National Industry PhD Program

Round 7 Assessment Guidelines

Contents

Overview

Introduction

The National Industry PhD Program (the Program) is a doctoral program as a part of the Department of Education's (DOE) University Research Commercialisation Package under the Increase Workforce Mobility Initiative. The Program is designed with an industry application, and under appropriate academic and industry supervision, PhD candidates can undertake a co-designed research project with university and industry participation. The specific objectives and assessment criteria for the Program are available in the *National Industry PhD Program Guidelines* on the Program website.

Program Objectives

The objectives of the program are to:

- Develop talented PhD candidates into researchers who can work in both industry and academic settings
- Support industry professionals to develop expert research skills and support the next generation of industry researchers and leaders
- Contribute to and strengthen industry-focused innovation and development through greater university-industry collaboration
- Support PhD Research Projects co-designed between university and industry, aligning with Australian Government priorities

Program Outcomes

The intended outcomes of the program are to:

- Equip PhD candidates with the skills and experience to better translate university research into commercialisation outcomes
- Equip PhD candidates with strong workforce capability at the interface of research and industry, and across the sectors in future

Purpose of the Assessment Rubric

The Assessment Rubric is a grid or matrix that contains the description of the standards for the selection criteria. It communicates the standards of the assessment task to the assessors.

Assessment Principles

The assessor must apply the following principles during their assessment of the project application:

- The assessment process must be fair, transparent, objective, impartial and independent and seen to be as such by all.
- The assessor must agree to a confidentiality and conflict of interest statement and must clearly disclose any conflicts of interest which may affect their ability to perform their role.
- The assessment must be undertaken free of any personal and unconscious biases.
- The assessor should employ the *SMART Principle (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time Bound)* when assessing project objectives to ascertain if they are attainable within the funding period.
- Each application must be considered individually on its merits, based on how well it meets the criteria, how it compares to other applications and whether it provides value with relevant money.
- The assessor must only consider information provided in the application and any included mandatory attachments and/or evidence for assessment purposes. Unsolicited attachments and/or evidence must be excluded from the assessment process.
- The assessment must maintain quality and excellence to achieve the highest quality decision-making and recommendations for funding approval.
- The assessment must be sufficiently detailed with justifications for each assessment criteria to arrive at the overall score and assessment outcome.
- The assessment comments must be free of inappropriate elements and comments.

Guidelines for Assessment

Scoring System

Assessments against the selection criteria should use the following scoring system:

Result	Raw Score	Scoring Standard	Description
Outstanding	80 – 100%	Exceptionally strong with negligible or no weaknesses	The response to the assessment criteria is of exceptionally high quality with all or most of the sub-criteria addressed to a very high standard. The response demonstrates a superior level of understanding of the purpose of the grant program and its intended outcomes. High-quality evidence is available and demonstrates superior performance against each criterion.
Very Good	70 – 79%	Very strong with one or two minor weaknesses	The response to the assessment criteria is of very good quality with most of the sub-criteria addressed to a high standard. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of the purpose of the grant program and its intended outcomes. Very good evidence is available and demonstrates strong performance against each criterion.
Good	60 – 69%	Strong with a few minor weaknesses	The response to the assessment criteria is of good quality with some of the sub-criteria addressed to a good standard. The response demonstrates a good understanding of the purpose of the grant program and its intended outcomes. Proven evidence is available and demonstrates good performance against each criterion.
Satisfactory	50 – 59%	Some strengths, but also contains moderate weaknesses	The response to the assessment criteria is of suitable quality with few of the sub-criteria addressed to a satisfactory standard. The response demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the purpose of the grant program and its intended outcomes. Suitable evidence is available and demonstrates satisfactory performance against each criterion.
Poor	0 – 49%	Very few strengths with at least one major weakness or numerous major weaknesses	The response to the assessment criteria is unsatisfactory. The response fails to address one or more sub-criteria satisfactorily and does not achieve the pass score for one or more criterion. Evidence is unavailable, not relevant or lacking in detail.

Assessment Rubric

Each application will be assessed against the following four selection criteria.

Selection Criteria	Total Weighting	Sub-criterion and Description	Weighting of Each Sub-criterion	Relevant Questions from Application Form	Demonstratable Requirements and Additional Assessment Guidance
1. Engagement between University and Industry Partners	25%	1.1 Potential for long-term collaboration between the University and Industry Partner • How will this project potentially lead to future collaborations between the University and Industry Partner? • Are there long-term benefits from this project for the University and Industry Partner? • Are there any significant risks that may impact a long-term collaboration?	12.5%	• Response to Selection Criterion 1 • Letter of Intent	• Case for future collaborations established • Long-term project benefits identified • Risks to long-term collaboration considered
		For existing collaborations **[i.e. new project with an existing partner]** 1.2.a Strength and quality of engagement between the University and Industry Partner • Has the University and Industry Partner collaborated on previous projects? • What is the length of the relationship and success of these previous projects? • How committed are the University and Industry Partner to the project's success and expanding on the existing working relationship?	12.5%		**For existing collaborations** • Previous projects with Industry Partner identified • Length and success of previous projects evidenced • Strong University and Industry Partner commitment established • Likelihood of project success considered

		• What interactions have the University and Industry Partner had on the proposed project to date and how does this indicate a likelihood of success? **OR** **For new collaborations** **[i.e. new project with a new partner]** 1.2.b Commitment to develop new or emerging collaboration between the University and Industry Partner • Is the new collaboration likely to be strong and ongoing? • How committed are the University and Industry Partner to the project's success and creating an effective working relationship? • What are the potential opportunities from this new collaboration? • What are the expected outcomes from this new collaboration?			**OR** **For new collaborations** • Capacity and capability of Industry Partner evidenced • Potential future collaboration opportunities identified • Strong University and Industry Partner commitment established • Likelihood of ongoing collaboration considered
2. Research feasibility and strategic alignment	25%	2.1 Viability of the project's design, duration, equipment, and supervisory team(s)/support • Is the project considered to be viable overall based on the aims, design resources and timeframes? • Have IP arrangements been agreed in advance between the University and Industry Partner? • Has an appropriately qualified and experienced University supervisor been identified? • What key risks may affect the viability of the project?	5%	• Project Description • Project Aims • Project Design • Project Timeline • Intellectual Property (IP) • University point of contact • Response to Selection Criterion 2	• Viability of project clearly established • IP arrangements appropriately considered and/or agreed upon • Suitably qualified and experienced University project supervisor/s identified • Risks to project considered
		2.2 Provision from the Industry Partner's resources for the project's design, development, and delivery • What level of financial resources is the Industry Partner providing for the project? Is there any additional cash and/or in-kind contributions from the Industry Partner? • Has the University and Industry Partner agreed to embed the PhD candidate between 20 to 50 per cent of the time? • How will the embedment arrangements be managed with the PhD candidate's other responsibilities? • Has an appropriately qualified and experienced Industry Partner supervisor been identified?	5%	• Project Contribution – industry contributions (financial/in-kind) • Industry Partner main project contact • Letter of Intent • Response to Selection Criterion 2	• Appropriate financial and in-kind Industry Partner contributions to support project success identified • University and Industry Partner embedment percentage agreed (either within the required 20-50% range, or with strong justification if outside this range) • Suitably qualified and experienced Industry Partner project supervisor/s identified
		2.3.a. Project aligned with Australian Government priority areas, including the National Reconstruction Fund (NRF) priorities • What NRF or other specified Government priority does the project align with? • How will the project contribute to the Government's plan to create new jobs, encourage investment in strategically important industries, drive sustainable economic growth and establish Australia's future prosperity?	5%	• Industry partner – National Reconstruction Fund (NRF) Government Priority • Response to Selection Criterion 2	• Alignment with NRF or other identified Government priority *(Service Provider to determine)* • Benefits from the project towards the priority area clearly identified *(Assessment Committee to assess benefits using scoring system where applicable)*
		2.3.b. Project located in a regional area outside of the Major Cities locations (as classified by the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS)) • Is the university's campus or industry partner's main location in a regional or remote areas as defined by the ASGS? • Will the project contribute to solving a regional-specific issue or problem? • What economic, environmental, technical or social benefits will this project bring to the regional area?	5%	• Locations – Is the university campus or industry work location in a regional location? • Response to Selection Criterion 2	• Project is located in a regional area *(Service Provider to determine)* • Benefits from the project towards the regional area clearly identified *(Assessment Committee to assess benefits using scoring system where applicable)*
		2.3.c. Project includes an Industry Partner that is an Australian-based for-profit organisation	5%	• Industry partner –	• Industry Partner is an Australian-based for-profit organisation *(Service Provider to determine)* • *No scoring by Assessment Committee required*

				○ Is the project partner Australian based? ○ Is the project partner a for-profit organisation? ○ ABN/ACN	
3. Project impact	25%	3.1 Demonstrated understanding of how the project will lead to social, economical, technical, cultural and/or environmental impact • How does the project contribute to Australia's economic, environmental and social needs? • Will the project likely support the development of real-world commercialisation and translation products or services?	12.5%	• Response to Selection Criterion 3	• Project's impact on national needs justified, including the impact level and scale • Measurement of the project impact explained • Genuine path to research translation and/or commercialisation and potential contribution to real-world innovation identified
		3.2 Relevance of the project to the Industry Partner's commercial or translation opportunity, including the pathways used to encourage the translation of research into impact • How important is the project to the Industry Partner? • Does the project relate to a key part of the Industry Partner's operations? • Is the project likely to lead to a new or improved commercial or translational outcome for the Industry Partner?	12.5%		• Project's contribution to Industry Partner's broader objectives and outcomes established • Likelihood of the project leading to translational and/or commercialisation considered • Process of the project's commercialisation explained • Pathways to the project's commercial translation justified
4. Capacity, capability, and resources to support the development of PhD candidates	25%	4.1 Suitability of plans to provide the PhD candidate with appropriate professional development • Is the project designed to provide the PhD candidate with an opportunity to develop research translation and/or commercialisation skills and knowledge? • Are there professional development plans in place and are these appropriate to support development of the PhD candidate?	12.5%	• Response to Selection Criterion 4 • Project Contribution – industry/university contributions (financial/in-kind) • Letter of Intent	• Appropriate plans to support PhD candidate's professional development and research translation and/or commercialisation skills and knowledge evidenced
		4.2 Resource commitment and support for PhD candidates from the Participating University and Industry Partner • What facilities and infrastructure are being provided to the PhD candidate from the University and Industry Partner? • What level of financial support is being provided to the PhD candidate from the University and Industry Partner? For Industry Linked PhDs, is the stipend support above the base rate? • How will the project contribute to the development of the PhD candidate's skills and long-term employment prospects? • Is it likely that the project's success will lead to employment at the Industry Partner upon completion?	12.5%		• Clear resources (including facilities, infrastructure and financial support) from Industry Partner to support PhD candidate identified • Potential post-completion employment opportunities for PhD candidate identified • Likelihood of project enhancing PhD candidate's long-term employment prospects considered

Score Sheet

Step-by-step Instructions for using Score Sheet:

1. Following the Assessment Rubric and Scoring Schema, enter a Raw Score (0 – 100%) in Column A for each sub-criterion.
2. Multiply the Raw Score (A) by the Weighting (B) to calculate the Weighted Score (C) for each sub-criterion (e.g. 80% x 25% = 20%). Record the Weighted Score in Column C.
3. Sum together all weighted scores to calculate the Total Overall Score (D). Record the Total Overall Score in Cell D, to two decimal places.

1. Engagement between University and Industry Partners (25%)	**A. Raw Score (0 -100%)**	**B. Weighting**	**C. Weighted Score (C = A x B)**
1.1 Potential for long-term collaboration between the University and Industry Partner		12.5%	
1.2.a Strength and quality of engagement between the University and Industry Partner **OR** 1.2.b Commitment to develop new or emerging collaboration between the University and Industry Partner and to the project's success		12.5%	
2. Research feasibility and strategic alignment (25%)	**A. Raw Score (0 – 100%)**	**B. Weighting**	**C. Weighted Score (C = A x B)**
2.1 Viability of the project's design, duration, equipment, and supervisory team(s)/support		5%	
2.2 Provision from the Industry Partner's resources (including staff time) for the project's design, development, and delivery		5%	
2.3.a. Project aligned with an Australian Government priority area, including the National Reconstruction Fund (NRF) priorities		5%	
2.3.b. Project located in a regional area outside of the Major Cities locations		5%	
2.3.c. Project includes an Industry Partner that is an Australian-based for-profit organisation *(Note: Service Provider to undertake assessment and provide score)*		5%	
3. Project impact (25%)	**A. Raw Score (0 -100%)**	**B. Weighting**	**C. Weighted Score (C = A x B)**
3.1 Demonstrated understanding of how the project will lead to social, economical, technical, cultural and/or environmental impact		12.5%	
3.2 Relevance of the project to the Industry Partner's commercial or translation opportunity		12.5%	
4. Capacity, capability and resources to support the development of PhD candidates (25%)	**A. Raw Score (0 -100%)**	**B. Weighting**	**C. Weighted Score (C = A x B)**
4.1 Suitability of plans to provide the PhD candidate with appropriate professional development		12.5%	
4.2 Resource commitment and support for PhD candidates from the Participating University and Industry Partner		12.5%	
Assessment Outcome	**D. Total Overall Score (sum of all C's) to two decimal points**		

Assessment Comments

Please provide short comments for each sub-criterion to explain the scores and broader application process.

Note: Comments will be used to support Campus Plus in providing constructive feedback to unsuccessful applicants following finalisation of the application round.

1. Engagement between University and Industry Partners (25%)	**Comments**
1.1 Potential for long-term collaboration between the University and Industry Partner	
1.2.a. Strength and quality of engagement between the University and Industry Partner **OR** 1.2.b Commitment to develop new or emerging collaboration between the University and Industry Partner and to the project's success	
2. Research feasibility and strategic alignment (25%)	**Comments**
2.1 Viability of the project's design, duration, equipment, and supervisory team(s)/support	
2.2 Provision from the Industry Partner's resources (including staff time) for the project's design, development, and delivery	
2.3 Alignment with identified strategic priorities (2.3.a – 2.3.c)	
3. Project impact (25%)	**Comments**
3.1 Demonstrated understanding of how the project will lead to social, economical, technical, cultural and/or environmental impact	
3.2 Relevance of the project to the Industry Partner's commercial or translation opportunity	
4. Capacity, capability and resources to support the development of PhD candidates (25%)	**Comments**
4.1 Suitability of plans to provide the PhD candidate with appropriate professional development	
4.2 Resource commitment and support for PhD candidates from the Participating University and Industry Partner	
Overall Comments, including clear overall value proposition for PhD Candidate and Industry Partner	