



Institute of  
Professional Editors

# ROSANNE FITZGIBBON EDITORIAL AWARD (The Rosie)

## NOMINATION GUIDELINES

The Rosanne Fitzgibbon Editorial Award (the Rosie) for editorial excellence, as demonstrated in one work, honours the memory of Rosanne Fitzgibbon DE (1947–2012) – a distinguished editor of literary fiction, nonfiction and scholarly work in literary studies. Rosie, as she was known, gave generously to her authors and to her profession, serving in many roles in many organisations. She was the inaugural recipient of the Beatrice Davis Editorial Fellowship in 1992.

The Rosie award is managed and administered by the IPed Standing Committee on Awards and Prizes with support from the IPed Secretary and IPed Communications Officer.

### **Eligibility of published works**

The nominated work may be a fiction or nonfiction published work in any genre, or another substantial body of work.

Examples of eligible works include a book, a series of books (with a single editor), or a monograph series. They may be in print or electronic format.

Potential nominees should contact [awards@iped-editors.org](mailto:awards@iped-editors.org) if they have any questions about whether a particular project fits the criteria for nomination. Please put “Rosie award” in your email subject line as this email serves all of the IPEd awards.

## Eligibility of nominees

Nominated editors must:

- be current (paid-up) IPEd professional members or nominated staff members under an IPEd corporate membership at the time of nomination and throughout the award process
- have the support of the author and publisher (who may be the same in the case of self-published works) for the nomination in relation to a specific project
- submit all supporting information requested in the nomination guidelines
- be the only editor who has edited the work (i.e. have not received AI assistance in their editing or editorial assistance from another editor). AI may only be used as a grammar, spelling or punctuation tool (e.g. Grammarly, Word, PerfectIt).

An editor may be nominated for more than one project in a given year and may be nominated in multiple years, provided the nominations are for different editorial relationships.

Table 1 maps eligibility with congruent roles.

**Table 1. Eligibility for the Rosie award**

| <i>Congruent roles</i>                             | <i>Eligibility</i>   |
|--|--|
| If the author or the editor is also the publisher  | eligible   |
| If the editor is also the author                   | not eligible   |
| If the editor is also the author and the publisher | not eligible   |
| If the author is deceased                          | eligible (provide materials from someone who can comment from a writer-like perspective) |

If a commissioning editor was involved in commissioning or perusing, assessing and accepting the manuscript for another editor to structurally edit, copyedit and proofread, this is acceptable.

If an author and editor work together to the extent that a manuscript is accepted for publication, the editor is eligible. The publisher’s endorsement is still needed.

## Conflicts of interest

To avoid potential conflicts of interest, anyone involved in administration or judging of the current Rosie is ineligible for nomination for this award.

## Selection criteria

Nominations should reference the criteria in Table 2 below and provide supporting evidence.

**Table 2. Selection criteria and skills tested for the Rosie award\***

| <i>Criteria</i>  | <i>Skills tested</i>                       |
|--|--|
| 1. Rapport with author/s   | Diplomacy                                  |
| 2. Adherence to, or improvement of, the brief  | Management                                 |
| 3. Thoroughness, consistency (structure, headings, table numbers, figures, captions, references, footnotes, voice and tone, language, characterisation, storyline, timelines, loose ends)                          | Attention to detail                        |
| 4. Insight (making queries and suggestions, seeking permissions where necessary, significant improvement to the quality of writing and/or the structure of the work, and/or addressing any potential legal issues) | Problem solving<br>Advanced editing skills |
| 5. Appropriate research or fact checking, where required   | Research                                   |
| 6. Credibility and trustworthiness   | Professionalism and ethics                 |
| 7. Recognition of the targeted readership  | Assessing reader's expectations            |

*\*Skills tested may be demonstrated under more than one criterion.*

## Use of AI in preparing nominations

The use of AI for spelling, grammar and punctuation purposes is permitted for all nominator and nominee documents. No other use of AI is permitted.

## Questions?

Send an email to [awards@iped-editors.org](mailto:awards@iped-editors.org) if you have questions about the eligibility criteria or nomination process. Please put "Rosie award" in your email subject line as this email serves all of the IPed awards.

## Nomination process

### Stage 1: Initial nomination

- A. The initial nomination comprises:
- the completed [Nomination Form](#)
  - three copies of the nominated work
  - an outline (max. 750 words) of the nominated work that indicates why the editor is nominated for their work on this project, addresses the award's criteria and confirms that all parties (the editor, author and publisher) support the nomination
  - a written statement, or dot point list, from the editor (max. 500 words) summarising their experience in the publishing industry. In relation to the nominated work, they should mention:
    - the degree of autonomy with which they worked
    - their key contributions
    - why they are proud of their editing on this work.
- B. Submission of the initial nomination can be made by the following methods:

Post nomination documents to Erin Rundle, c/- IPed, PO Box 4118, Lake Haven NSW 2263.

*or*

Submit nomination documents by email to [secretary@iped-editors.org](mailto:secretary@iped-editors.org). Copies of the nominated work must be in PDF electronic format.

*Note: if you are considering sending in a different electronic format, it is imperative that you check first with the IPed Secretary at the above email address for instructions. Any requests for variations will be managed on a case-by-case basis.*

*Note: printed copies of the nominated work will not be returned unless this has been negotiated before they are submitted. IPed cannot guarantee that books will be returned in saleable condition.*

Judges will select a longlist of nominees based on initial nominations. Longlisted editors will be invited to submit full nominations in Stage 2.

## Stage 2: Invitation to full nomination

Longlisted editors will be notified and asked to submit the following contributions by email to [secretary@iped-editors.org](mailto:secretary@iped-editors.org) for judging during the second stage of nomination:

- Written statement from the author (max. 500 words) on how the editor contributed to the final result of the nominated work, referring to specific parts of the work as appropriate. This statement should refer to the selection criteria (see Table 2), including how the editor's insight (queries, suggestions, problem solving, significant improvement to the quality of writing and/or the structure of the work) improved the work; rapport with the author; and credibility and trustworthiness.
- Written statement from the publisher (max. 500 words) on how the editor contributed to the final result of the nominated work. This statement should refer to the selection criteria (see Table 2), noting what the editor's brief was and their adherence to, or improvement of, it; the editor's consistency and thoroughness; any key fact checking; any identification of potential legal or copyright issues; and recognition of the target readership.

*Note: if the work is self-published, the author should provide two statements covering both the author and publisher perspectives.*

- Written statement from the editor (max. 1000 words) that includes analysis of their editorial input to the nominated work, specifying their level of responsibility (for example, structural editing, copyediting, developmental work or other) and the degree of autonomy with which they worked. This statement should refer to selection criteria (see Table 2) and their key contributions to the nominated work in relation to the award's criteria.

*Note: there is no need to repeat any information from the initial submission as the judges will have access to this when they undertake judging of full submissions*

## Stage 3: Shortlist and winner announcement

From the full nominations submitted, judges will select a shortlist. Shortlist results will be notified to successful nominees and their nominator and published via a media release.

The judges will then select a winner from the shortlisted nominees. The winner will be notified (under embargo) prior to the biennial IPEd Editors Conference and announced as part of an awards presentation event at the conference. The winner will be invited to attend the presentation event to receive their award and prize.

## Timeline

Key dates for the nominations process are provided in the [Rosie award timeline](#).