

Judging Criteria

Nominees must be an ATMS member. ATMS Board and Committee members are not eligible to be nominated.

How judges will score (applies to all questions)

Score what is evidenced in the nomination text (not reputation / personal familiarity; not popularity).

The same 1–4 scale will be used for each question:

- **4 — Excellent:** Clear, compelling, well-evidenced; outcomes/impact are strong and obvious; exceeds typical award standard.
 - **3 — Very Good:** Strong evidence with good examples; impact/outcomes are clear; meets award standard very well.
 - **2 — Good:** Some evidence/examples; meets baseline expectations but depth/clarity/impact is limited.
 - **1 — Basic:** Minimal/vague/unclear evidence; claims largely unsubstantiated or don't show award-level impact.
-

Q1 — About the nominee & why they are nominated (25%)

What judges are looking for:

- Clarity, coherence, and strength of the case for nomination (a strong “why them” argument).
- Alignment to the award purpose (show fit with the category/purpose).
- Specifics that support claims (not popularity-based statements).

Score cues (what “better” looks like):

- **4:** Exceptionally clear and persuasive case; specific evidence supports claims; strong alignment to award purpose.
 - **3:** Clear rationale with multiple specific examples; convincing and consistent case.
 - **2:** Understandable rationale; some examples but limited detail/impact; uniqueness not fully shown.
 - **1:** Vague praise/unclear rationale; mostly unsupported claims; hard to see why nominee stands out.
-

Q2 — Demonstrated excellence in practice / business / studies (45%)

What judges are looking for:

- Evidence of outcomes and excellence demonstrated through: innovation, professionalism, ethics, quality, sustained high performance, and continuous improvement.
- Strong, specific examples (show what was done and what changed).

What to include (nominator prompts):

- Focus on 1–2 strong examples rather than listing everything.
 - For each example, cover: the situation/challenge → what the nominee did → the outcomes/improvements achieved.
 - You may include (where relevant): clinical outcomes/patient improvements; business growth/systems improvement/practice development; academic achievements/research/study leadership; innovation/creativity/problem-solving; leadership/mentoring/going above expectations.
-

Q3 — Contribution to industry and/or local community (30%)



What judges are looking for:

- Contribution and impact beyond their immediate role, including scope, reach, and sustainability.
- Examples may include: voluntary service, advocacy, education, mentoring, collaboration

What to include (nominator prompts):

- Contributions can be formal or informal, large or small—all levels are valuable.
- You may include: volunteering/pro-bono work; mentoring students/graduates/colleagues; community education (talks/workshops); participation in industry events/committees/associations; outreach programs/wellness initiatives/support services; advocacy/promotion of natural medicine values.
- Describe: what they contributed; who benefited; why it mattered—and don't downplay "small" contributions if they're consistent and genuine.

