

## Reviewing Outreach grant applications

Please note that this scoring criteria is for Outreach Grants only.

If you are reviewing an or Connecting Ecologists to Other Disciplines grant or Research grant, please refer to their scoring criteria.

## Scoring the application and leaving feedback

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

Please provide a score and comments for (1) the project's aims; (2) the project design; and (3) the candidate's capability to deliver the project.

- **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 makes the final decision on which projects are awarded funding, guided by your comments.

## Scoring Criteria

Please score the project aims, design and candidate's potential from 1-5. 5 being the highest score, and 1 being the lowest.

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.

## Project aims

**Provide a score for the project aims.**

- Please copy any comments you make here into the '*Project Remark*' box at the bottom of the form.
- Ensure any feedback here is **constructive and focused on the project rather than the individual**.

### 5 – Exceptional

- There is an outstanding alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements
- The project is based on exceptional and sound research and clearly identifies the target audience, the approximate number of individuals it is likely to reach and the expected levels of engagement.
- The proposed work is likely to lead to significant advances in engagement with issues associated with ecological research

### 4 – Excellent

- There is an excellent alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements
- The project is based on high quality, sound research and clearly identifies the target audience and the approximate number of individuals it is likely to reach

- The proposed work is likely to make an important contribution to advance in engagement with issues associated with ecological research

### **3 – Very good**

- There is a very good alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements
- The project is based on very good research and identifies the target audience and the approximate number of individuals it is likely to reach
- The proposed work is likely to make a contribution to the advance in engagement with issues associated with ecological research

### **2 – Good**

- There is a some alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements
- The project is based on research with some merit and attempts to identify the target audience and approximate number of individuals it is likely to reach
- The proposed work will lead to only a minor advance in engagement with issues associated with ecological research

### **1 – Not competitive**

- There is little or no alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements
- The project is based on poor/un-competitive research and does not identify the target audience nor the approximate number of individuals it is likely to reach
- The proposed work is unlikely to lead to any advance in engagement with issues associated with ecological research

## **Project design**

### **Provide a score for the project design and methods.**

- Please copy any comments you make here into the '*Project Remark*' box at the bottom of the form.
- Ensure any feedback here is **constructive and focused on the project rather than the individual**

### **5 – Exceptional**

- The objectives of the proposed project/event are achievable and this is supported by an outstanding, highly appropriate delivery plan and methodology based on current best practise appropriate to the target audience
- The work represents outstanding value for money and all resources requested are completely justified
- Outreach activities proposed are highly appropriate to the work and use both routine and innovative ways to engage end-users that are extremely likely to generate significant impact
- The project includes appropriate assessment and evaluation mechanisms undertaken against clearly defined success criteria

### **4 – Excellent**

- The objectives of the proposed project/event are achievable and this is supported by an excellent delivery plan and methodology based on current best practise appropriate to the target audience
- The work represents excellent value for money and all resources requested are completely justified
- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work, use both routine and innovative ways to engage end-users and are likely to generate significant potential for impact
- The project includes appropriate assessment and evaluation mechanisms undertaken against success criteria that are mostly well defined.

### **3 – Very good**

- The objectives of the proposed project/event are achievable and this is supported by a very good delivery plan and methodology based on current best practise appropriate to the target audience
- The work represents very good value for money and most resources requested are justified

- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work and use routine ways to engage end-users and are likely to generate potential for impact
- The project includes appropriate assessment and evaluation mechanisms, undertaken against success criteria that are partly defined

## **2 – Good**

- The objectives of the proposed project/event are mostly achievable and this is supported by a good delivery plan and methodology based on current best practice appropriate to the target audience
- The work represents reasonable value for money and some of the resources requested are justified
- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work and use routine ways to engage end-users that may generate potential for impact
- The project includes some appropriate assessment and evaluation mechanisms however it lacks clearly defined success criteria

## **1 – Not competitive**

- The objectives of the proposed project/event are not achievable and they are not supported by a delivery plan and methodology based on current best practice appropriate to the target audience
- The work represents poor value for money and little or none of the resources requested are justified
- Outreach activities proposed are not appropriate to the work, do not use either routine and innovative ways to engage end-users and are unlikely to generate impact
- The project does not include appropriate assessment and evaluation mechanisms

## Potential of the applicant

### **5 – Exceptional**

- The applicant demonstrates exceptional links to the research community at regional and where appropriate international levels
- The applicant has a proven or demonstrable ability to develop and implement very strong partnerships with practitioners and/or non-academic partners in the delivery of projects
- Applicants have demonstrated an exceptional ability to measure and communicate the impact of their activities

### **4 – Excellent**

- The applicant demonstrates excellent links to the research community at regional and where appropriate international levels
- The applicant has a proven or demonstrable ability to develop and implement strong partnerships with practitioners and/or non-academic partners in the delivery of projects
- Applicants have demonstrated an excellent ability to measure and communicate the impact of their activities

### **3 – Very Good**

- The applicant demonstrates very good links to the research community at regional and where appropriate international levels
- The applicant has a proven or demonstrable ability to develop and implement partnerships with practitioners and/or non-academic partners in the delivery of projects
- Applicants have demonstrated clear ability to measure and communicate the impact of their activities

### **2 – Good**

- The applicant demonstrates good links to the research community at regional and where appropriate international levels
- The applicant has some proven or demonstrable ability to develop and implement partnerships with practitioners and/or non-academic partners in the delivery of projects
- Applicants have demonstrated some ability to measure and communicate the impact of their activities

**1 – Not competitive**

- The applicant does not demonstrate strong links to the research community at regional and where appropriate international levels
- The applicant has little or no experience in developing and implementing strong partnerships with practitioners and/or non-academic partners in the delivery of projects
- Applicants have demonstrated no ability to measure and communicate the impact of their activities

**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 project aims and design 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.