|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Criterion 1 | | Criterion 2 | | Criterion 3  ADVISORY TEAM  Quality of advisory team including record of successful supervision, appropriate advisory load, complementary expertise.  *Weight 10%* | |
|  | CANDIDATE  Quality of the candidate including academic performance, evidence of research capability, quality of research project.  *Weight 80%* | | ENVIRONMENT  Quality of the research environment including resourcing.  *Weight 10%* | |
| The following scoring descriptors are to be used as a guide to score an applicant against each of the assessment criteria. The descriptors are indicative rather than exhaustive. Evaluation of performance will take into account opportunity and research discipline. | | | | | | |
| Score | | Score |  | Score |  | Score |
| 6-7  An exceptionally strong application with essentially no weaknesses. The application meets all or most of the criteria | Relative to opportunity the applicant:   * Demonstrates outstanding academic achievement as evidenced by high CGPA, rank within class, academic prizes and awards * Has Honours I (or equivalent) and/or Masters with outstanding thesis grade or Coursework Masters with outstanding performance, particularly in research related courses. * Has high quality research output(s). * Received Excellent to Outstanding referees’ reports. * High quality project that is a good strategic fit and potential impact and/or builds on existing research |  | Outstanding research environment demonstrated by:   * Funding sufficient to support research costs * Record of sustained research excellence as measured by outputs and external research support consistent with the discipline expectations. * Strong strategic support from Enrolling Unit. * Active research seminar program |  | Strong advisory team   * Principal Advisor has sustained track record of timely HDR completions. * For new advisors, demonstrated capacity to act as Principal Advisor and teamed with experienced advisor. * No or minimal progress issues with current HDR candidates. * Advisory team provides complementary expertise. * Evidence of previous HDR graduate outcomes. * Good mentoring and demonstrate support for HDR candidate development |  |
| 4-5  A strong application with only minor weaknesses | Relative to opportunity the candidate:   * Demonstrates strong academic achievement with good CGPA. * Honours I (or equivalent) * Has good research output(s) consistent with the discipline. * Received Good to Excellent referees’ reports. * Good project proposed with minimal deficiencies |  | Strong research environment demonstrated by:   * Funding sufficient to support research costs. * Emerging area of research within the enrolling unit/Faculty. * Record of quality research outputs. * Developing record of external research support or external recognition of impact. |  | Suitable advisory team   * Principal Advisor has supervised HDR student(s) to completion. * Advisory team established but does not complement research proposal well. * Progress issue(s) with current HDR student(s) but manageable. * Some concerns with current advisory team load. |  |
| 1-3  The application has identified weaknesses | Relative to opportunity the candidate:   * Demonstrates adequate academic achievement with moderate GPA. * Demonstrates only minor or no evidence of research capability. * Received marginal referees’ reports. * Project is questionable and/or has identified weaknesses. |  | Marginal research environment demonstrated by:   * Insufficient support for research costs * No strategic fit * Limited record of research output and/or grant income * Minimal support from Enrolling Unit |  | Inadequate advisory team   * No record of HDR completions within the advisory team. * Progress issues with current HDR students and record of previous withdrawals. * Advisory team lacks adequate expertise require for the proposed research. * Already high advisory load. * No engagement with HDR candidate development. |  |