



Assessment Rubric

Australian General Practice Research Foundation PhD Top-up Scholarships

Scoring approach

Each criterion is assessed using a 10-point scale, informed by the rubric below. The rubric describes five performance bands (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, Poor). Each band corresponds to a range of scores (for example, Excellent = 9–10).

Applications are assessed according to the extent to which they align with the descriptors in each performance band for the relevant criterion. An application may demonstrate characteristics described across more than one performance band.

Assessors use their professional judgement to determine the score that best reflects the overall quality of the application against each criterion, taking into account the relative strengths and weaknesses demonstrated. For example, an application may align strongly with several descriptors in the 9–10 band while also aligning with some descriptors in a lower band. In these circumstances, the assessor will determine the most appropriate score within the available range.



Criterion 1: Suitability of the applicant (40%)

The applicant should demonstrate strong academic capability, relevant research experience and/or training, motivation to contribute to academic general practice post-PhD, and potential for future contribution to general practice research.

9-10 Excellent	7-8 Very good	5-6 Good	3-4 Satisfactory	1-2 Poor
- Academic record demonstrates sustained high achievement and strong readiness for doctoral research relative to opportunity. - Research experience and/or training provide an excellent Foundation for the candidate to successfully manage the proposed PhD research. - Motivation and commitment to academic general practice are compelling and clearly aligned to the proposed research area, with a credible pathway toward future contribution to general practice research. - Publications, presentations, prizes, awards, or other scholarly achievements demonstrate strong research engagement relative to opportunity.	- Academic record demonstrates consistent achievement appropriate for doctoral research relative to opportunity. - Research experience and/or training are well aligned to the proposed PhD and demonstrate good research capability. - Motivation and commitment to academic general practice are clearly articulated, with good potential for future contribution to general practice research. - Publications, presentations, prizes, awards, or other scholarly achievements demonstrate meaningful research engagement relative to opportunity.	- Academic record demonstrates capability for doctoral research, though strengths or consistency are less evident. - Research experience and/or training provide an appropriate foundation for undertaking the proposed PhD. - Motivation to contribute to academic general practice is evident, though future contribution pathways are not strongly developed. - Some publications, presentations, prizes, awards, or other scholarly achievements are evident relative to opportunity.	- Academic record includes some areas of concern regarding preparedness for doctoral research. - Research experience and/or training are limited in scope, relevance, or depth for the proposed PhD. - Motivation to contribute to academic general practice and future involvement in general practice research are only broadly described, weakly developed, or poorly connected to the proposed research area. - Limited evidence of scholarly engagement relative to opportunity.	- Academic record does not demonstrate adequate preparedness for doctoral research. - Research experience and/or training do not adequately support undertaking the proposed PhD. - Motivation to contribute to academic general practice and future involvement in general practice research are unclear, unconvincing, or absent from the application. - Minimal or no evidence of scholarly engagement relative to opportunity.



Criterion 2: Strength of the research project (30%) The proposed research project should demonstrate strong methodological quality, feasibility within the context of a PhD, relevance to general practice, and potential to contribute meaningful outcomes to general practice and patient care.				
9-10 Excellent	7-8 Very good	5-6 Good	3-4 Satisfactory	1-2 Poor
- Research question/s are exceptionally clear, and focused. - Relevance to general practice is clearly articulated and strongly integrated throughout the project. - Study design, methodology, and proposed approach are highly appropriate and well justified. - Project scope and proposed timelines demonstrate strong feasibility within the context of a PhD. - Project demonstrates a credible and well-developed pathway toward outcomes that may inform general practice policy, practice, education, or patient care.	- Research question/s are clear. - Relevance to general practice is clearly articulated and consistently reflected throughout the project. - Study design, methodology, and proposed approach are appropriate with only minor limitations. - Project scope and proposed timelines appear realistic and appropriate within the context of a PhD. - Project demonstrates good potential to contribute outcomes relevant to general practice policy, practice, education, or patient care.	- Research question/s are satisfactory. - Relevance to general practice is evident, though integration into the overall project is less developed. - Study design and methodology provide an appropriate foundation for the proposed research, though some elements require clarification or stronger justification. - Project is likely to be feasible, though some concerns regarding scope or complexity are evident. - Potential contribution to general practice policy, practice, education, or patient care is plausible but not strongly articulated.	- Research question/s are only broadly described. - Relevance to general practice is only briefly described, inconsistently addressed, or weakly connected to the proposed project. - Research is insufficiently justified or weakly connected to a meaningful issue in general practice. - Study design, methodology, or proposed approach include notable weaknesses, inconsistencies, or insufficient detail. - Feasibility concerns regarding scope, timelines, complexity, or delivery are evident. - Potential contribution to general practice policy, practice, education, or patient care is vague or underdeveloped.	- Research question/s are unclear, or inappropriate. - Little or no evidence of relevance to general practice. - Study design, methodology, or proposed approach are fundamentally flawed, poorly justified, or absent. - Project scope, timelines, complexity, or delivery approach do not demonstrate adequate feasibility within the context of a PhD. - Little or no evidence of potential contribution to general practice policy, practice, education, or patient care.



Criterion 3: Strength of the supervision (30%)

The supervisory team and research environment should demonstrate appropriate expertise, alignment to the proposed project, meaningful mentoring and training support, and opportunities to support the applicant's research development and successful completion of the PhD.

Assessment should focus on the evidence provided within the application regarding supervisory expertise, mentoring, support arrangements, and research development opportunities relevant to the proposed PhD. Institutional reputation or supervisor prominence within the sector should not be used as proxies for supervision quality.

9-10 Excellent	7-8 Very good	5-6 Good	3-4 Satisfactory	1-2 Poor
- Supervisory expertise demonstrates strong alignment across the proposed research area, methodology, and applicant development needs. - Academic general practice expertise has a central and active role in supervision throughout candidature. - Mentoring, training, and research support arrangements are clearly articulated and strongly support the applicant's research development. - Application clearly describes meaningful opportunities for collaboration, networking, and research skill development during candidature. - Application demonstrates a well-supported environment for successful completion of the PhD.	- Supervisory expertise is well aligned to the proposed project and applicant development needs. - Academic general practice expertise has a clear and active role in supervision during candidature. - Mentoring, training, and research support arrangements are appropriate and well described. - Application describes good opportunities for collaboration and research development during candidature. - Application demonstrates a supportive environment for successful completion of the PhD.	- Supervisory expertise is generally appropriate for the proposed project, though some gaps or limitations are evident. - Academic general practice expertise is included within the supervision arrangements and contributes to supervision during candidature. - Mentoring, training, or research support arrangements provide an appropriate foundation for doctoral development, though some elements lack detail or clarity. - Some opportunities for collaboration or research skill development are evident. - Application demonstrates general capacity to support successful completion of the PhD.	- Supervisory expertise is limited in scope, alignment, or relevance to the proposed project. - Academic general practice expertise has a limited, unclear, or peripheral role within supervision arrangements. - Mentoring, training, or research support arrangements lack clarity, depth, or appropriateness for the applicant's needs. - Limited opportunities for collaboration or research development are evident. - Some concerns regarding the capacity to support successful completion of the PhD are evident.	- Supervisory expertise does not adequately support the proposed project or applicant development needs. - Little or no evidence is provided regarding how academic general practice expertise will support the applicant during candidature. - Mentoring, training, or research support arrangements are unclear, inadequate, or absent. - Minimal opportunities for collaboration or research development are evident. - Significant concerns regarding the capacity to support successful completion of the PhD are evident.