



Mead Fellowships : Stage 1 Shortlisting criteria (for information only)

Here is the marking criteria that the shortlisting panel will use to assess your Stage 1 Mead Fellowship application. After shortlisting, you will receive individual panel feedback about the main points made.

Before you submit your application, we suggest you ask trusted colleagues / friends to review your proposal against these criteria, and make any suggestions for improvements.

	Weak = 1	Moderate = 2	Strong = 3
Q2. What is the name of your project / idea?	Vague, unlikely to engage an audience. <input type="radio"/>	Comprehensible, and possibly able to engage an audience. <input type="radio"/>	Clear, persuasive compelling and likely to engage an audience. <input type="radio"/>
Q3. Who is the project / idea for and why is it unique?	Little or no understanding of audience / lacks any evidence. Lacking in originality. <input type="radio"/>	Some understanding and analysis of audience. Some factual support. Demonstrates some unique elements. <input type="radio"/>	Clear and compelling, fact-based description of audience, including testing of the viability of the idea. Appears particularly unique and interesting. <input type="radio"/>
Q4. What do you hope to learn/ achieve through carrying out your project / idea?	Unclear how participant's learning will develop, or what they intend to achieve by undertaking the project. <input type="radio"/>	Partial explanation of how participant's learning will develop, and what they intend to achieve by undertaking the project. <input type="radio"/>	Convincing, extensive and detailed descriptions of participant's learning gain, benefits and what they intend to achieve. <input type="radio"/>
Q5. If you win an award, how do you plan to spend it?	Poor description and identification of costs associated with project. No evidence of research. <input type="radio"/>	Adequate description and identification of costs associated with project. But not much evidence of research. <input type="radio"/>	Detailed and comprehensive description / identification of costs associated with project. Clear evidence of research. <input type="radio"/>
Q6. What skills and experience do you have that can help turn this project/ idea into reality?	No evidence showing applicant has the right skills or experience to undertake or complete the project. <input type="radio"/>	Some relevant skills and experience. And/or some awareness of skills gaps - and consideration of how to address these. <input type="radio"/>	Clear evidence that skills and experience are perfectly matched. And/or evidence of partners/team members who will address any skill gaps. <input type="radio"/>
Q7. How will you measure if your project/ idea has been successful?	Unclear how the project outcomes would be evaluated. <input type="radio"/>	Some explanation of how the project outcomes would be evaluated. <input type="radio"/>	Clear and convincing identification of methods for evaluating project outcomes. <input type="radio"/>
Q8. How does your project/ idea fit with your longer term ambitions?	Unclear why they would benefit from undertaking project. <input type="radio"/>	Some evidence to support value to applicant's future in undertaking this project <input type="radio"/>	Clear and convincing explanation about value of project to future objectives. Commitment to building on their previous experience. <input type="radio"/>
Overall Presentation	Rambling script, missing information, typographical errors, excessive use of superlatives. <input type="radio"/>	Intermediate level of communication. Does not force reader to skim-read irrelevant detail. <input type="radio"/>	Clear, concise, engaging, easy to read. Well-constructed case for funding. No irrelevant sections, no careless errors. All superlatives are supported by evidence. <input type="radio"/>
Section scores	___ x 1 =	___ x 2 =	___ x 3 =
TOTAL SCORE			=