Assessment Scoring and Framework

Scoring guide

This scoring framework provides a guide for developing each applicant's score against a merit criterion. Using the table below, scores are to be allocated on a scale of *Excellent* to *Unacceptable Quality* for Criterion 1 and 2. Choose the score that best matches the applicant's response. Supporting information required to be provided with the application can be taken into consideration when determining each score for each Criterion.

When scoring applicants, consider whether the amount of detail provided by the applicant is relative to a PhD or post-doctoral project and complexity.

Criterion	Weighting
1. Personal statement (25%) and CV (25%)	50%
2. Research plan	50%
Total	**100%**

Must fund			Should fund				Below minimum standards for funding		
10	**9**	**8**	**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Excellent Quality *Response to this criterion significantly exceeds expectations. *Evidence confirms	**Outstanding Quality** *Response to this criterion exceeds expectations in most key areas and addressed to a very high	**Very Good Quality** *Response to this criterion meets expectations to a very high standard in all areas.	**Good Quality** *Response to this criterion meets expectations to a high standard in all areas.	**Fair Quality** *Response to this criterion addresses all areas well. *Claims are well substantiated in most areas.	**Acceptable Quality** *Response addresses most key areas to a consistent acceptable standard with	**Marginal Quality** *Response is marginal and does not fully meet expectations. *Some claims	**Poor Quality** *Response poorly addresses some areas or fails to address some areas.	**Very Poor Quality** *Response inadequately deals with most or all areas. *Claims almost totally	**Unacceptable Quality** *Response does not meet expectations. *Criteria not addressed or insufficient or no information

consistent superior performance against this criterion in all areas. *Claims are fully substantiated.	standard in others. *Most claims are fully substantiated with others very well substantiated.	*All claims are well substantiated.	*Claims are well substantiated in key areas.	*Some minor shortcomings.	no major shortcomings. *Most claims are adequately substantiated. *Some proposals may be questionable.	unsubstantiated; others only adequately substantiated or lack sufficient detail. *Some proposals may be unworkable.	*Claims largely unsubstantiated. *A number of proposals may be unworkable.	unsubstantiated. *A number of proposals may be unworkable.	to assess the criterion. *Claims unsubstantiated, no evidence and unworkable.