Macquarie University Higher Degree Research

Scholarship Rating Sheet

STAGE 1 – MRes Equivalence for PhD admission
Does the applicant have an MRes or a degree equivalent to the MRes? Using the University and relevant faculty guidelines, assess if an applicant has MRes equivalence. Document this on the Admission to PhD – Assessment working sheet assessment sheet provided by the HDRO and included with candidature applications.

The University guidelines are as follows:
- All candidates are expected to have undertaken a Master’s degree, (or equivalent) predominantly focussed on research and research preparation. This degree may vary in length and name, and will be assessed together with the totality of the candidate’s qualifications. A combination of other university degrees and/or a significant track record of other research may be considered for entry.
- The standard period of candidature for the PhD at Macquarie University is three years, full-time equivalent. For admission to the PhD, the university needs to assess that prospective candidates have the capacity to complete their degree within this time, and that:
  A) they have undertaken significant study of their discipline beyond undergraduate level, and are equipped to make strategic decisions about the state of research in their field and key new directions for research, and are thus ready to conduct an HDR level project;
  B) candidates have undertaken a substantial research project at Masters level, which indicates they have significant experience in independently identifying a research question; designing a research project using a methodology that they have been able to justify in relation to alternatives and that their project has produced coherent and well-justified conclusions, situated in relation to the literature.

IMPORTANT: Please note any research activity (publications, prizes etc.) which is used to meet candidature equivalence in Stage 1 cannot be used again towards scholarship rating in Stage 2.

STAGE 2 - Scholarship rating for applicants with MRes or MRes equivalence

Determine the score for standard scholarship criteria and then calculate a single nominal rating using the formula provided below.

Standard Criteria:
Applicants should be given a score of 1 to 5 for each of the 4 standard criteria. Refer to the rating sheet table for detail. The 4 standard criteria are:
A = references
B = academic performance and thesis results
C = peer-reviewed outputs or other evidence of peer-reviewed research activity
D = merit-based scholarships, prizes and awards

The standard criteria are then used to calculate a single nominal rating. Note that criteria A and B are weighted and must be multiplied as detailed below.

Nominal Rating:
Step 1: Total = (rating for criterion A x 2) + (rating for criterion B x 4) + rating for criterion C + rating for criterion D.
Step 2: Divide the total by 8 to give a rating out of 5.

Example of nominal rating:
Standard criteria scores are:  A=4, B=4, C=3, D=2.
Step 1: total = (4 x 2) + (4 x 4) + 3 + 2 = 29
Step 2: 29 / 8 = 3.625 nominal rating

Ranking (for scholarship main rounds): Based on the nominal rating, Faculties are asked to rank their applicants on the spreadsheet provided by the HDRO.

Exceptional cases: Faculties may make a case for exceptional applicants where there are other additional outstanding factors not covered by standard rating criteria. For example, the exceptional ranking of the applicant’s former university or an applicant’s outstanding work-related research activity may be considered exceptional. Such cases may be taken into consideration where the Faculty makes a case and supplies evidence for inclusion of these factors.
**HDR Scholarship Rating Sheet**

Name: __________________________  SN: __________________________

Program: __________________________  Faculty: __________________________

Dept: __________________________  Prior EFTSL: __________________________

Prior HDR Scholarship? [ ] yes [ ] No

Completed [ ] PhD  [ ] MPhil  [ ] MRes

### STANDARD CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. References (x2)</th>
<th>B. academic performance &amp; thesis results (x4)</th>
<th>C. Peer reviewed research outputs or other evidence of peer reviewed research activity</th>
<th>D. Merit-based scholarships, prizes &amp; awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A. References (x2)</th>
<th>B. academic performance &amp; thesis results (x4)</th>
<th>C. Peer reviewed research outputs or other evidence of peer reviewed research activity</th>
<th>D. Merit-based scholarships, prizes &amp; awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All Excellent</td>
<td>Applicant was top of class, with outstanding thesis results, all or mostly HDs</td>
<td>A record of publications in international journals or international conference proceedings</td>
<td>Recognition beyond the institution e.g. national awards, external funding bodies, significant industry prizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good to Excellent</td>
<td>Applicant is highly ranked in class, has excellent thesis result and all or almost all D's or HD's</td>
<td>Publication(s) in international journals or conference proceedings and/or papers presented at international conferences</td>
<td>Recognition e.g., prizes and scholarships at institutional level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Applicant ranked well in class but not in top group, has very good thesis result and mostly D's and HD's</td>
<td>Publications in national journals, poster presentations at international or national conferences</td>
<td>Multiple prizes or scholarships at faculty, school or department level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Applicant attained good thesis result and mostly D's</td>
<td>Publication in in-house journals, conference or poster presentations in local conferences</td>
<td>Single prize at faculty, school or department level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Applicant received mostly Credits and average thesis result</td>
<td>Non peer reviewed research output</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCORE:

**NOMINAL RATING**

* NOMINAL RATING = [(Ax2) + (Bx4) + C + D] / 8

**Exceptional cases (attach evidence)**

**Revised Rating**

### Notes:

- Where Medal or Commendation equivalence is claimed, details must be provided.
- 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.
- An account must be given of the significance and academic competitiveness of prizes/scholarships.
- Departments must give an evaluation of the relevant peer-reviewed activity (e.g. ranking of journal, difficulty of being accepted at conference).

Nominated for scholarship: [ ] No  [ ] Yes  Proposed Nominal Rating: _________  Allocation Code: ________________

HDR Director: __________________________  Signature: __________________________  Date: _____________

ADHDR: __________________________  Signature: __________________________  Date: _____________