STAGE 1 – MRes Equivalence for PhD admission (if applicable)

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 the assessment on the Applications Assessment sheet provided by the HDRO and include 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 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 OR applicants for MRes/PhD bundle scholarship consideration

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 0 to 5 for each of the standard criteria A – C. Refer to the rating sheet table for detail. The 3 standard criteria are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Academic Referees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Academic performance and thesis result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>High quality peer-reviewed research output and/or relevant professional related research experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Nominal Rating:**
Step 1: Total = Rating for criterion A + (rating for criterion B x 4) + rating for criterion C
Step 2: Divide the total by 6 to give a numerical rating.

**Example of nominal rating:**
Standard criteria scores are: A=4, B=4, C=3
Step 1: total = 4 + (4 x 4) + 3 = 23
Step 2: 23/ 6 = 3.83 nominal rating

**Bonus:** In order to pursue the University strategy of more closely aligning scholarships to high quality candidates Macquarie adds a weighting to the Academic Performance and Thesis Results category by multiplying the individual rating by 1.1 for Macquarie University MRes graduates, applicants with qualifications from a top 200 university as listed on the Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Rankings of World Universities (http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU2015.html) or applicants with qualifications from Macquarie University Priority 1 Cotutelle and Joint PhD partners (https://www.mq.edu.au/research/phd-and-research-degrees/explore-research-degrees/cotutelle-and-joint-phd/_nocache).

Standard criteria scores are: A=4, B=4, C=3
Step 1: total = 4 + (4 x (4 x1.1)) + 3 = 24.6
Step 2: 24.6/ 6 = 4.1 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, 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.
### Standard Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>A (x1)</th>
<th>B (x4) Entry Qualification</th>
<th>C (x1)</th>
<th>Academic performance &amp; thesis results*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All Excellent</td>
<td>Applicant has outstanding thesis results and outstanding academic track record</td>
<td>High quality peer-reviewed research output and/or relevant professional related research experience**</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>One or more publication(s) in highly rated journal(s) of international standing usually as lead author, or equivalent</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>Publication(s) in journals of internationally recognised standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Applicant attained good thesis result and mostly D’s</td>
<td>Publications in nationally recognised journals, poster presentations at international or national conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Applicant received mostly Credits and average thesis result</td>
<td>Publication in in-house journals, conference or poster presentations in local conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOMINAL RATING**

NOMINAL RATING = \( \frac{((Ax1) + (Bx4) + C)}{6} \)

***BONUS***

*refer to page one under Bonus*

### EXCEPTIONAL CASES

### REVISED RATING

---

*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 Proposed Nominal Rating: ______ Allocation Code: ______________________
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