



Scoring criteria for Workshop and Institute Proposals

Scoring Criteria	Points Awarded					
	6	5	4	3	2	1
1. Innovative session content that can change and/or challenge how attendees conduct clinical practice, education, research, and/or programming	Definitely	Very Likely	Likely	Possibly	Unlikely	Definitely Not
2. Topic is timely and relevant to the field.		Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3. Well-described interactive and engaging teaching methods.		Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. Clear, appropriately scoped, and achievable learning-based objectives (see Bloom's taxonomy).		Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. Abstract includes three peer-reviewed references that are within the past five years.	1=yes 0=no					
6. Abstract demonstrates a clear effort to support SAHM's goal for equity and inclusion. * (if deemed applicable based on the proposal content focus; exceptions may apply)		Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. Diverse representation of presenters based on discipline (e.g. across disciplines and/or across specialties), background, nationality, country, and/or perspective (if deemed applicable based on the proposal content focus; exceptions may apply)		Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Anticipated roles of presenters are clearly defined.		Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

*Including, but not limited to, individuals with differing abilities and those from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds, marginalized groups, and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) community, etc.