## DEPT MEDICINE POSTDOCTORAL TRAVEL AW ARD SCORING SYSTEM

Please score the applications following the scoring criteria, using a sliding scale where appropriate.
Applicants to a round should not judge in that round. Panel members should abstain from scoring applications from their own labs, or where there is a conflict of interest. Please make the panel chair aware of any such circumstances that arise.

Highest possible score=13

|  | POINTS AW ARDED |
| :---: | :---: |
| Abstract acceptance |  |
| Abstract accepted | 1 |
| Quality of lay summary - score on a sliding scale from 5 to 0 |  |
| Clear and well-written lay summary, research well explained to a lay person | 5 |
| Unclear and poorly written lay summary, research not well explained to audience | 0 |
| Quality of scientific summary - score on a sliding scale from 5 to 0 |  |
| Clear and well-written summary, research well explained to scientist outside of the field | 5 |
| Unclear and poorly written lay summary, research not well explained to audience | 0 |
| Quality of justification - score on a sliding scale from 5 to 0 <br> Including clear aims of attending the conference, why the conference is relevant to their research programme, and how they will share their experience of attending this conference with others (need to cover all 3 for full marks) |  |
| Strong fully justified reasoned statement, with specific examples | 5 |
| No/poor justification | 0 |
| Supporting letter - score on a sliding scale from 2 to 0 |  |
| Highly positive letter of support from Line Manager/Head of Department | 2 |
| Letter of support from Line Manager/Head of Department | 1 |
| No letter of support (reject application) | 0 |

