



# SEB AWARD: PLENARY LECTURES

---

<b>SEB Award: plenary lectures</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Eligibility criteria</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Judging Criteria</b>	<b>2</b>
Scientific Remits (Animal, Cell, Plant)	2
OED Remit	3
<b>Who are the Judging Panels?</b>	<b>3</b>
Scientific Remits (Animal, Cell, Plant)	3
OED Remit	3
<b>Considerations of the Judging Panel</b>	<b>3</b>
Scientific Remits (Animal, Cell, Plant)	4
OED Remit	5
<b>Judging Process</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Equality and Inclusion</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Nomination form</b>	<b>8</b>
Scientific Remits (Animal, Cell, Plant)	8
OED Remit	9

## CONTENTS

---

### OVERVIEW

Each year at the SEB Annual Conference, the work of George Parker Bidder III and Harold Woolhouse is honoured with plenary lectures alongside the Cell Biology and Outreach, Education and Diversity (OED) plenary lectures. Lecturers are given by prominent scientists of outstanding merit who have demonstrated excellence in their fields of research or OED practice.

You do not need to be a SEB member to nominate someone for the award, and you can put forward as many nominations as you like; however, we do not accept self-nominations. You will need to log-in or create a SEB account to submit the application.

Nominees do not have to be a member of SEB; however, they must be available to give a talk at the SEB annual conference.

Winners will be entitled to:

- Conference registration, including the awards dinner,
- Hotel and travel cost coverage.



- A medal.

To help winners of SEB awards in accepting their prizes, we provide the following support:

- Affordable childcare at our annual conference from as little as £10 per half-day
- Although in-person talks are preferable, we do have hybrid options available for those experiencing extenuating circumstances.
- We have an SEB hardship fund available which can provide support on membership renewal costs in times of financial hardship

Date	Action
July	Nominations open
Last Friday of September	Nominations close
Late November/ early December	Plenary lectures informed of the awards and approached to give a lecture at the annual conference the following summer.

### ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Nominees must meet certain requirements to be considered for judging. These are:

- Must have made a substantial influence within their research field or OED practice over a sustained period
- Nominees must agree to the SEB code of conduct and have no confirmed or potential impediment to their professional standing
- Nominees must be within the scientific remit of the SEB (animal, plant, cell) or the OED remit\*
- Nominations will only be considered that conform to the application guidelines and applications will be judged solely on the nomination form

*\* The rules and forms for the scientific and the OED remits are different. Please check for specific information for each remit.*

### JUDGING CRITERIA

#### SCIENTIFIC REMITS (ANIMAL, CELL, PLANT)

Prominent scientists of outstanding merit who have demonstrated excellence in their field are selected to give the Plenary Lectures. Our definition of excellence includes all areas of a diverse and modern scientific landscape.

Judging is based on the following criteria:

- Scientific Excellence
- Scientific Impact
- Leadership and inspiring the next generation
- Contributions to the SEB or/and the field of experimental biology
- Outreach and advocacy for experimental biology
- Personal Character/Professional Standing

If a situation arises where multiple nominees are judged by these criteria to have equal merit, the judging panel may also use the information provided on the application form to consider the nominees' broader contribution to the experimental biology community.

Examples of relevant contributions could include, but are not limited to:

- Quality of publications and/or patents and/or software



- Independence
- Collaboration and teamwork
- Teaching/demonstrating
- Service on boards, committees or panels
- Peer-reviewer
- Other indicators of esteem indicated by the nominator/referee

### **OED REMIT**

Prominent scientists of outstanding merit who have demonstrated a sustained record of high-quality and extensive impact work within outreach, education and/or diversity are selected to give the Plenary Lectures. Our definition of excellence includes all areas of a diverse and modern scientific landscape.

Judging is based on the following criteria:

- Relevance and novelty
- Engagement and impact
- Contributions to the SEB or the field of experimental biology
- Personal Character/Professional Standing

If a situation arises where multiple nominees are judged by these criteria to have equal merit, the judging panel may also use the information provided on the application form to consider the nominees' broader contribution to the experimental biology community.

Examples of relevant contributions could include, but are not limited to:

- Quality of publications, resources, software, teaching and/or projects
- Independence
- Collaboration and teamwork
- Teaching/demonstrating
- Service on boards, committees or panels
- Peer-reviewer
- Other indicators of esteem indicated by the nominator/referee

### **WHO ARE THE JUDGING PANELS?**

#### **SCIENTIFIC REMITS (ANIMAL, CELL, PLANT)**

The judging panel is made up of the relevant scientific section committee, depending on the application. The SEB has three scientific sections: Animal, Plant, and Cell, which are assembled by the Section Chair, Convenors of the sections' interest groups, and a co-opted member.

#### **OED REMIT**

The judging panel is made up of the three scientific section chairs (Animal, Cell and Plant). If they are not available, the deputy chair will judge the entries instead.

### **CONSIDERATIONS OF THE JUDGING PANEL**

To help nominators submit an application with the best chance of success, we have outlined the primary judging criteria and examples of what the judges may consider as demonstrations these have been met in the table below. Nominees may not meet every consideration of the judges; these examples should be used as a guide, and you do not need to answer every question outlined. Equally, the list is not extensive, so please include anything you feel is important for the judges to consider, even if it is not included in these examples.



**SCIENTIFIC REMITS (ANIMAL, CELL, PLANT)**

Criteria	Examples of questions the judges may ask or aspects for consideration
Scientific excellence	<p>Does their research solve an outstanding problem in the field?</p> <p>Is their research innovative and generates new ideas?</p> <p>Did they develop a novel experimental method that will further aid the scientific community?</p> <p>Have they made an original and outstanding scientific contribution?</p> <p>Is there evidence of this, for example, from published papers, typescripts of papers accepted for publication, or pre-prints?</p>
Scientific impact	<p>Has their work led to new research areas?</p> <p>What impact has their research made/ or is expected to make in their field?</p> <p>Has their work led to an advancement outside of their research scope or topic?</p> <p>Has their work been used outside of their daily research, for example, contributions to textbooks, etc?</p> <p><i>*"Scientific Impact" refers to the eventual impact of fundamental research as well as direct impact of applied work</i></p>
Leadership and Inspiring the next generation	<p>Do they have a record of active leadership in mentoring experimental biology careers?</p> <p>Do they motivate and encourage students and/or colleagues?</p> <p>Do they have a track record of attracting new students/scientists to the field of experimental biology?</p> <p>Have they shown exceptional skill in inspiring the next generation in their teaching or leadership role?</p>
Outreach and advocacy for experimental biology	<p>Have they made an impact in their wider community?</p> <p>Do they promote their work or experimental biology in scientific outreach efforts to the public, youth, or disengaged groups of society?</p> <p>Do they contribute to the greater scientific understanding of the general population through engagement with media?</p> <p>Is there evidence of this in outreach work, press releases, media appearances, etc?</p>



	<p>Are they active in scientific policy or advisory groups?</p> <p>Do they have a history of improving diversity and inclusion in their field?</p>
Contributions to the SEB or the field of experimental biology	<p>Are they a member of the SEB or similar organisation?</p> <p>What is the length of their membership and engagement with the SEB?</p> <p>Have they made a significant contribution to the SEB or the experimental biology community either over a long period of sustained engagement or an intensive short period of action?</p> <p>Have they presented at previous SEB events, such as the Annual Conference or similar?</p> <p>Have they contributed content for the SEB website, magazine or other biological publications?</p> <p>Have they actively promoted the SEB or experimental biology and its community in any way, e.g., through social media or posters in the department?</p> <p>Have they organised or chaired events for the experimental biology community, such as a symposium or session at a SEB event?</p>
Personal Character/professional Standing	<p>Do they comply with the SEB professional code of conduct?</p> <p>Are they an upstanding member of the scientific community and a good role model to colleagues?</p> <p><i>*Ask nominators and nominees to declare that to the best of their knowledge there is no confirmed or potential impediment to their nominee winning from the point of view of that individual's professional standing</i></p>

### OED REMIT

Criteria	Examples of questions the judges may ask or aspects for consideration
Relevance and novelty	<p>How relevant is the work to experimental biology?</p> <p>Does their work solve an outstanding problem in the field?</p> <p>Is their work innovative and generates new ideas/resources?</p> <p>Did they develop a novel method that will further aid the scientific and OED community?</p> <p>Have they made an original and outstanding outreach, education and/or diversity contribution?</p> <p>Is there evidence of this, for example, from published papers, resources, videos, etc?</p>
Engagement and impact	<p>What impact has their work made/ or is making within the experimental biology community?</p>



	<p>Has their work made an impact on the wider community?</p> <p>What is the short and long-term impact of this work?</p> <p>Do they contribute to the greater scientific understanding of the general population through engagement with media?</p> <p>Is there evidence of their work, press releases, media appearances, etc?</p> <p>Have they demonstrated an ability to lead and/or encourage students and/or colleagues?</p> <p>Do they have a track record of attracting new audiences to experimental biology?</p>
<p>Contributions to the SEB or the field of experimental biology</p>	<p>Are they a member of the SEB or similar organisation?</p> <p>What is the length of their membership and engagement with the SEB?</p> <p>Have they made a significant contribution to the SEB or the experimental biology community either over a long period of sustained engagement or an intensive short period of action?</p> <p>Have they presented at previous SEB events, such as the Annual Conference or similar?</p> <p>Have they contributed content for the SEB website, magazine or other biological publications?</p> <p>Have they actively promoted the SEB or experimental biology and its community in any way, e.g., through social media or posters in the department?</p> <p>Have they organised or chaired events for the experimental biology community, i.e. a symposium or session at a SEB event?</p>
<p>Personal Character/professional Standing</p>	<p>Do they comply with the SEB professional code of conduct?</p> <p>Are they an upstanding member of the scientific community and a good role model to colleagues?</p> <p><i>*We ask nominators and nominees to declare that to the best of their knowledge, there is no confirmed or potential impediment to their nominee winning from the point of view of that individual's professional standing</i></p>

### JUDGING PROCESS

1. A nominator fills out a form about the nominee containing questions that are guided by the judging criteria. They are also asked to upload a CV or link to an online CV or biography of the nominee. We encourage nominators to work with their nominees to gather the relevant information to ensure the best chance of success.\*
2. The judging panel will receive all completed forms and judge them based on a scoring system against the aforementioned criteria



3. The top finalists (up to three), including the winner, are ratified at a meeting with the SEB Section Chairs, President, and Vice President. If the judging panel cannot make a final decision, this group will have the power to decide the final winner between the top 2 candidates at this stage.
4. The winner is informed and invited to speak at the SEB Annual Conference

*\*Please note that the information provided in the nomination form will be the **only** consideration in the judging process. Please make sure to complete due diligence in assessing the suitability of the candidate. For the best chance of success, you may also wish to work with your nominee to fill out information such as supplying an up-to-date CV.*

### EQUALITY AND INCLUSION

The SEB has a continued commitment to ensure equality, inclusion, and diversity in all our activities. This includes recognising and rewarding scientists of outstanding merit from all backgrounds. To achieve this, we have:

- Made the nomination process easier to encourage more first-time nominators and expand the pool of nominees at the judging stage
- Made the judging process and criteria more transparent to allow nominators and nominees to submit applications that have the best chance of success
- Continued to encourage and normalise non-traditional career paths by allowing flexibility in the eligibility criteria regarding “demonstrating excellence” and committed to highlighting role models from diverse backgrounds and career routes.
- Actively encouraged nominators to consider diversity on the nomination form and in any promotional material surrounding the awards
- Committed to proactively engage with other organisations, institutes, and societies in an effort to increase nominations from underrepresented groups

### TIMEFRAME

Deadline	Action: Plenary Lectures
	These awards are given to prominent scientists of outstanding merit who have demonstrated excellence in their fields of research or OED practice.
July	Nominations open  Section chair and convenors to engage with attendees and membership at the Annual Conference to encourage submissions for nominations
August	Section chair and convenors are to approach their interest groups for nominations.  An email, on behalf of the Section Chair, will also be sent out to all members of the relevant section. Anyone (members and non-members) has the opportunity to nominate a prominent scientist
Last Friday of September	All nominations must be received by this date via the plenary lecture nomination form.
Early October	Nominations are sent to the relevant sections/committees for judging



31 October	Section committee members are asked to rank all nominees based on their application forms using the judging criteria table by 31 October. Three finalists are selected from the compiled rankings.
November section meetings (2 <sup>nd</sup> or third week of November usually)	Plenary lectures are decided; if there is a tie and no agreement can be reached, the SEB president, vice presidents, and section chairs can decide between the top candidates
Late November /Early December	Plenary lectures are informed of the awards and approached to give a lecture at the annual conference the following summer.

## NOMINATION FORM

Each year at the SEB Annual Conference, the work of George Parker Bidder III and Harold Woolhouse is honoured with plenary lectures alongside the Cell Biology and Outreach, Education and Diversity (OED) plenary lectures. Lecturers are given by prominent scientists of outstanding merit who have demonstrated excellence in their fields of research or OED practice.

The information provided in this form will be the only consideration in the judging process. Please make sure to complete due diligence in assessing the suitability of the candidate.

For the best chance of success, you may also wish to work with your nominee to fill out information such as supplying an up-to-date CV. We also recommend you read "Considerations of the Judging Panel". This section outlines the primary judging criteria and examples of what the judges may consider demonstrations these have been met. Nominees may not meet every consideration of the judges; these examples should be used as a guide, and you do not need to answer every question outlined. Equally, the list is not extensive, so please include anything you feel is important for the judges to consider, even if it is not included in these examples.

For more information, please visit: <https://www.sebiology.org/grants/award-listing/seb-annual-lecture-awards.html>

## SCIENTIFIC REMITS (ANIMAL, CELL, PLANT)

- Your name
- Your email address
- Name of nominee
- Nominee's email address
  
- Please confirm that the nominee does not have any confirmed or potential impediment to their professional standing  
*Hint: We expect all parties engaging with the activities of the SEB to treat colleagues fairly and with respect in line with the SEB code of conduct.*  
 (Checkbox - mandatory)
  
- Do you and the nominee adhere to the [SEB code of conduct](#)?  
 (Checkbox - mandatory)
  
- Please explain how the nominee's work demonstrates scientific excellence  
*Hint: How is their research innovative and original and contributes to the field or/and wider scientific community?*  
 (Text box with 500-word limit - mandatory)





- What impact has the nominee's research made or is expected to make in their field?  
(Text box with 500-word limit - mandatory)
- Please explain how the nominee demonstrates leadership and inspires the next generation.  
(Text box with 500-word limit - mandatory)
- Please describe their contributions to outreach and advocacy for experimental biology  
(Text box with 500-word limit - mandatory)
- Please describe their connection and contributions to the SEB or the field of experimental biology.  
(Text box with 500-word limit - mandatory)
- Please upload a recent copy of the nominee's CV
- (Or) Please provide a link to the nominee's online CV or biography
- Is there anything else you wish to add?  
(Text box with 500-word limit - optional)

Thank you for completing this form. The judges will now consider your nomination and the plenary lectures will be announced later this year.

#### **OED REMIT**

- Your name
- Your email address
- Name of nominee
- Nominee's email address
  
- Please confirm that the nominee does not have any confirmed or potential impediment to their professional standing  
*Hint: We expect all parties engaging with the activities of the SEB to treat colleagues fairly and with respect in line with the SEB code of conduct.*  
(Checkbox - mandatory)
- Do you and the nominee adhere to the [SEB code of conduct](#)?  
(Checkbox - mandatory)
- Please upload a supporting statement describing your work and its impact.  
*Hint: Please describe your outreach, education and/or diversity work in the experimental biology field and the impact it has had. If you have been involved with SEB or other similar organisations, please also include this information.*  
(Upload file - mandatory)
- Please upload a recent copy of the nominee's CV
- (Or) Please provide a link to the nominee's online CV or biography
- Is there anything else you wish to add?  
(Text box with 500-word limit - optional)



Thank you for completing this form. The judges will now consider your nomination and the plenary lectures will be announced later this year.