

SCORING RUBRIC for the member-wide Science Outreach and Communication Grant

Each question is scored on a scale from 1-5 (descriptions of the values is listed under each scoring criteria)

| Scoring criteria |
|---|
| CONTENT |
| Reasonability of program aims and objectives 1 - The proposed work lacks specific aims and objectives. 3 - The proposed work has stated aims or objectives, but they do not completely support ASBMB or align with the criteria statement (promoting the understanding of the molecular nature of life). 5 - The proposed work has clearly stated and reasonable aims and objectives that support the criteria statement (promoting the understanding of the molecular nature of life). |
| Justification of proposed program and activities 1 -The proposed work does not justify the program or activities or address a clearly stated need 3 -The proposed work may justify the program or activities or address a clearly stated need 5 -The proposed work is strongly and clearly justified and addresses the goals and objectives of the project. |
| TARGET AUDIENCE (While we cannot support programs that are exclusionary, we welcome programs that promote belonging and opportunity for all.) |
| Defining the intended target audience 1 - Does not define the target audience, identify a legitimate need, or demonstrate an understanding of the target audience 3 - Defines a target audience, but does not go into details as to why this audience was chosen, or is vague in demonstrating an understanding and legitimate need of the target audience. 5 - Clearly defines the target audience as evidenced by the fact that you can easily say who is benefiting and why, and identifies a legitimate need with a clear understanding of the target audience. |

SCORING RUBRIC for the member-wide Science Outreach and Communication Grant

| |
|--|
| <p>Relevance of activities for target audiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1 - Does not describe how the proposed activities is relevant or will benefit the target audience3 - Provides some indication of how the proposed activities are relevant, but it is vague5 - Clearly describes how the proposed activities are relevant to the target audience & what they'll gain from the activities. |
| EXECUTION PLAN |
| <p>Reasonability of execution plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1 - The execution plan, as described, would exceed the timeline, budget, resources, or scope, does not incorporate partners or collaborators.3 - The execution plan seems reasonable for the most part, but may need additional information, includes community partners, but does not explain engagement.5 - The execution plan can be reasonably accomplished within the timeframe, budget, resources, and scope proposed, includes community partners and explains engagement. |
| <p>Organization and delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1 - Does not address how the proposed program will be organized and delivered, there is no mention of collaborators, and health and safety is not addressed.3 - Does outline how the program will be organized and delivered, but it is vague or incomplete. There is mention of volunteers, but how they will be trained or supported is vague. Notes some safety considerations.5 - Clearly describes how the proposed program will be organized and delivered. Health and safety considerations are clearly outlined. |
| ALIGNMENT |
| <p>Alignment with society's aims and/or impact on participants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1 -The proposed work does not align with the Society's ethos (promoting the understanding of the molecular nature of life).3 -The proposed work aligns somewhat with the Society's ethos but may not be highly impactful.5 -The proposed work strongly aligns with the Society's ethos and is highly impactful on participants. |
| BUDGET |

SCORING RUBRIC for the member-wide Science Outreach and Communication Grant

Reasonability of the proposed budget and cost effectiveness

- 1 - Does not include a budget **or** budget includes discouraged items (transportation, food) **without justification** and/or rises above the $\frac{1}{4}$ of total budget limit.
- 3 - A budget is included but does not clearly describe how the funds will be used, is not cost effective, or does not include cost per item. If funding for food and/or transportation is requested, it remains under $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total budget limit, but it is not justified.
- 5 - Includes a clear, cost effective budget detailing plans for how the funds will be used and includes costs, suppliers, and materials for each item. If funding for food and/or transportation is requested, a clear justification is provided.

Impact of materials/program

- 1 - Focuses only on the planning of the event with little to no consideration of community impact/benefits.
- 3 - Describes clear community benefits with some measures of impact (i.e. event feedback and testimonials).
- 5 - Demonstrates meaningful potential for significant impact/benefit, showing substantial consideration of participant learning and confidence (i.e. pre/post event assessments, follow-up surveys).

TIMELINE

Feasibility of activity plan within the specified time period

- 1 - Does not include a timeline for the proposed project
- 3 - A timeline is included but the timeline may not be feasible or is incomplete or vague in parts
- 5 - A clear, readily attainable timeline is included.