

Reviewing Research grant applications

Please note that this scoring criteria is for Small Research, Synthesis Groups, Pedagogical Research and Long Term Research grants.

If you are reviewing an Outreach Grant or Connecting Ecologists to Other Disciplines 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, which will lead to a significant advance in scientific understanding.
- The proposed work is at the leading edge internationally
- A clear understanding of the potential impact of the work is demonstrated, including how this impact and the results will be shared

4 – Excellent

- There is an outstanding alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements which will lead to a significant contribution to the advance in scientific understanding

- The proposed work is at a high international standard
- A clear understanding of the potential impact of the work is demonstrated including how this impact and the results will be shared

3 – Very Good

- There is a very good alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements which will make a contribution to the advance in scientific understanding
- The proposed work is internationally competitive
- An understanding of the potential impact of the work is demonstrated, although more information is needed to understand how the applicant will share the impact and results

2 – Good

- There is some alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements, which will lead to a minor advance in scientific understanding
- The proposed work has merit but is not internationally competitive
- Some understanding of the potential impact of the work is demonstrated, although it is unclear if the applicant understands the process of how to share the impact and results

1 – Not competitive

- There is little or no alignment with the grant's objectives and requirements, and it is unlikely to advance scientific understanding
- The proposed work has merit but is not internationally competitive
- Little understanding of the potential impact of the work is demonstrated

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 work are achievable, and this is supported by an outstanding, highly appropriate research plan and methodology. There are no questions about the feasibility of this project.
- The work represents outstanding value for money, and all resources requested are completely justified
- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work, use both routine and novel ways to engage end-users, and are likely to generate very significant potential for impact

4 – Excellent

- The objectives of the proposed work are achievable, and this is supported by an excellent, highly appropriate research plan and methodology with very few questions about the feasibility of the project.
- The work represents excellent value for money, and most of the resources requested are completely justified
- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work, use both routine and novel ways to engage end-users, and are likely to generate significant potential for impact

3 – Very Good

- The objectives of the proposed work are achievable, and this is supported by a very good, appropriate research plan and methodology, although some further clarity is needed on the feasibility of the project
- The work represents very good value for money, and most resources requested are justified
- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work, use both routine and novel ways to engage end-users, and are likely to generate potential for impact

2 – Good

- The objectives of the proposed work are mostly achievable, and this is supported by a good, appropriate research plan and methodology, although more information is needed to understand the methods and timelines
- The work represents reasonable value for money, and some of the resources requested are justified
- Outreach activities proposed are appropriate to the work, use either routine or novel ways to engage end-users, and may generate potential for impact

1 – Not Competitive

- The objectives of the proposed work are not achievable and are supported by a poor research plan and methodology. It is difficult to understand the methods and the timelines for this project.
- The work represents poor value for money, and few or none of the resources requested are justified
- Outreach activities proposed are not appropriate to the work, don't use either routine or novel ways to engage end-users and are unlikely to generate potential for impact

Candidate score

5 – Exceptional

- The applicant has provided outstanding evidence of their previous employment and education history that directly relates to their proposed project and demonstrated an outstanding capability to deliver this project

AND/OR

- The applicant is early in their career but shows outstanding future potential based on their previous experiences. They have evidenced that they would be very capable of delivering their proposed project. Their proposed project directly relates to their career path, and it's clear that this grant would benefit them.

4 – Excellent

- The applicant has provided excellent evidence of their previous employment and education history that mostly relates to their proposed project and demonstrated an excellent capability to deliver this project. Some information could have been expanded to help understand past experiences.

AND/OR

- The applicant is early in their career but shows excellent future potential based on their previous experiences. There is only a little bit of uncertainty that they might be unable to deliver their proposed project. Their proposed project directly relates to their career path, and it's clear that this grant would benefit them.

3 – Very Good

- The applicant has provided very good evidence of their previous employment and education history that relates to their proposed project and demonstrated a very good capability to deliver this project. Some of the information provided could have been expanded to help understand past experiences.

AND/OR

- The applicant is early in their career but shows very good future potential based on their previous experiences. There is some uncertainty that they might be unable to deliver their proposed project although they have support from their references. Their proposed project relates to their career path and it's clear that this grant would benefit them.

2 – Good

- The applicant has provided good evidence of their previous employment and education history that relates to their proposed project and demonstrated good capability to deliver this project although there is some uncertainty if they would be able to deliver the proposed project.

AND/OR

- The applicant is early in their career but shows good future potential based on their previous experiences. There is some uncertainty that they might be unable to deliver their proposed project, and the support from their references is vague. Their proposed project somewhat relates to their career path, but it is unclear if this grant would benefit them.

1 – Not Competitive

- The applicant has provided little or no evidence of their previous employment and education history that relates to their proposed project and has not demonstrated the capability to deliver this project

AND/OR

- The applicant is early in their career but has provided insufficient information regarding their experiences and how this relates to their project. There is a high level of uncertainty that they might not be able to deliver their proposed project and the support from their references is not clear. Their proposed project does not relate to their career path, and it is unclear if this grant would benefit them.

[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.