

Assessment Criteria for SHF Awards

Clear statement that articulates how candidate or thesis fits with [SHF mission](#)

5:

Excellent

A cogent, compelling, imaginative, well-structured, and clearly argued statement that shows excellent potential. It engages with, and advances, the SHF mission and values clearly, and identifies and demonstrates sustainable links between the PhD project and the proposed WRDTP pathway. It outlines the clear added value that the award will offer to the candidate, and to wider debates and society.

4:

Very Good

A well formulated statement that demonstrates the synergies between the application and the SHF mission and values. It advances clear rationales for the application and its contributions. It illustrates the potential wider benefits to society and the candidate, and links to the WRDTP pathway. It may be less well expressed and/or make fewer compelling links than applicants gaining the highest scores.

3:

Good

A solid statement that offers a coherent structure and argument. It shows an awareness of the SHF mission and may connect this to the application and to its potential benefits for society and the candidate. This potential may not always be clear or convincing and may not link well to the WRDTP pathway. The statement and its arguments will be less well expressed than the higher grades.

2:

Weak

Weakly written/unconvincing statement that suggests a partial grasp and limited engagement with the SHF mission. Fails to link this mission to the thesis, to society, to the student's future or to the WRDTP pathway. The structure and expression may be poor.

1:

Poor

Makes a very limited or no attempt to meet the brief or to connect the statement to the wider agendas outlined above.

0:

No Evidence

Candidates fail to address the criteria in any meaningful or consistent way

WRDTP
June 2025