

Scoring System for ABS student research grants

For each proposal assigned to you, we ask that you review the proposal with regard to research merit and also review the proposal with regard to contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI). Beginning in 2020 all grants are required to include a DEI statement, and all reviews should address this aspect of the proposal. Therefore, we ask you to provide 2 separate numerical ratings (one for research and one for DEI), with 10 or 5 the highest rating and 1 or 0 the lowest on research and DEI rating scale, respectively. The review, which will be returned to the applicant, should also include a brief written (1-2 paragraph) evaluation of the research proposal commenting on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. In this written review there should be an explicit but brief (2-4 sentences) evaluation of the DEI component. A description of the DEI solicitation is provided below to assist reviewers in their comments. The ABS grant review committee will weigh the two rankings to create a final ranking for the proposal. The DEI ranking will be taken into account for all proposals but will weigh more substantially in consideration of the new JEDI award (Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion).

Research Scoring

The following is intended as a guide to the research rating system. Past experience tells us that most of the proposals are rated as good or higher so we encourage reviewers to use the **full scale** to the extent possible in order to separate out the superb proposals from the very good ones. The following is meant as a guide to numerical research scoring.

Category of Proposed Research	Numerical Score	Description
Exceptional	10.0	A proposal that will generate results worthy of Science or Nature: represents a substantial breakthrough. Likely to be picked up by popular press
Outstanding	9.0	A proposal that will generate results worthy of the best journals in the specific discipline: will be an important paper and cited often. Likely to be written up in secondary sources or "editor's pick". No obvious weaknesses.
Very good	8.0	A proposal that will generate novel results of broad interests: will be cited often. Very strong study design.
Good	7.0	A proposal that will generate useful results in a narrower field of study: likely to be cited. Strong study design.
Above average	6.0	A proposal that will generate publishable results in a narrower field: less likely to be cited outside of the field: good study design.
Average	5.0	A proposal that will generate publishable results: there may be uncertainty about study design but not sufficiently important to prevent publication of the results. Minor concerns about study design but overall adequate.
Satisfactory	4.0	A proposal likely to generate publishable results: some concerns about study design or choice of appropriate techniques.
Marginally satisfactory	3.0	A proposal that might generate publishable results: obvious but not necessarily lethal weakness in the study design.
Unsatisfactory	2.0	A proposal that is seriously deficient in one or more areas.
Not Fundable	1.0	The proposal has fatal flaws in basic design.

DEI Scoring

To promote excellent science and dedication to diversity, all research grants are required to have a diversity equity and inclusion statement to highlight applicants' communication skills, resiliency in the face of setbacks, high standards of ethics and integrity, and commitment to inclusive and equitable science that promotes diversity in the field of animal behavior.

The DEI Statement is an opportunity to describe contributions to diversity which might fall into the following categories.

1. Reflection on educational, cultural, economic, or social experiences that have shaped the applicant's academic journey or that influence others.
2. Past actions and future plans for active engagement (e.g., employment, service, teaching or other activities) in programs focused on increasing participation by groups that have been historically underrepresented in higher education or programs focused on educating/correcting a majoritarian group or system.
3. Past actions and future plans for personal, research, teaching, or mentorship contributions to diversity in general and specifically within ABS.

The written review should evaluate the applicant's contributions or dedication to DEI in the areas described above. The following is meant as a guide for numerical DEI scoring.

Category of DEI Statement	Numeric al Score	Description
Exceptional	5.0	Contributions or dedication to DEI are exemplary. Describes meaningful experiences shaping academic journeys in light of DEI. Clearly outlines concrete past achievements and future plans in activities to increase participation of underrepresented groups in general and in the field of animal behavior. Plans include novel creative contributions or creative combinations of existing resources.
Good	4.0	Contributions or dedication to DEI are good. Describes meaningful experiences shaping academic journeys in light of DEI. Clearly outlines concrete activities to increase participation of underrepresented groups in general and in the field of animal behavior, however, past achievements or future plans are good but not creative.
Satisfactory	3.0	Contributions or dedication to DEI are satisfactory but lack information in one of the three areas (reflection on DEI, engagement in past activities or future plans for increasing diversity in STEM and in the field of animal behavior).
Marginally satisfactory	2.0	Contributions or dedication to DEI are provided but lack information in two of the three areas (reflection on DEI, engagement in past activities or future plans for increasing diversity in STEM and in the field of animal behavior).
Unsatisfactory	1.0	Contributions or dedication to DEI fall short of general expectations for applicants' career stage.
Not fundable	0.0	No DEI statement provided