

Undergraduate Research Bursary Assessment Process

Proposals will be ranked on the following criteria, taking into account the terms and conditions of the bursary scheme:

1. Fit to the charitable aims of the Association (Pass or Fail)
2. Completeness of the application and adherence to the specific terms and conditions (Pass or Fail)
3. Quality of the proposed training and personal development opportunities offered by the project and the supervisor(s) (25%)
4. Scientific excellence of the project (25%)
5. Feasibility of the project (25%)
6. Time that the principal supervisor is personally prepared to devote to the project (25%)

1. Fit to charitable aims:

This will be assessed on a pass or fail basis. Projects that are considered to fall outside the charitable aims of the Association will not be considered further.

2. Completeness and adherence to the terms and conditions:

This will be assessed on a pass or fail basis. Applications that are incomplete in any aspect will not be considered further. Applications that are deemed to fail any of the stated terms and conditions, e.g. regarding the eligibility of the students or supervisors, or number of permitted applications, or for any other reason, will not be considered further.

3. Quality of the proposed training and personal development opportunities offered by the project and the supervisor(s)

This should take into account the background and career ambitions of the student, as stated in their personal statement, as well as the ability of the supervisor(s) to supervise a project in the field of study. Ideally, the project should offer opportunities for the student to be trained in techniques that are new to them, in a field that is relevant to their ambitions, by researcher(s) in that field. This category will be scored out of 10 using the following indicative scores:

Score	Quality of research project
10	Excellent, highly relevant training opportunities, delivered by researchers in the field
8	Excellent, relevant training opportunities, delivered by researchers in the field
6	Good, highly relevant training opportunities, delivered by researchers in the field
4	Good, relevant training opportunities, delivered by researchers in the field
2	Limited training in new techniques, and/or of limited relevance to student's career ambitions
0	No opportunities to be trained in new techniques, or no relevance to student's career ambitions

4. Scientific quality:

This category will be scored out of 10 using the following indicative scores:

Score	Quality of research project
-------	-----------------------------

10	Outstanding: of exceptional scientific merit and originality; top 5%
8	Excellent: novel and timely; will advance understanding and should be publishable; top 20%
6	Very good: original, competitive science; potentially publishable
4	Good: a scientifically sound project with modest ambitions that will add new, useful knowledge
2	Of merit: a generally sound but limited project that may provide new, useful knowledge
0	A poorly conceived project that is significantly flawed in some aspect

5. Feasibility

This depends upon a number of potential factors, such as the time available for the project; potential problems with sample collection/availability; the nature of the available facilities; the need for additional, unsecured, funding etc. All aspects related to feasibility should be considered. This category will be scored out of 10 using the following indicative scores:

Score	Feasibility of the overall project
10	No obvious deficiencies and definitely achievable in the time indicated
8	Likely to be achievable in the time indicated, and no more than one minor concern
6	Should be achievable but potential problems in more than one aspect of the research
4	A number of potential problems mean that this project may not be feasible
2	Unlikely to be feasible and/or achievable in the time indicated
0	An unfeasible project that is fundamentally flawed

6. Time that the principal supervisor is personally prepared to devote to the project

More important than the absolute number of hours is the quality of the time and when it occurs during the project. As an acceptable minimum, it is expected that the principal supervisor will be available at the outset of the project in order to ensure a smooth beginning for all concerned, is available to discuss results and interpretations, and is available towards the end to ensure a successful conclusion. This category will be scored out of 10 using the following indicative scores:

Score	Description
10	The principal supervisor will be present continuously throughout the entire project
8	The principal supervisor will be present for most of the duration of the project
6	The principal supervisor will be present for no more than half the project
4	The principal supervisor is able to commit to the minimum only
2	The principal supervisor is unable to commit to the minimum amount of time
0	No details are provided or the principal supervisor is unable to commit any time