ASHG
American Society of Human Genetics

Featured Symposium Scoring Rubric

Used by the Program Committee to objectively assess submitted featured symposium proposals. Featured symposium scores will inform the Program Committee as they select proposals for programming at the Annual Meeting.

Proposal Impact/Interest & Quality	Very High Impact/Interest, Excellent Proposal Quality	High Impact/Interest, Strong Proposal Quality	Medium Impact/Interest, Potential for Improved Proposal Quality	Medium to Low Impact/Interest, Questionable Proposal Quality	Low Impact/Interest, Poor Proposal Quality, Incomplete/Non-compliant Submission
Scoring	**1**	**2-3**	**4-5**	**6-8**	**9**
Topic	**Exciting Topic:** Exciting, non-redundant topic of interest to most ASHG attendees.	**Engaging Topic:** Topic is non-redundant and of interest to most ASHG attendees.	**Moderately Engaging Topic:** Topic of interest to some ASHG attendees.	**Specialized Topic:** Topic may appeal to a small subset of ASHG attendees.	**Limited Interest Topics:** Topic is of little interest to most ASHG attendees.
Proposal organization and content	**Exceptionally Well-Written:** Clear and coherent with distinct learning objectives, seamlessly integrated talks, and compelling speaker abstracts.	**Well-Developed:** Clear and structured with defined learning objectives and detailed speaker abstracts.	**Adequately Solid:** Generally well-organized but lacking in connectivity or detail in learning objectives and speaker abstracts.	**Disorganized with Weak Content:** Lacks clear organization and continuity; weak learning objectives; lacking detailed and compelling speaker abstracts.	**Poorly Constructed:** Significantly lacking in organization, clarity, and detail; unclear learning objectives; unconvincing speaker abstracts.
Diversity *(gender, ethnicity, career stage, institution, geography, discipline)*	**Exemplary Diversity Representation**: Fully meets all diversity criteria, including the trainee component.	**Strong Diversity Representation:** Meets all or most diversity criteria, including the trainee component.	**Moderate Diversity Representation:** Meets a majority of the diversity criteria, including the trainee component.	**Insufficient Diversity Representation:** Fails to meet multiple diversity criteria, including lacking a trainee component.	**Poor Diversity Representation:** Lacks most or nearly all diversity criteria.
Overall (will be an average of above scoring criteria)	**Outstanding Proposal (Slam Dunk):** Demonstrates multiple strengths across all aspects; no revisions needed.	**Strong Proposal with Minor Weaknesses:** Few minor weaknesses; requires minor revisions.	**Moderate Proposal with Several Weaknesses:** Noticeable weaknesses; needs multiple revisions for consideration.	**Weak Proposal Needing Significant Revision:** Significant weaknesses in multiple aspects; substantial revisions required.	**Poor Proposal Requiring Comprehensive Revision:** Lacks coherence and quality across most aspects; needs near-complete overhaul.

If a conflict of interest exists between a reviewer and a proposal, the reviewer must recuse themselves from scoring the proposal.

Interactive Workshop Scoring Rubric

Used by the Digital Learning Committee to objectively assess submitted interactive workshop proposals. The scores will inform the Digital Learning Committee as they select proposals for programming at the Annual Meeting and for virtual events throughout the year.

Proposal Impact/Interest and Quality	Decline	Triage	Pursue for Discussion	Excellent
Scoring	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**
Topic Appeal	Topic is of little interest to most ASHG attendees.	Topic is too specialized; may appeal to a small subset of ASHG attendees.	Topic is non-redundant and of interest to many ASHG attendees.	Exciting, non-redundant topic of interest to most ASHG attendees.
Organization and Content	Significantly lacking in organization, clarity, and detail; unclear learning objectives. No explanation of interactivity.	Generally well-organized but lacking in connectivity or detail in learning objectives. Does not appear interactive.	Clear and structured with defined learning objectives. Somewhat interactive. May be primarily lecture-based or “demo”-led.	Clear and coherent with distinct learning objectives. Excellent interactivity with hands-on activities that supports goals of the workshop.
Overall	**Poor proposal in need of major revision.** Lacks coherence and quality across most aspects; needs near-complete overhaul.	**Weak proposal in need of revision.** Somewhat organized but could use major revision.	**Strong proposal with some minor weakness.** Minor weakness(es); requires minor revision.	**Outstanding proposal.** Demonstrates multiple strengths across all aspects; no revisions needed.

If a conflict of interest exists between a reviewer and a proposal, the reviewer must recuse themselves from scoring the proposal.