



# Higher Degree Research Scholarship Ratings

---

## Process and Rating Sheet

---

### PREAMBLE

Use this sheet to rate applicants for HDR scholarships, according to the process outlined below. The aim of this rating scheme is to ensure applicants with different track records can compete equally in the scholarship process. Faculties are able to weight the applicant's score to emphasise their academic record, if they have not had the opportunity to publish or undertake relevant professional work, or to emphasise publications and professional achievements if that is the most important factor in their profile. The weighting scheme does guarantee that academic performance still significantly contributes to the applicant's final score, as it is taken as the most important indicator of potential HDR success.

**General Principle:** Macquarie University rates scholarship applicants, according to their prior academic performance, emphasising previous thesis outcome, taking into account publications and professional experience, when it can boost their rating.

### PROCESS:

1. Rating: Give a rating 1-10 in every column (For columns B and C 0.5 increments are possible)
2. Bonus: Columns A and B each attract 10% bonus for:
  - a. Macquarie Research Masters graduates (MPhil and MRes)
  - b. Graduates of top 200 universities according to the ARWU rankings
  - c. This applies to the qualification used for HDR admission, being the highest academic qualification the applicant has achieved. (For applicants in combined Masters of Psychology and Doctoral programs, this may be their Honours grade but only if it has been re-examined and deemed MRes equivalent).
3. Weighting: Award relative weightings based on the strengths of the candidate. Column A has weighting of minimum 2 and maximum 3; Column B, weighting of minimum 2 and maximum 5; Column C weighting of minimum 0 and maximum 3. Weightings must add up to 7.
4. Score: Divide by 7 for a score out of 10

NB: Honours theses can be counted under B, but the maximum weighting they can attract is 2, unless they have been formally re-examined and deemed equivalent to the MRes in the application process for combined Masters of Psychology/Doctoral programs.

**Ratings are indicative:** Applicants' profiles will not always fit neatly into the ratings scale shown. These ratings should be taken as indicative only, and faculties are asked to provide an explanation as to why a certain rating has been given. In relation to thesis outcome, "good" thesis reports will still be varied in quality. Faculties should have evidence to justify their ratings here.

**Subject to opportunity:** Faculties should bear in mind that applicants will have had different degrees of opportunity to perform in publications and professional experience. This could be because of parental or other carer responsibilities, or because of applicants' stage of career. This should be dealt with primarily by the choice of weightings.

**Creative works:** Creative works are considered an equal type of research output, where they are relevant to the proposed project.

**Professional experience** must be in a research environment where the work contributes to some output, such as a government or industry report, a standard, patent, policy change or substantial plan. It should demonstrate the ability to synthesise and analyse important information and to communicate effectively in an appropriate way. There should normally be some proxy for peer-review or evaluation, such as implementation of recommendations in a report, policy change, adoption of a standard or patent etc.

**Scholarship ratings (indicative)**

<b>Score</b>	<b>A: Academic Performance in Highest Qualification as used for admission</b>	<b>B Thesis Outcome</b>	<b>C: Research Output* and Professional Experience</b> <b>*may include creative works, where relevant to project</b>
10	University medal or GPA = 7	Top 5% of class; Thesis outcome $\geq$ 95% and/or outstanding thesis reports	Primary author of a significant track record (>3) of publications in high quality internationally-recognised outlets AND/OR Leader of projects with a significant track record of research output (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
9	Dean's commendation or GPA at least 6.8 but less than 7	Top 5% of class; Thesis outcome at least 92 but less than 95% and/or excellent thesis reports	Primary author of at least one paper in high quality internationally recognised outlet(s) AND/OR Significant research output (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
8	GPA at least 6.5 but less than 6.8	Top 10%; Thesis outcome at least 90 but less than 92% and/or excellent thesis reports	Major contribution to at least one paper in good quality internationally-recognised outlet(s) AND/OR Lead author of several examples of research output (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
7	GPA at least 6.2 but less than 6.5	Top 10% of class; Thesis outcome at least 87 but less than 90% and/or excellent thesis reports	Contribution to at least one paper in good quality internationally-recognised outlet(s) AND/OR Lead author of one major piece of research output (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
6	GPA at least 6.0 but less than 6.2	Thesis outcome at least 85 but less than 87% and/or very good to excellent thesis reports	Primary author of a significant track record (>3) of publications in high quality national outlets AND/OR Major contribution to one or more examples of research output (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
5	GPA at least 5.8 but less than 6.0	Thesis outcome at least 83 but less than 85% and/or very good examiner reports	Primary author of at least one paper in high quality national outlet(s) AND/OR Important work on research-projects that lead to multiple research outputs (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
4	GPA at least 5.5 but less than 5.8	Thesis outcome at least 80 but less than 83% and/or very good examiner reports	Major contribution to at least one paper in good quality national outlet(s) AND/OR Important work on a research project that leads to research output (laboratory reports, manuals, government or business reports) in research-related work relevant to discipline, as indicated by impact or citations
3	GPA at least 5.3 but less than 5.5	Thesis outcome at least 78 but less than 80% and/or good examiner reports	Contribution to at least one paper and/or ancillary publications/presentations/posters in good quality national outlet(s) AND/OR Significant work in a research-productive professional environment
2	GPA at least 5.0 but less than 5.3	Thesis outcome at least 75 but less than 78% and/or good examiner reports	Primary author of peer-reviewed academic student publication and/or national conference presentation AND/OR Work in a research-productive professional environment
1	GPA less than 5.0	Thesis outcome 75% and/or good examiner reports	Non-peer reviewed academic publication and/or local conference presentation

**HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP RATING SHEET**

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID \_\_\_\_\_

Program \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Prior EFTSL \_\_\_\_\_

Prior HDR Scholarship [ ] No [ ] Yes

Completed [ ] PhD [ ] MPhil [ ] MRes

<b>Standard Criteria</b>			
	<b>A: Academic Performance in Highest Qualification as used for admission</b>	<b>B: Thesis Outcome</b>	<b>C: Research Output* and Professional Experience *may include creative works, where relevant to project</b>
Score <b>(1 – 10)</b>			
	Column A has weighting of minimum 2 and maximum 3	Column B, weighting of minimum 2 and maximum 5	Column C weighting of minimum 0 and maximum 3.
Weightings must add up to 7.			
<b>WEIGHTED SCORE</b>			
<b>*BONUS</b> <i>(refer to page one under Bonus)</i>			
<b>EXCEPTIONAL CASES</b>			
<b>REVISED RATING</b>			

\* Where small size of Research Masters cohort makes a percentage figure meaningless, a case must be made for applicant to be considered among top 10% of performers in the academic field.

\*\* Departments must give evidence of the international standing of the publisher of the peer-reviewed research output (i.e. Impact Factor or equivalent metric/descriptor). Departments should also draw attention to any discipline-specific variations which may affect the rating, for example, if conference proceedings in your discipline are peer-reviewed and have equivalent status to peer-reviewed journal articles, or any other relevant consideration.

Nominated for Scholarship [ ] No [ ] Yes

HDR Director: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Associate Dean HDR: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_