



Scoring criteria for Workshop and Institute Proposals

Scoring Criteria	Points Awarded				
1. Innovative session content that can change and/or challenge how attendees conduct clinical practice, education, research, and/or programming.	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
2. Topic is timely and relevant to the particular focus with the field of adolescent health and medicine.	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
3. Well-described interactive and/or engaging teaching methods within the proposal.	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
4. Clear, appropriately scoped, and achievable learning-based objectives (<i>see Bloom's taxonomy</i>).	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
5. Proposal includes three peer-reviewed references that are within the past five years.	2 = Yes 1 = No				
6. Proposal demonstrates a clear effort to support SAHM's goal for equity and inclusion. * (<i>if deemed applicable based on the proposal content focus; exceptions may apply</i>)	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
7. Diverse representation of presenters based on discipline (e.g. across disciplines and/or across specialties), background, nationality, country, and/or perspective (<i>if deemed applicable based on the proposal content focus; exceptions may apply</i>)	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
8. Anticipated roles of presenters are clearly defined.	5 Strongly agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
9. Proposal covers one of the Program Committee's suggested topics for this year's Annual Meeting.	Yes or No (<i>no points assigned</i>)				

*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.