Society Supported Conference Grants Scoring Criteria

	Criterion	Score
Benefits to research	Applicant provides specific details, such as topics, concepts, and issues regarding the research/work of the invited speaker. Applicant emphasises the importance of this research and having the speaker at the named meeting. Applicant explains why the topic is timely, and if relevant, novel in its respective field.	3
	Applicant provides general information regarding the research/work of the invited speaker. Applicant acknowledges the importance of this research and having the speaker at the named meeting. Applicant explains why the topic is timely, and if relevant, novel in its respective field.	2
	Applicant provides little information regarding the research/work of the invited speaker and acknowledges the importance of having the speaker at the named meeting. No description is provided for why the topic is timely or novel in its respective field.	1
	Invited speaker is not relevant to the audience's research interests.	0
Benefits to professional development of audience	Applicant clearly details the anticipated audience, description and size, and specifically describes what the intended audience will gain from attending the meeting. Applicant specifies the ways they will facilitate knowledge exchange and networking.	3
	Applicant briefly details the anticipated audience, description and size, and generally describes what the intended audience will gain from attending the meeting. Ways in which knowledge exchange and networking are facilitated are unclear.	2
	Relevance of the meeting to the audience's professional development is unclear or under-developed. No relation to overall objectives of Society conferences.	1
	Meeting is not relevant to the audience's professional development.	0
Equality, diversity and inclusion	Applicant has clearly addressed the Society's EDI policy when identifying invited speakers for the meeting. Selection of invited speakers is appropriately justified where membership diversity statistics cannot be reflected. Applicant has included a meeting code of conduct.	3
	Applicant has attempted to address the Society's EDI policy when identifying invited speakers for the meeting. Selection of invited speakers is vaguely justified where membership diversity statistics cannot be reflected. Applicant has referenced a meeting code of conduct.	2
	Applicant has attempted to address the Society's EDI policy when identifying invited speakers for the meeting but has not justified selection of invited speakers when membership diversity statistics cannot be reflected	1
	Applicant has not considered the Society's EDI policy when selecting invited speakers for the meeting.	0
Costs	Applicant describes a detailed and complete budget (travel, venue, lodging, etc) and seeks cost saving measures, and other funding sources to guarantee meeting success.	3
	Applicant provides detailed and complete information regarding budget, but no cost saving measures are obvious.	2

	Applicant provides information regarding budget, but it is incomplete/insufficient/unrealistic.	1
	Applicant does not provide information regarding budget.	0
Meeting programme*	Programme is relevant to the remit of the Microbiology Society. Programme provides a general outline of the meeting including potential speakers, affiliations and talk topics/themes with time slots roughly allocated. The programme includes a variety of content delivery options to engage delegates, including but not limited to, panel discussions, poster and oral presentations.	3
	Programme is relevant to the remit of the Microbiology Society. Programme provides an incomplete outline of the meeting with time slots roughly allocated. The programme includes a variety of content delivery options.	2
	Programme is relevant to the remit of the Microbiology Society. Programme provides an unclear outline of the meeting sessions. The programme lacks variety of options for delivering content.	1
	Programme is necessary but not provided.	0
Promotion and evaluation	Applicant clearly describes a complete event communication plan; detailed methods to promote the meeting and Society are included in this. The applicant details appropriate methods and criteria that will be used to evaluate the meeting.	3
	Applicant describes a complete event communication plan; some methods to promote the meeting and Society are included in this. The applicant vaguely describes some methods and criteria that will be used to evaluate the meeting.	2
	Promotion and evaluation plans are unclear and/or under-developed.	1
	No promotion or evaluation plans are provided.	0
Total score (/18)		

*Taking into consideration key meeting organising dates and grant processing timelines, reviewers should not expect to see complete meeting programme details. Much of this information is likely to be obtained following delegate registration, abstract submission etc.

Society Supported Conference Grants Scoring Criteria