

The information IIE/CIES transmits includes a summary of the review criteria, data on the pool of applications and recommended candidates for the country/program, including the candidates' overall rating and review criteria ratings agreed upon during the discussion, and justifications for candidates who have had previous Fulbright Scholar awards.

The U.S. embassy or Fulbright Commission subsequently convenes an in-country review and proposes candidates for funding to the U.S. Department of State. Depending on the country, the in-country review may also include conferring with proposed host institution(s) on feasibility and interest.

About the final selection of grantees

The Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (FFSB) was established by Congress to supervise the Fulbright Program and to officially select students, scholars, teachers, trainees, and other persons to participate in the program. Appointed by the President of the United States, the 12-member FFSB meets quarterly. The FFSB establishes worldwide policies and procedures for the Program and issues an annual report on the state of the Program. The FFSB makes the final selection of candidates, and the U.S. Department of State confirms the availability of funding.

AWARD INFORMATION

Expectations and requirements of awards

The expectations and requirements of each award in the Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program are provided in the Catalog of Awards. When reviewing applications for relevant award requirements, you should refer to the award descriptions in the Catalog. Note that some award descriptions provide specific qualifications, host institutions, etc. However, many awards allow greater flexibility in the types of applicants they attract than reviewers may expect.

The focus of peer review is on the applicant's academic or professional training, experience, and achievements, as well as the merit of the candidate's proposed activity. Should the applicant be recommended for further consideration, the U.S. embassy or Fulbright Commission is well-positioned to assess the fit of the applicant and their proposed project with the country's needs and priorities.

GRANT ACTIVITY

The Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program enables scholars and professionals to pursue projects involving teaching, research, professional activities, or some combination of these.

TEACHING

- Teaching at the undergraduate and/or graduate level;
- It may also involve student advising, advising on program and/or curriculum development; faculty development; teaching can also be comprised of giving seminars, workshops, guest lectures, and public lectures;
- The award may specify the teaching load, and may also indicate whether the activity may take place at multiple host institutions;
- The course(s), workshop(s), etc. may be designed by the applicant or prescribed by the host institution; the subjects may be known at the time of application, or negotiated after they are selected for the award; they may be taught solely by the applicant, co-taught or co-presented, or consist of multiple guest lecturing opportunities.

RESEARCH

- Investigation of a topic to reach new conclusions, often in collaboration or partnership with a host institution;
- The project may be designed by the applicant or in collaboration with the host institution.

PROFESSIONAL PROJECT

- Working with an appropriate organization to further their professional goals; may include visiting organizations, gaining practical experience, attending public lectures;

HOST INSTITUTIONS

- While the award may specify eligible hosts, they can include higher education institutions, research centers/institutes, language institutes, laboratories, think tanks, nonprofit organizations, foundations, museums, archives, studio collectives, artist residencies, theaters, cultural organizations, government agencies/ministries, hospitals, and professional associations. Generally, for-profit organizations may not serve as hosts.

Note: Scholars cannot engage in activities for which a license to practice medicine or nursing is required (i.e., direct patient care, clinical training, direct patient contact), nor shall they engage in pastoral, missionary, or other professional religious activities.

APPLICATION

A complete application

Materials required for all applications:

- Application form
- Project statement   *up to 5 pages*

• Curriculum vita/resume	*up to 6 pages; up to 8 pages for Distinguished Chair awards*	
• References	*two are required, applications are not permitted to be reviewed by peer reviewers if fewer than two have been received*	

Required depending on the grant activity, award requirements, and discipline:

• Bibliography	*up to 3 pages, required for research awards**
• Syllabi/course outlines	*up to 10 pages, required for teaching awards**
• Letter of invitation	*varies by award; invitation may be required; preferred; optional; or should not be sought.*
	*for awards where the invitation is required, applicants have been given an extension to October 15 to provide IIE with their invitation(s); letters may be received while under review by peer review committee
• Foreign language proficiency (two parts)	*required or optional if proficiency in a foreign language (not English) is needed for teaching and/or research (see award); not required for native speakers of the language*
(1) Self-evaluation is part of the application form	
(2) Foreign language evaluation appears with letters of recommendation; up to two may be provided.	
• Portfolio	*requested for certain disciplines including fine and creative arts, architecture, design, journalism; materials are uploaded to the application and include visual samples, video and/or audio recordings, and writing samples*

*Note: applications for combined grant activities should have all materials necessary for each proposed activity (e.g., teaching/research application will have a bibliography and syllabi/course outlines).

Based on feedback from past reviewers who wanted more information about the breakdown of an applicant's responsibilities at their institution, we've added questions asking about the type of position the applicant holds and their teaching, research, and service responsibilities at their institution. We added this information to give you more context regarding the applicant's capacity for teaching and research at their home institution and how this may affect considerations such as their publication record and the progress they have made on their proposed project. For example, a professor who teaches full-time at a small college may not have the time and capacity to match the research output of someone with a lighter teaching load and institutional support for research. Those with heavier teaching or service loads may not be as far along in their project at the time of application as those with more time to devote to research. We hope this additional information is helpful to you in your evaluation.

REVIEW CRITERIA

As you read through applications and prepare to complete your comments online for each applicant, evaluate each applicant's qualifications as they relate to the proposed project, as well as the quality and cogency of the application. Please do not compare applications against each other; instead, compare each to the review criteria.

Committee members should consider only the review criteria listed below.

The criteria are not ranked; consider all of them equally.

IMPORTANT: Given the wide range of disciplines and types of proposed projects in the Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program, keep in mind that some criteria may not be applicable to all applications.

For all applicants, look for:

Applicant training, background, and experience

- Applicant possesses the training, credentials and active professional standing in their field necessary to complete the project, as appropriate for their career stage, home institution/employer type, and teaching and administrative load (if applicable);
- Applicant meets language proficiency requirements or adequately addresses alternative(s) (if needed);
- Applicant maintains an appropriate record of service to their academic/professional community and home institution/employer;

Quality of the project

- The project is feasible, original, well-designed, innovative, and sophisticated, with sufficient resources and time allocated, and can be adapted if needed. In addition, the project can be understood by individuals outside of the applicant's discipline.
- Applicant demonstrates the need for the project to be undertaken in the specified location
- The project shows considerable engagement with the host institution and community;
- Teaching:
  - Syllabi/course outlines represent the applicant's experience teaching the subject(s), reflect innovative and effective pedagogical approaches, and are sufficiently developed; (Syllabi are not required to be tailored to the proposed host institution, unless specified by the award description.)
- Research:
  - Research is clearly designed, and methodology considered sound in the discipline
  - Bibliography reflects likelihood of project to contribute to the existing body of work on the topic

Project's potential impact, outcomes, and benefits

- Application demonstrates relevance and currency of project to the discipline
- Applicant clearly describes plans to feasibly disseminate results
- Applicant's project exhibits potential for impact, which is significant, broad, and sustainable in discipline, at their home institution and community, and to the applicant's professional development

Personal qualities

- Applicant displays ability to be adaptable, culturally sensitive, collegial, and can serve as a cultural ambassador for the U.S. This should be addressed in the short essay question; evidence may also be found in the project statement and letters of reference.

Previous overseas experience and prior Fulbright awards

One of the objectives of the Fulbright Program is to provide an educational exchange experience to those not previously afforded such an opportunity.

Substantial recent experience abroad is defined as "study, teaching, research, or employment for a period aggregating more than an academic year (nine months) during the past five years."

Prior Fulbright awards Reviewers should keep in mind that the policies of the FFSB require that, "as a general matter, *preference* for Fulbright Scholar opportunities will be given to candidates who have not previously received a Fulbright Scholar grant," or substantial recent experience abroad.

Applicants are required to address their prior Fulbright Scholar award(s) in the application, providing compelling justification to be awarded the proposed award.

Applicants with a prior Fulbright Scholar award are eligible to be recommended for another, provided the following are met:

- Waiting Period: As of the 2018-19 application cycle, a two-year waiting period between awards was implemented. This waiting period is applicable at the time of application. This means those with prior awards are eligible to apply two years after they completed their previous award. Applicants with prior awards are expected to make a strong justification in their application for an additional Fulbright award.

- Lifetime Limits: As of the 2014-15 application cycle, lifetime limits on Fulbright Scholar Program awards were lifted.

- COVID-19 Exemptions:
    - Fulbright Scholars with curtailed grants in 2019-20: As the program was suspended in March, grantees whose award was cut short due to COVID-19 were allowed to apply for an award in the 2021-22 academic year. These applicants should provide a justification and can be considered like others with a prior Fulbright Scholar grant (see above and page 9).
    - Fulbright Scholars selected for 2020-21: This cohort has not yet started their grants. Given uncertainties regarding COVID-19, they were encouraged to reapply. They can be considered as new applicants who were selected previously, and no justifications will be provided as they have not yet departed for their grants.

Veterans

Candidates who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States will be given preference, provided their qualifications are approximately equivalent to those of other candidates.

EVALUATING AND RATING APPLICATIONS

As a peer reviewer, you are granted access to the online application and review system (Slate), where the applications and associated review forms are located. (Separate instructions will be provided for using Slate.)

After reviewing each application, you provide supporting comments and ratings on the following areas. (The online system has prompts to guide this evaluation.)

- Applicant training, background, experience;
- Quality of the project statement;
- Project's potential impact, outcomes, and benefits;
- Personal qualities.
- For applicants who received Fulbright award(s) previously, their justification for another award.

Comments may be in cohesive paragraphs or bullet-point format, and do not need to be formal. Comments for one application should not refer to other applications.

Ratings: To help capture the strengths (and weaknesses) of an application, you enter a rating for each criterion using the following scale: exceeds all aspects of criterion; meets all aspects of criterion; meets some, but lacks some aspects of criterion; does not meet criterion.

Finally, you assign an overall rating of Highly Recommended, Recommended, or Not Recommended.

Recusals: If you cannot review an application due to a conflict of interest (see the Peer Review Committee Policies section of this document for more information), select "Recuse Myself" for your rating and include an explanation in the comments field. You should not use this rating for any other purpose.

What not to consider

- The host country's interest in the project, the feasibility of the project in the country, including the time and resources needed to complete the project, nor the availability of an invitation letter, if not required;
- Information about the applicant not presented in the application (do not search for information about the applicant online).

Guide to the overall ratings

The following definitions may be used in determining an overall rating for each application. There is no limit in the number of applications assigned a rating by each reviewer, nor by a single committee. (It is possible that a committee recommends all of their applications.)

<u>HIGHLY RECOMMENDED</u>

Application exceeds review criteria for all (or nearly all) of the following:

- Applicant's background, accomplishments, and experience uniquely qualify them for the proposed project, which is appropriate for their career stage and path, home institution/employer type, and teaching and administrative load (if applicable). This may include applicant's grants, fellowships, honors, awards, standing in their profession, as well as research, conference papers, presentations, publications, compositions, exhibitions, performances, or other achievements and professional activity.

- Applicant has strong record of service.

- Applicant is proficient in language(s) relevant to project, and at a level appropriate for project, or has proposed appropriate alternative.

- Project quality: Project is feasible, innovative, intellectually rigorous, and well-written, with sound, appropriate methodology; applicant addresses any local, political, and/or other issues that may arise; project may appear ambitious, but applicant demonstrates ability to adapt project for successful completion.

    o For applicants proposing a combination of activities and/or Flex, clear, thoughtful plans and rationale for allocation of time for each activity and/or grant segment.

- Applicant demonstrates cultural humility and willingness to engage with and learn from others; shows evidence of cultural adaptability and sensitivity, collegiality, and passion for the topic.

- The project is highly likely to be impactful, significant, and sustainable in the field(s) to which it will contribute; the applicant has included appropriate and achievable plans for dissemination of results; the project will meaningfully benefit the applicant's professional development.

- For applicants with prior Fulbright award(s) and/or substantial experience abroad, compelling rationale justifying need for Fulbright is provided.

RECOMMENDED

Application meets all or most review criteria. The application may have some weaknesses, but strengths compensate sufficiently. Note: You may recommend a candidate with reservations but should explain your concerns in your comments.

- Applicant's background, accomplishments, and/or experience qualify them for the proposed project, which is appropriate for their career stage and path, home institution/employer type, and teaching and administrative load (if applicable). This may include applicant's grants, fellowships, honors, awards, standing in their profession, as well as research, conference papers, presentations, publications, compositions, exhibitions, performances, or other achievements and professional activity.

- Applicant has a record of service.

- Applicant may be proficient in language(s) relevant to project, and at a level appropriate for project, or has proposed adequate alternative.

- Project quality: Project is likely feasible, and may be innovative, intellectually rigorous, and well-written, with sound, appropriate methodology; applicant may address any local, political, and/or other issues that may arise; project may be too ambitious, but applicant is likely able to adapt project for successful completion.

  o For applicants proposing a combination of activities and/or Flex, appropriate allocation of time for each activity and/or grant segment, and plans are adequately described.

- Applicant shows evidence of cultural adaptability and sensitivity, and collegiality.

- The project may be impactful, significant, and sustainable in the field(s) to which it will contribute; the applicant has included reasonable plans for dissemination of results; the project will benefit the applicant's professional development.

- For applicants with prior Fulbright award(s) and/or substantial experience abroad, sufficient rationale justifying need for additional Fulbright is provided.

NOT RECOMMENDED

Application does not meet criteria for some or all the following:

- Applicant is not sufficiently qualified for the proposed project. Applicant's record of grants, fellowships, honors, awards, standing in their profession, as well as research, conference papers, presentations, publications, compositions, exhibitions, performances, or other achievements and professional activity are not sufficient.

- Applicant does not have a record of service.

- Applicant is not proficient in language(s) relevant to project, and at a level appropriate for project, nor have they proposed appropriate alternative.

- Project quality: Project is not feasible (and/or risky, overly ambitious), not innovative, not described adequately to assess the plan or need for the project.

  o For applicants proposing a combination of activities and/or Flex, plans and rationale for allocation of time for each activity and/or grant segment are not sufficiently explained.

- Application does not demonstrate applicant's cultural adaptability, sensitivity, or collegiality.

- The project is unlikely to be impactful, significant, or sustainable; the applicant has not included realistic plans for dissemination of results; the project may only benefit the applicant, and/or may cause harm to the host, community, and/or culture.

- For applicants with prior Fulbright award(s) and/or substantial experience abroad, lack of rationale justifying need for additional Fulbright.

Rating applications with prior Fulbright Scholar award(s)

You may recommend an applicant with substantial recent experience abroad and/or a previous Fulbright Scholar award. (Other kinds of Fulbright grants including Student, Specialist, and Fulbright-Hays, are not counted in this.)

Having a previous Fulbright Scholar award (or awards) should not be the single reason to not recommend an application. However, it may be the difference between a Highly Recommended and Recommended rating.

During the meeting: If the committee recommends the application for an additional Fulbright award, the committee will be asked to identify justification(s) for the recommendation. The meeting facilitator will display the following list. Ideally, multiple justifications will be selected, and they will have been addressed clearly by the applicant. If the committee cannot find evidence of any rationale supporting another award, the application should be rated Not Recommended.

- Applicant's experience
    1. The prior award experience better prepares applicant
    2. The applicant possesses unique expertise that will be an asset to this Fulbright
    3. The applicant's experience is a strong fit for an additional Fulbright award
- Connection to the host country and/or host institution
    4. The applicant demonstrated a well-founded need to be in the host country and/or work with the host institution
- Evidence of impact
    5. The prior success of the previous award is likely to be repeated
    6. The project will have different outcomes from the previous Fulbright award
    7. The project will extend the applicant's experience to a new location
    8. There is a strong likelihood of long-term institutional linkages between the home and host institutions
- Applicant's personal qualities
    9. The applicant displays the ability to serve as a cultural ambassador/is culturally sensitive
    10. The applicant's previous experience indicates that the applicant will be flexible and adaptable in-country
- For Teaching/Research/Professional Projects:
    11. The project proposed is highly relevant and important to the host country/institution
    12. The applicant proposed a topic that is understudied, and the additional Fulbright award would be a benefit to this important topic
    13. The applicant is proposing a continuation of the prior project, which will maximize the impact on the host community and/or the research topic

PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting goals and roles

The peer review committee meeting will give you, as committee members, the opportunity to discuss the applications together in a virtual setting. The goal is to come to consensus on which applications to recommend for further consideration by the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (FFSB) and the in-country Fulbright Commission, based on award criteria and program policies.

Each meeting will be facilitated by IIE/CIES Fulbright Program staff. Their goal will be to keep the discussion on topic, constructive, and moving forward; to ensure each committee member has the opportunity to share thoughts about each applicant; and to address any questions on criteria, policies, procedures, application materials, and awards. The meeting facilitator will be introduced to you closer to the meeting date.

Meeting preparation

On the day before the meeting, IIE/CIES will prepare a committee scoring grid with all reviewers' overall ratings for the applications as well as a copy of your comments and ratings for each. IIE will then provide you with both prior to your meeting. (Late submissions of ratings and comments will delay this for the entire committee.)

You will not be able to view each other's comments. IIE/CIES will be able to display the applications via the videoconference platform in the meeting.

Meeting day

The scoring grid will be used to help organize the discussion, serving as a starting point.

To collect more data capturing how well each application met the review criteria, and to share more information with U.S. Embassies and Fulbright Commissions on the recommended applicants, we will record ratings on the individual review criteria in addition to the overall rating. The same scale used in initially evaluating applications will be used: exceeds all aspects of criterion; meets all aspects of criterion; meets some, but lacks some aspects of criterion; does not meet criterion.

Meeting expectations

IIE/CIES is committed to providing a safe and welcoming space for the review and discussion of applications. Peer reviewers, observers, and IIE/CIES staff are expected to treat each other and the applications with respect and consideration.

IIE/CIES recognizes that peer review meetings previously held in person require some adaptation to be held virtually.

As such, everyone is asked to adhere to the following protocols for virtual meetings: be present; minimize distractions (i.e., minimize alerts for emails and texts, close email and other computer applications); and be prepared for video participation. We ask that everyone be available for the duration of the meeting time and not schedule other meetings at the same time. At the same time, we will be sensitive to each other's situations. We will take breaks during the meeting.

For the meeting discussion, everyone is asked to be patient; listen actively; communicate openly and respectfully; handle disagreement constructively; recognize diversity, including of opinions and experiences; be flexible and collaborative; and not to engage in harassment.

It is our collective responsibility to ensure we create and maintain a safe, thoughtful, productive, and welcoming environment.

PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE POLICIES

Policy statement on conflict of Interest

It is the policy of the Fulbright Program to avoid any conflict of interest, or the appearance of conflict of interest, that may be related to membership on review committees organized by IIE/CIES. The following guidelines were established by IIE/CIES to limit, under certain circumstances, participation of reviewers in the evaluation of applications. These guidelines ensure that no applicant will gain or appear to gain an advantage resulting from a reviewer's service on a peer review committee.

Conflict of interest

Reviewers will recuse themselves from evaluation and final recommendation of applicants for whom they have ever written letters of reference for a Fulbright or other closely related award.

Reviewers will recuse themselves from evaluation and final recommendation of applications submitted by an immediate family member or partner.

Potential conflict of interest

A potential conflict of interest is when an applicant is a person with whom the reviewer has some significant personal or professional relationship (members of the same department, co-authors, research collaborators, relative, etc.) which could bias his/her judgment of the applicant or the application. You should determine whether such relationships involve a conflict of interest.

If you have determined you have a conflict of interest with the applicant, you should recuse yourself from the evaluation of the applicant in the review system, and you should select "Recuse Myself" in the rating section for the applicant.

If you are not sure, contact PeerReview@iie.org for guidance.

Eligibility/conflict of interest

- Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program peer reviewers may not write a letter of recommendation for an applicant being reviewed by the committee on which they serve until the academic year following the completion of service or resignation from the committee.

- Fulbright U.S. Scholar peer reviewers may not apply for a Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program award until one year after the completion of their service on the committee. For example, if a member reviews applications for awards in the 2021-22 application cycle, they could apply the following year, for an award in the 2022-23 application cycle.

- Fulbright U.S. Scholar peer reviewers may not serve on multiple review committees for the U.S. Scholar Program in the same year. (Peer reviewers may serve on U.S. Student National Screening Committees in the same year.)

- Members of the CIES Advisory Board may not submit an application for a Fulbright award until one year after the expiration of their service on the board.

Confidentiality of application materials

Application materials should be treated in a confidential manner. Reviewers are asked to strictly observe the confidential nature of committee deliberations, decisions, ratings and comments on specific individuals.

The nominations in the online review system and related attachments contain sensitive, confidential information and are provided solely for evaluating applicants for awards in the Fulbright U.S. Scholar

Program. Reviewers should not duplicate, use, or disclose these materials, in whole or in part, except to the extent necessary to evaluate the nominee.

Reviewers are prohibited from sharing the following with anyone outside the review process, while reviewing the applications and afterward:

- The applications and associated materials;
- The number and quality of applications;
- The meeting discussion, individual comments on applications, nor the outcome of the review.

Reviewers may consult colleagues on issues raised by an application but should never identify the applicant; comments from someone other than the reviewer are allowed, but should be acknowledged in the reviewer's evaluative remarks.

When considering candidates, reviewers should base their evaluation solely on the information provided in the applications. To prevent any applicant from gaining or appearing to gain an advantage in the review process, applicants are asked to not direct reviewers to materials outside their application package, and reviewers should not consult the internet or any other outside resource for supplemental applicant information.

Provisions of The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as Amended

- Applicants shall be considered without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, sex or age.
- Although the physical and mental health of candidates must be adequate to allow them to fulfill the terms of their award, no qualified disabled candidate will be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability.
- Preference shall be given to those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.
- Due consideration shall be given to applicants from all geographical areas of the United States.

Commitment to diversity

Guided by the statement on diversity issued by the U.S. Department of State, IIE/CIES strives to ensure that the Fulbright Scholar Program reflects the diversity of the United States.

Reviewers should note that the U.S. Department of State and IIE/CIES encourage participation in the Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program by qualified individuals and institutions that are generally considered under-represented, such as small liberal arts colleges, community colleges, minority-serving institutions, women, racial and ethnic minorities, and people with disabilities.

STAGES OF REVIEW IN THE UNITED STATES AND ABROAD

1. Preliminary Review   September 16 – Early October

Following the application deadline, IIE/CIES completes a technical review of applications for eligibility and completeness.

2. Peer Review   Early October – Mid-November

Reviewers evaluate applications based on established review criteria and recommend candidates for further consideration.

After this stage, all applicants are notified by IIE of their review status *(recommended or not recommended).*

Recommended applications are then sent forward for review abroad and to the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (FFSB).

3. Review in Host Country/Countries   December – May

Review of recommended Fulbright candidates by Fulbright bi-national Commissions or the public affairs section of U.S. embassies abroad, together with prospective host institutions, for final consideration.

4. Selection   December – May

Review and official selection of recommended candidates for Fulbright awards by the Foreign Scholarship Board and the U.S. Department of State.

Applicants selected for awards receive a letter from the FFSB chair as official notice of selection for a U.S. Fulbright Scholar award. Alternates and applicants not selected for awards will receive a letter regarding their status from IIE/CIES.

FULBRIGHT PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Peer review committees consist of groups of individuals with specialized discipline and world area expertise who evaluate applications and recommend candidates for further consideration to binational Fulbright Commissions and U.S. diplomatic posts in more than 150 countries.

Appointment

Prospective peer reviewers are identified based on recommendations from Fulbright Commissions and U.S. embassies, current and past peer reviewers, IIE staff, and individual self-nomination. Academic discipline, regional expertise, demographics, and institutional balance are taken into consideration in determining the final composition of the review committees.

Prospective reviewers are vetted by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), National Academy of Sciences (NAS), Social Science Research Council (SSRC).

Term

Committee membership is typically three years but is contingent upon each committee's needs and reviewer availability each year. Serving in consecutive years is not required.

Each year, IIE/CIES conducts a needs-analysis to assess the overall pool of applications in relation to available awards. IIE/CIES also helps to ensure that committee membership broadly represents a given year's applicant pool. In certain circumstances, a member's term may be extended for an additional year.

BACKGROUND ON THE FULBRIGHT SCHOLAR PROGRAM

Established under legislation introduced by then Senator Fulbright of Arkansas in 1946, the Fulbright Program is the flagship international educational exchange program of the U.S. government and is designed to "increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries." With this goal as a starting point, the Fulbright Program has provided more than 380,000 participants—chosen for their leadership potential—with the opportunity to observe each other's political, economic, educational and cultural institutions, to exchange ideas, and to embark on joint ventures of importance to the general welfare of the world.

The Fulbright Program awards approximately 8,000 new awards each year and currently operates in more than 150 countries worldwide. All Fulbright Scholars are selected through merit-based open

competition on the basis of academic and professional excellence, leadership potential, and an ability to share ideas with people in diverse cultures.

The U.S. component of the Fulbright Scholar Program is comprised of two to 12-month awards for teaching and/or research; specialized programs involving collaborative work across designated world regions; and several short-term seminars for education administrators. Together, the programs enable over 800 college and university faculty, administrators, professionals, and independent scholars from the United States to teach, research, or offer consulting expertise abroad.

Administration

The Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (FFSB)

The FFSB was established by Congress to supervise the Fulbright Program and to officially select students, scholars, teachers, trainees, and other persons to participate in the program. Appointed by the President of the United States, the 12-member Board meets quarterly. The Board formulates policy for the administration of the program, establishes criteria for the selection of candidates, gives final approval for candidates nominated for awards, and issues an annual report on the state of the Program.

United States Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA)

ECA directs the administration of the Fulbright Program under policy guidelines established by the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board and sets the Department's Fulbright funding and program priorities. ECA collaborates with the binational commissions and foundations in 49 countries, United States embassies in approximately 100 other countries, and a number of cooperating agencies in the United States in the administration of the Program.

The Institute of International Education/Council for International Exchange of Scholars (IIE/CIES) administers the Fulbright Scholar Program for faculty and professionals through a cooperative agreement with ECA. IIE/CIES assembles panels to conduct the merit review of candidates for Fulbright Scholar awards. IIE manages a wide variety of educational and cultural exchanges including the Fulbright Student Program, as well as training and technical assistance programs.

Fulbright Commissions, Foundations and U.S. Embassies abroad establish the numbers and categories of Fulbright awards to be offered each year and supervise scholar competitions locally. The slate of U.S. candidates recommended by peer review committees is forwarded to U.S. Embassies and Fulbright Commissions for their recommendations.

Funding

The primary source of funding for the Fulbright Program is an annual appropriation made by the U.S. Congress to the United States Department of State. Participating governments and host institutions in many countries and in the United States also contribute financially through cost sharing, as well as by indirect support such as salary supplements, tuition waivers, university housing, and other benefits.