

	5	4	3	2	1 (unfundable)
Potential for academic excellence	Academically outstanding candidate (e.g. academic achievements assessed via CV, personal statement and references), and/or demonstrating significant potential and experience from outside academia (e.g. work experience)	Academically strong candidate, and/or demonstrating strong potential and experience from outside academia	Academically average candidate, including on potential and experience from outside academia	Academically weaker candidate (only meets the minimum admissions criteria)	Does not meet minimum admissions criteria
Project alignment with research challenge areas (depending on the scholarship)	Strategic priority is clear and project aligns outstandingly with the research challenge areas outlined in the scholarship brief	Strategic priority is clear and there is strong alignment between the project and the research challenge areas outlined in the scholarship brief	Strategic priority is reasonably clear (or can be divined from the information provided), and/or the project aligns reasonably well with the research challenge areas outlined in the scholarship brief	Strategic priority is not clear, and/or there is weak alignment between the project and the research challenge areas outlined in the scholarship brief	Information missing
Research proposal	Outstanding proposal: demonstrates clarity of understanding of the research field, outlines gaps in the literature, a clear research question (and theoretical framework, where applicable), considers originality of the project and ethical implications (where relevant), and outlines appropriate research methods to answer the research question	Strong proposal, but slightly weaker on clarity and/or understanding for the criteria outlined in the first box	Average proposal, but weaker on clarity and/or understanding, and/or addresses some of the criteria outlined in the first box reasonably well, but others less so	Less than average proposal, weaker on clarity and/or understanding, and/or addresses fewer criteria outlined in the first box well	Information missing, and/or the proposal is inadequate.

Project fit	Outstanding 'synergy' with supervisors, School/ Research Centre	Strong 'synergy' with supervisors, School/ Research Centre	'Synergy' with supervisors, School/ Research Centre is reasonably clear (or can be divined from the information provided), and/or the project aligns reasonably well	'Synergy' with supervisors, School/ Research Centre is not clear, and/or there is weak synergy	Information missing
Project feasibility	Outstanding demonstration of feasibility in the 4-year funding period (e.g. acknowledgment of anticipated challenges and reporting of contingency plans)	Strong demonstration of feasibility in the 4-year funding period	Feasibility is reasonably clear, and/or the project feasibility can be divined from the information provided	Feasibility is not clear, and/or anticipated challenges and contingencies are not expanded upon	Information missing, or overly ambitious project with no consideration of challenges and contingency plans

Scoring

The scores for each category will be summed, and the score will then be divided by 5; the final score will therefore range from 1 to 5.

Total score =5, outstanding (fundable); total score=4, strong (fundable); total score=3, average (fundable but in the middle range); total score=2, weaker/ less than average (would be fundable if budget was infinite); total score =1, unfundable