

## Reviewing Connecting Ecologists with Other Disciplines grant applications

Please note that this scoring criteria is for the Connecting Ecologists to Other Disciplines grant.

If you are reviewing an Outreach Grant or Research Grant, please refer to their scoring criteria.

## Scoring the application and leaving feedback

Full details of each grant scheme, including objectives and requirements, are available on [the BES website](#).

Please provide a score and comments for (1) the aims of the placement (2) the value of the placement; and (3) the candidate

- **Do not** add your name to any feedback. All scoring is anonymous.
- Use the scoring criteria below

## How are decisions made on which grants are funded?

Thank you for completing your reviews.

All reviews are collated and the top proportion of applications are discussed in detail at a BES Grants Committee Meeting. The BES Grants Committee decides which projects are awarded funding, guided by your comments.

## Scoring Criteria

When scoring, you may find that a score may fall between points, (e.g. you want to score higher than a 4 but it's not quite a 5) In this instance, please consider the whole application when deciding the final score for each scoring section.

As each application is reviewed by 3 members of the review college, your scores will be combined with the reviews from the other members to get an average.

If applicable please remember to provide constructive feedback to the applicant to help them improve future applications.

## Proposed placement

### 5 – Exceptional

- The candidate thoroughly understands the organisation they would like to join and fully understands the organisation's outputs.
- The candidate has provided an outstanding explanation of their own skills and how they can fit into the proposed organisation
- The candidate has provided an outstanding agreed plan and has provided a strong reason for how the new skills and knowledge they hope to learn will transfer to their ecological discipline

### 4 – Excellent

- The candidate has an excellent understanding of the organisation they would like to join, although it is a little unclear what the organisation does
- The candidate has provided an excellent explanation of their own skills and how they can fit into the proposed organisation, although not all of their current existing skills are referenced to the organisational outputs
- The candidate has provided an excellent training plan with very few gaps, and has provided a very good reason of how the new skills and knowledge learned will transfer to their ecological discipline

### 3 – Very Good

- The candidate has a very good understanding of the organisation they would like to join, although it is difficult to understand what the organisation does.
- The candidate has provided a very good explanation of their own skills and how they can fit into the proposed organisation, although many of their current existing skills are not referenced to the organisational outputs
- The candidate has provided a very good training plan although there are some gaps of where the new skills and knowledge will be gained. They have provided a good reason of how the new skills and knowledge learned will transfer to their ecological discipline

## 2 – Good

- The candidate has some understanding of the organisation they would like to join, although the information provided is minimal
- The candidate has provided a good explanation of their own skills and how they can fit into the proposed organisation, although most of their current existing skills are not referenced to the organisational outputs
- The candidate has provided a good training plan although there are large gaps on how the new skills and knowledge gained can transfer to their ecological discipline.

## 1 – Not Competitive

- The candidate has very little understanding of the organisation they would like to join
- The candidate has provided little explanation of their own skills and how they can fit into the proposed organisation
- The candidate has provided a vague training plan and it is difficult to understand how they will use any of the transferable skills and knowledge to their own ecological discipline.

## Value of the placement

### 5 – Exceptional

- There is an outstanding alignment with the grant objectives in helping ecologists share their skills and knowledge with the host organisation and learn new skills and knowledge from a discipline outside their area of expertise. There are no questions about how this will be achieved.
- The applicant has provided an outstanding budget, with all expenses clearly outlined and justified representing excellent value for money.
- Evidence has been provided for all of their expected expenses, such as cost of living expenses. Evidence can include receipts, invoices, relevant weblinks

### 4 – Excellent

- There is an excellent alignment with the grant objectives in helping ecologists share their skills and knowledge with the host organisation and learn new skills and knowledge from a discipline outside their area of expertise. There are very few questions about how this will be achieved.
- The applicant has provided an excellent budget. All expenses are clearly outlined and justified representing excellent value for money, although some expenses seem to be over/undervalued.
- Evidence has been provided for most of their expected expenses, such as cost of living expenses. Evidence can include receipts, invoices, relevant weblinks

### 3 – Very Good

- There is a very good alignment with the grant objectives in helping ecologists share their skills and knowledge with the host organisation and learn new skills and knowledge from a discipline outside their area of expertise. There are a few questions about how this will be achieved.

- The applicant has provided a very good budget. The majority of expenses are clearly outlined and justified representing very good value for money, although several of the expenses seem to be over/undervalued.
- Evidence has been provided for some of their expected expenses, such as cost of living expenses. Evidence can include receipts, invoices, relevant weblinks.

## 2 – Good

- There is a good alignment with the grant objectives in helping ecologists share their skills and knowledge with the host organisation and learn new skills and knowledge from a discipline outside their area of expertise. There are several questions about how this will be achieved.
- The applicant has provided a good budget. The majority of expenses are clearly outlined although not well justified. The proposed length of the placement does not seem to match the budget
- Little evidence has been provided for their expected expenses, such as cost of living expenses. Evidence can include receipts, invoices, relevant weblinks

## 1 – Not Competitive

- There is little alignment with the grant objectives in helping ecologists share their skills and knowledge with the host organisation and learn new skills and knowledge from a discipline outside their area of expertise. There are a lot of questions about how this will be achieved.
- The applicant has provided a vague budget. The majority of expenses are not clearly described or well justified.
- No evidence has been provided for expected expenses, such as living expenses

## Candidate Score

### 5 – Exceptional

- The organisation has provided an outstanding reason why they would like the candidate to join their organisation and how the agreed ambitions will be achieved
- The candidate has provided outstanding evidence of their past experiences and has provided a very high level of confidence that their experience will greatly benefit them and the host organisation.

### 4 – Excellent

- The organisation has provided an excellent reason why they would like the candidate to join their organisation and how the agreed ambitions will be achieved.
- The candidate has provided excellent evidence of their past experiences and has provided a high level of confidence that their experience will greatly benefit them and the host organisation.

### 3 – Very Good

- The organisation has provided a very good reason why they would like the candidate to join their organisation and how the agreed ambitions will be achieved. Some more information would be helpful to understand how the candidate will be trained.
- The candidate has provided very good evidence of their past experiences and has provided a good level of confidence that they will benefit from this opportunity

### 2 – Good

- The organisation has provided a good reason why they would like the candidate to join their organisation and how the agreed ambitions will be achieved. Some more information would be helpful to understand how the candidate will be trained.
- The candidate has provided good evidence of their past experiences and has provided a small level of confidence that they will benefit from this opportunity

## 1 – Not Competitive

- The organisation has provided a vague reason why they would like the candidate to join their organisation and how the agreed ambitions will be achieved. A lot more information would be helpful to understand how the candidate will be trained.
- The candidate has provided very little evidence of their past experiences and has not provided any level of confidence that they will benefit from this opportunity

## Confidence Score

Comments are not compulsory but please include a score: YES = 1, NO = 0

If there are any confidential comments you wish for the committee to see e.g. regarding the candidates' eligibility or feasibility of the project, please place these in the box below. These comments will not be shared with the candidate.

## Project Remark

Please copy and paste any comments that you made regarding the aims and value of the placement into this box. This box will be sent to the candidate, so please make sure all feedback is constructive and focused on the project, rather than the individual.