

Research Grants Committee - Assessment Criteria Rubric

Category	Rank	Level Descriptor
Research proposals which are fundable (α)	5	Outstanding research proposal. Research has exceptional scientific merit. Research methods are very clear; project is very well structured, description of research outcomes and deliverables are excellent. Project typically lies in the top 5 to 10% of all proposals received.
	4	Very good research proposal. Research has very clear scientific merit. Research methods are clear; project is well organised, and research outcomes are very clear. Research proposal will be funded if resources allow.
	3	Good research proposal. Research has clear scientific method and research project is generally well-structured. Project is generally put together well, although there may be one or two points which are less clear. Research outcomes are easy to identify. Research outcomes are easy to identify and research proposal would be worth funding if resources allow.
	2	Sound research proposal on a good geoscience topic. Candidate has identified a clear research area, but there may be some deficiencies in the proposal in terms of organisation and scope. Methodology is solid, but may lack some details. The committee feels there is likely to be a good research project to come from the proposal, which may be worth funding if resources allow.
	1	Solid research proposal of interest, but one that is limited in some way: Project outline may be too broad; methods may lack some detail, or the organisation of the proposal could be improved. There may be questions as to whether every part of the project proposal is in fact deliverable. Overall, the committee feels that there is likely to be a sound research project to come from the proposal despite the deficiencies identified and it may be considered for funding if resources allow.
Research proposals which are <i>potentially</i> fundable (β)		Solid research proposal, but one which has several deficiencies: The project description may be markedly too wide (for instance it describes the whole of a PhD project), or alternatively it may not have enough detail;; The committee may be critical about whether the project is actually deliverable (in terms of funding and/or approach). The proposal may contain some scientific errors. Nevertheless, the committee feels the proposal may deliver a sound scientific outcome and could potentially be funded if resources allow.
Research proposals which are not fundable (γ)		Poor research proposal or ineligible for funding. Project is poorly formulated or organised. The committee has serious doubts about whether the proposal could be delivered as described. Alternatively, the application does not fulfil the requirements for these research grants – for instance an application for an expedition without a clear science focus, or a request to ‘top-up’ PhD funds.